Expert Group Meeting on Creating and Inclusive Society: Practical Strategies to Promote Social Integration. Paris, France, 10 - 13 September 2007

Measuring Social Inclusion and Cohesion – the Challenges.

Mari Fitzduff, Brandeis University 10-13 September 2007, Paris

(Please see below as an addition to the summary re indicators in the E dialogue that preceded the workshop)

Challenge 1: Definition.

It is now over a decade since the term 'Social Inclusion' came into being, and despite a multitude of discussion it is still very difficult to obtain agreement on the term. Such lack of agreement inevitably poses difficulties for concepts of indicators and measurement.

For many, a prime focus of the term is on the issue of poverty, albeit for some it denotes modern poverty as opposed to traditional poverty e.g.*'poverty that is traceable to the global economic restructuring, family dissolution and strained social contracts of the last two decades. It is thus sometimes conflated with a 'new poverty' or 'structural' unemployment that persists and even worsens despite resumed economic growth.*[1]

For others, it is about focusing on *participation* or the lack of it by those of those who are the poorest in society e.g. **'***Social inclusion means ensuring that the marginalized and those living in poverty have greater participation in decision making which affects their lives, allowing them to improve their living standards and their overall well-being.***'**[2]

The issue of participation was also critical to the findings of the UN Social Summit of 1995 whose concept encompassed maximum involvement, and participation of each member of society in social activities. It deemed a socially cohesive society to be one where *all groups have a sense of belonging, participation, inclusion, recognition and legitimacy*.[3]

For some, poverty is not necessarily part of an inherent definition of social inclusion, and their concern would apply even to those who while maybe earning good salaries are prevented from participating in mainstream society for social, cultural and political reasons.

---

[1] Democratic Dialogue *Social Inclusion ☐Report No. 2 ☐by* Democratic Dialogue (1995)
[2] Definition used by Combat poverty Ireland Combat poverty
http://www.combatpoverty.ie/povertyinireland/glossary.htm
[3] http://www.unesco.org/most/besseng.htm

Moreover, the *manifestations of social exclusion,* and how people understand it, *will often be understood differently according to the perceived needs of their society* e.g. in some societies, gender may be the main issues of exclusion, in others immigrants or racial, ethnic and religious minorities are excluded; in others, linguistic communities. It has also been shown that social exclusion is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, encompassing work and unemployment, distribution of wealth, health and educational equity issues, urban management, cultural and political systems

Indeed, some cynics will say that the definitions of 'social exclusion' that international agencies or governments use *tend to be the vague product of consensus-seeking or the ideological upshot of national traditions or interest-group rhetoric.[4]*

To complicate the challenge, and despite the best attempts at glossary makers [5] definitions for social cohesion, social inclusion/exclusion and social integration (although the latter is more often posited as an objective rather than a process) often tend to be used interchangeably.[6]

Given the above challenges, it is all the more important that it is understood that any attempted measurement of Social Inclusion *can only be useful within the framework of a particular contextual analysis, and the program objectives arising from such an analysis.* In other words, put simply, you have to know where you want to go before you can measure if you are getting there – the term Social Inclusion – or Cohesion will not be a useful guide to you. It is also important to remember that measurement tools, like other tools, are often designed to achieve particular and often differing results e.g. *analytical* tools are designed to expose the problem; *educational* tools are designed to raise awareness, to transfer knowledge and support training; and *consultative and participatory* tools are designed to improve the quality of policy-making and deepen democracy.[7] It should be noted of course that many tools can apply to all three categories, as well as being used as tools to measure output and success.

Challenge 2: Focus.

The focus of all programs, and all program decisions are, or should be, the product of an analysis of a context, and the needs arising from such. A program designed specifically to address issues of unemployment will be different from a program undertaken to address issues of conflict, although of course there may be a connection between them, and such connections will need to be taken into account in the program design. This perspective has been most cogently recognized in issues of e.g. development and conflict where it is

---

[4] Hilary Silver, 'Reconceptualising Social Disadvantage: Three Paradigms of Social Exclusion', and Hilary Silver and Frank Wilkinson, 'Policies to Combat Social Exclusion: A French-British Comparison' in Gerry Rodgers, Charles Gore and José Figueiredo eds, *Social Exclusion: Rhetoric, Reality, Responses,* International Labor Organization, Geneva, 1995

[5] For an interesting attempt look at http://www.combatpoverty.ie/povertyinireland/glossary.htm and more recently http://www.integrationandcohesion.org.uk/Our_final_report.aspx

[6] http://cordis.europa.eu/tser/src/socialind.htm

[7] www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/literature_review.pd

now agreed that if development is undertaken with no thought given to conflict issues, it can be counterproductive.[8]

Given that my personal and work interest is a focus on coexistence/peace building[9] issues i.e. issues which contribute negatively or positively to conflict or the lack of it between people of different identity groups of an ethnic, religious, cultural or linguistic nature, these are the issues I will address in this paper. In doing so I will use the framework posited by a recent OECD/DAC report which suggested how one should undertake a conflict analysis. Their contention is that while an overall contextual analysis of a situation will seek to understand, broadly, the entire political, economic and social scene, a conflict analysis will focus on measuring those '*elements of the broad picture that propel the conflict, and without which the conflict either would not exist or would be significantly different; which can be long- term structural issues, more immediate triggers or anything in between—as identified by people in the situation. This includes political, economic, social and historical (etc.) factors – but focuses on those that appear to be the driving factors of conflict, and directly influence the shape and dynamics of the conflict.* [10]

Using this analysis, one would note e.g. that while poverty and inequities per se is rarely a cause for violence, poverty that is linked to an identity group that is excluded from e.g. unemployment, education, and livelihood choices, is a very significant factor in fomenting conflict. [11]

Challenge 3: Establishing Objectives.

Following a decision on problem focus, methods and issues of measurement should of course then be linked to objectives, which should in turn provide for indicators. These need to be connected to the particular vision people have of their society, and need the vision to be framed as concretely as possible – otherwise measurement is not feasible. Establishing objectives and indicators for Coexistence/Conflict issues is a relatively new focus, but one which has been gathering momentum over the last few years. I have taken two examples to illustrate the care with which people are attempting to set objectives for such work.

The first examples are taken from a generally peaceful context, i.e. they are the general

---

[8] Anderson, Mary B. *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace - Or War.* Boulder, CO, and London, UK: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1999

[9] I use the term coexistence as used by Coexistence International to cover the range of initiatives necessary to ensure that communities and societies can live more equitably and peacefully together, including conflict prevention and management, post-conflict and conflict transformation work, conflict-sensitivity, peacebuilding, reconciliation, multicultural, and pluralism work.
http://www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/work/coexist.html

[10] An approach to DAC guidance for Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peace building activities
A Joint Activity by: DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation and
DAC Network on Development Evaluation (2007) http://www.adb.org/Documents/Papers/DAC-Guidance/Approach-DAC-Guidance.pdf

[11] UNU /Wider: 2000 *The Wave Of Emergencies Of The Last Decade.* www.wider.unu.edu/pb2pdf

aims established for the UK Social Unit in 2007 whose prime concern is social cohesion that encompasses racial, ethnic and religious differences, primarily arising out of the community conflicts which emerged after 9/11 i.e. Their objectives are expressed in the following terms:

1. There is a clearly defined and widely shared sense of the contribution of different individuals and different communities to a future vision for a neighborhood, city, region or country
2. There is a strong sense of an individual's rights and responsibilities when living in a particular place – people know what everyone expects of them, and what they can expect in turn.
3. Those from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities, access to services and treatment
4. There is a strong sense of trust in institutions locally to act fairly in arbitrating between different interests and for their role and justifications to be subject to public scrutiny
5. There is a strong recognition of the contribution of both those who have newly arrived and those who already have deep attachments to a particular place, with a focus on what they have in common
6. There are strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, in schools and other institutions within neighborhoods. [12]

The second set of objectives are those set for a previously violent society i.e. Northern Ireland, which is now coming out of violence, and which has deemed it necessary to legislate not only for equality success, but also for what it terms success in 'Good Relations' work. Given the context of the work, it is noted that the contextual emphasis here is on safety, the need to include victims/survivors in processes involved in the structuring of society i.e. (in no particular order):

1. Northern Ireland society is free from racism, sectarianism and prejudice.
2. All places are shared, safe, inclusive and welcoming for everyone.
3. Positive and harmonious relationships exist between communities at interface areas.
4. Increased sharing in education
5. Northern Ireland is a community where people of all backgrounds work, live, learn and play together.
6. All work places are safe and shared.
7. Minority ethnic people participate in public, political and economic life.
8. Minority ethnic people benefit from equality in health and welfare.
9. Northern Ireland is a place where cultural diversity is embraced, respected, valued.
10. Victims/survivors have a voice.
11. Public service delivery in Northern Ireland provides value for money on a shared, inclusive and equal basis.[13]

---

[12] www.integrationandcohesion.org.
[13] Good Relations Indicators Baseline Report http://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/good-relations-report.pdf

From such objectives, detailed indicators can and have be set so as to ensure that targets are being met, and can be reviewed as necessary. See pages 32 – 164 of http://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/good-relations-report.pdf.for a very detailed iteration of these indicators in relation to the Northern Ireland objectives set out in the second example above - they provide a good example of what is possible in measurement terms.

Challenge 4: Clarifying Values

Objectives set are set by societies in relation to the values they espouse for their societies, and how they seek to establish these. In reviewing the literature on measurement for social inclusion, four values appear to be of preeminence particularly in societies that are divided and in conflict with each other. These are:

Equality i.e. a commitment at all levels of society to ensuring equality of access to resources, structures and decision-making processes and the adoption of actions to secure and maintain these objectives.

Respect for diversity that affirms the value that can be derived from the existence, understanding and acceptance of difference, whether expressed through religious, ethnic or political background.

Participation i.e. active and effective participation in all aspects of societal decision making that is relevant to their lives at local and national level, and through formal and informal networks.

Interdependence, which requires recognition by different interest or identity groupings of their obligations and commitments to others and of the interconnectedness of individual/community experiences and ambitions. [14]

For each of these it is possible to find established tools for measurement. It is also useful to note that many of these measurement tools often overlap with each other

a) Equality Measurement.

It is important to recognise that equality legislation tends to be framed in terms of *equality of opportunity rather than process or outcome* and to note that inequalities in outcomes are often, although not always, pointers to inequalities in opportunities and/or process i.e. inequality in outcome may be attributable to individual choice and/or

---

[14] In Northern Ireland an Equity, Diversity and Interdependence Framework has been adopted. This framework has been based on: A Framework for Organizational Learning and Change in Northern Ireland by Karin Eyben, Duncan Morrow, Derick Wilson (UU) and Billy Robinson (Counteract) http://www.socsci.ulster.ac.uk/research/education/futureways/edi_report.pdf
Minu Hemmatti, in her UNDESA report on *Participatory Dialogue: Towards a Stable, Safe and Just Society for All* http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/prtcptry-dlog/prtcptry_dlg(full_version).pdf suggests the need to assess a) levels of inclusion, including an assessment of institutions, mechanisms and procedures for inclusion that are provided in a given country b) levels of participation, including measuring the frequency, equality, equity, transparency and effectiveness of participation by all social groups, with particular attention to minorities and marginalized and (formerly) excluded groups
and c) justice/social justice, including assessing the constitution and laws of a country.

differences in opportunity or process

For a good review of measurement indicators see the work by Julia Litchfield for the World Bank at :
http://www1.worldbank.org/prem/poverty/inequal/methods/litchfie.pdf. These sets of measurement are particularly good for those interested in statistical analysis.

A good review for those interested in addressing socio-economic inequality using the Life Quality Index, which considers the disparities in income as well as in mortality, and also takes into account the respondents standard of living. It can be found at http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/klu/soci/1997/00000039/00000002/00128425

In addition there are many measures of quantifying Ethnicity and Inequality, such as the work done Eaton and Rahav who focused particularly on issues of immigration. http://eric.ed.gov:80/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb =true&_&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED166080&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0 =eric_accno&accno=ED166080

For a good discussion on the issues involved in measuring Equality, see the general literature review on the development and use of indicators of equality and diversity by Jim Jamison, Richard Buchanan, Roy Carr-Hill, Donal McDade and Paul Dixon at http://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/literature_review.pdf

Realizing that contexts should determine both focus and indicators for measurement, it may be interesting to look at the measure developed in Northern Ireland to address substantial issues of inequality. In 2000, the Noble Index http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/io/research/0202.pdf was developed to more accurately reflect existing thinking on the measurement of inequality, and this continues to serve as a baseline for all equality measurement in the region today. It serves as an interesting and detailed example of an attempt to cover the muliti-dimensional nature of the measurement of inequality.

The Index covered 9 issues of difference i.e. *Religion, Political Opinion, Age, Race, Marital Status, Sexual Orientation, Men and Women, Disability and Dependents.* A total of 45 indicators were then used which covered the seven domains of *income, employment, health & disability, education & training, geographical access, social environment and housing* (see http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/io/research/0202.pdf for a list of these indicators). The measures were then further combined to produce an overall Multiple Deprivation Measure using the following weights which were derived from a process of consultation: Income 25%, Employment 25%, Health & Disability 15%, Education, Skills & Training 15%, Geographical Access 10% Social Environment 5%, Housing 5%. Finally, these figures were then correlated with district council ward boundaries, which were subsequently used to distribute extra funding and programs to address issues of inequality. The process provided for a cycle of continual updating of the indices, and a consequent adjustment of expenditure. What is important to note is that this Index was drawn up in conjunction with all parties to the conflict, this providing for a

common criteria for distribution of resources.

b) Diversity Measurement

The measurement of the right to be different, and a policy framework which affirms the value which can be derived from the existence, understanding and acceptance of difference whether expressed through religious, ethnic, linguistic or political background is also one which has been receiving increasing attention. According to Stephen Marks, the existing norms relating to cultural rights fall essentially to five different categories: [15]

I. Right to cultural identity, including free determination of cultural future participation
     In cultural life
ii. Conservation and diffusion of culture
iii. Protection of cultural property
iv. Rights of creators, transmitters and interpreters of artistic and other cultural works

One of the basic measurement indicators of cultural rights is of course the ratification of international human and cultural rights instruments, and minority protection instruments. A useful summary of these may be found on the Minority Rights site at *http://www.minorityrights.org/*

For its part, the Human Development Report 2004, produced by the UNDP [16] http://hdr.undp.org/docs/events/global_forum/2005/papers/Laaksonen_paper_revised.pdf stresses cultural freedom as the foundation for development since it allows people to make multiple choices concerning their own well being without being discriminated against in terms of their cultural identity. The Report offers 'a helpful model of universal indicators related to cultural freedom, inclusion and diversity that can be complemented by local and regional frameworks of means to measure discrimination in access and participation in cultural life.'

In addition the UK Community Cohesion report, set up after 9/11 in the UK http://www.communities.gov.uk/pub/690/BuildingaPictureofCommunityCohesion_id150 2690.pdf explores whether ethnic diversity is positively valued in an area through a variety of interesting survey techniques,

c) Measuring Participation

As noted in the e-dialogue summary:

Inclusive societies are characterized by active participation in civic, social, economic

---

[15] Marks, Stephen, ìDefining Cultural Rights in Human Rights and Criminal Justice for the Downtrodden, Marinus Nijhoff Publishers, Leiden/Boston, 2003, 293-324. Cited in Human Development report 2004. http://hdr.undp.org/docs/events/global_forum/2005/papers/Laaksonen_paper_revised.pdf
[16] Third Global Forum on Human Development: Defining and Measuring Cultural Exclusion 17 ñ 19 January, 2005 Paris Annamari Laaksonen Measuring Cultural Exclusion through Participation in Cultural Life

and political activities by individuals, both at the local and national levels. A society where most of its citizens, if not all, feel that they are playing a part, have access to their basic needs/livelihoods, and are provided with the opportunity to participate in discussions relevant to their concerns, is a society that will best foster principles of inclusivity. In order to encourage all-inclusive participation, there must be universal access to public infrastructures and facilities. To create and sustain inclusive societies, it is a pre-requisite that all members of society are able to participate in the decision-making processes that affect their lives.

The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) http://www.integrationindex.eu/ is intended to measure policies to integrate migrants in 25 EU Member States and 3 non-EU countries. It uses over 100 policy indicators to create a rich, multi-dimensional picture of migrants' lives and their opportunities (or otherwise) to participate in European societies.

What is important about MIMEX is that it takes place within an established normative context which is based on existing EU legislation, international conventions and NGO proposals and MIMEX is therefore an important tool in assessing whether principles, statements, declarations and good intentions of countries are actually translated into inclusion policy consistently. Each of the indicators are argued for by high level experts in terms of research about the most important priorities to ensure participation e.g. lack of access to employment has been identified in the majority of countries as the most important barrier to integration, as has long term residence and Family Reunion possibilities which are seen as vitally important for immigrants life and life planning. Naturalization, participation and anti discrimination are seen as important in allowing people to become active citizens. The measures also allow for comparisons between different countries.

More recently (2006) Michael Stoiber and Heidrun Abromeit [17] have emphasized the need on to take into account the specific context for participation and the relevance of such a context to effective participation. http://www.politikwissenschaft.tu-darmstadt.de/fileadmin/pg/arbeitsbereiche/vergleich/Stoiber__MesDemMPSA2006.pdf.
They attempt to refine the contextual attributes and the different possible institutional opportunity structures that ensure effective participation and how the institutional settings address the demand for specific forms of participation. They test their indicators qualitatively by applying the model to nine West European countries. The results show that there are varying deficits of democratic quality in selected countries depending on different demands resulting from a different context

d) Measuring Interdependence.

---

[17] . A New Measurement of Democracy: The Inclusion of the Context Michael Stoiber Heidrun Abromeit

Interdependence requires recognition by different interest or identity groupings of their obligations and commitments to others and of the interconnectedness of individual/community experiences and ambitions, and shared future aspirations. Interdependence therefore includes issues of social relations, interactions and cooperation.

As well summarized in the e-dialogue *'There is a need to create positive images of an inclusive society of the future, and have those images shared and understood by every member of society. Potent images of the future can act like a magnet drawing society towards its envisioned future. A society with no vision for the future indicates a society in decline. Societies that maintain a unity of purpose, or a shared common goal embraced by the community, and encourage broad-based stakeholder participation in the formulation of that goal, will be more inclusive as every member will be working synergistically towards a unified objective.*

The literature strongly suggests that the development of strong horizontal links between communities of differing beliefs and traditions through the development, usage and common management, participation in and ownership of institutions, common memberships of business and social communities, are an effective bulwark against community conflict and violence. [18]

The importance of such development is recognized as part of the work necessary within and between divided communities. After 9/11 the UK Community Cohesion commission produced a Guide for Local Authorities in the UK which can be found at: http://www.communities.gov.uk/pub/690/BuildingaPictureofCommunityCohesion_id150 2690.pdf. This Guide suggests indicators for the following objectives e.g.

a) *The percentage of people who feel that there local area is a place where people from different backgrounds can get on well together*
b) *A Common vision and sense of belonging*
c) *The percentage of respondents who feel that they belong to their neighborhood/town/county/England/Wales/Britain*
d) *Strong and positive relationships are being developed between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, schools and neighborhoods*
e) *The percentage of people from different backgrounds who mix with other people from different backgrounds in everyday situations*

In Northern Ireland, 'Good Relations' legislation to ensure effective interdependence has been developed and implemented as part of the 1998 Belfast agreement, echoes such aims:

The legislations requires that organizations carrying out their functions, have to have due regard not just to the need to promote equality of opportunity: but also to have regard to the desirability of promoting good relations between persons of different

---

[18] Varshney, Ashutosh. *(2003) Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life: Hindus and Muslims in India. Yale University Press.*

religious belief, political opinion or racial group. [19] *The objectives for such work are the establishment over time of a normal, civic society, in which all individuals are considered equals, where differences are resolved through dialogue in the public sphere and where all people are treated impartially. A society where there is equity, respect for diversity and recognition of our interdependence'.* [20]

There are a variety of existing measurements available for assessing the state of Social Relations. The Bogardus' Social Distance Scale allows the measurement of a person's social attitude towards members of other ethnic groups and nationalities, as well as a certain psychological predisposition to affiliate with or, conversely, to alienate oneself from other ethnic groups or nationalities, irrespective of their personal qualities and peculiarities. A respondent's answer to the question of the capacity (e.g. friend, neighbor, marriage) in which he/she is ready to accept representatives of other ethnic groups or nationalities makes it possible to determine the measure of social distance he/she would prefer to be preserved the respondent and the group in question which can measure attitudes of individuals towards groups other than their own, http://www.csudh.edu/dearhabermas/bogardus02.htm

Osgood's Semantic Differential is a tool that connects scaled measurement of attitudes with the connotative meaning of words, and thus elicits negative or positive predispositions on the part of one individual or group towards another group. http://www.ciadvertising.org/student_account/spring_02/adv382J/kcw2287/Measurement%20Theory/semantic.html

The Multifactor Racial Attitude Inventory (MRAI) http://www.gbv.de/dms/sub-hamburg/245446133.pdf is a well-established tool, which is used to measure different aspects of attitudes toward people of other races

Behavior change is usually even more important than attitude change, and a surer indicator of truthfulness than measuring merely attitudinal change re issues of identity. Behaviour can be measured by direct observation and measurement of change as it occurs in e.g. social networks and interaction, more integrated education and work places shopping patterns, use of leisure facilities, inter group marriage, joint education, shared shopping facilities, etc.

Challenge 5: Utilizing emerging issues of evaluation in the conflict field.

The tools available to us to undertake the evaluation of interventions in conflict prevention and peace building contexts has become a significant focus for the field over the last 5 years, and are useful to utilize in tandem with the work above. Reports of particular interest include the following:

---

[19] Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998

[20]http://www.northdown.gov.uk/uploads/docs/Master%20Good%20Relations%20Strategic%20Plan%202007-2010%20-%20PDF%201a.pdf

Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs 2006. http://www.sfcg.org/programmes/ilr/ilt_manualpage.html
This manual, written by Cheyanne Church and Mark Rogers and produced by Search for Common Ground in partnership with the United States Institute for Peace and the Alliance for Peace building is the first of its kind to focus on the particular needs of the conflict transformation field. It addresses the many challenges faced by conflict transformation practitioners in their attempts to measure and increase the effectiveness of their work with practical tips and examples from around the world.

Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (ME&L) for Fragile States And Peace building Programs: Practical Tools For Improving Program Performance And Results 2007
http://www.socialimpact.com/resource-center/downloads/fragilestates.pdf
This manual focuses on how to measure and evaluate work that is undertaken in fragile states that are socially, politically and economically volatile. ME&L in fragile states needs to be focused for making management decisions in often dangerous field environments. This guide consolidates a number of ME&L approaches that have been newly developed or contextualized for fragile states and peace building programs. A range of qualitative, quantitative and participatory approaches are included as well as tools for strengthening ME&L systems at the project or organizational level. The approaches have come from bilateral and multilateral donors, local and international NGOs, consultants, and university groups from around the globe who were consulted in putting this guide together.

An Approach to DAC Guidance For Evaluating Conflict Prevention And Peace building Activities (CPPB) by DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation and DAC Network on Development Evaluation 2007
http://www.adb.org/Documents/Papers/DAC-Guidance/Approach-DAC-Guidance.pdf
This report helping evaluators to focus on the boundaries that define CPPB; identifying the distinguishing characteristics and special considerations of CPPB evaluations; proposing standards against which to evaluate CPPB activities; and outlining the potential elements and processes that could be used in such evaluations. The overall objectives are to help improve evaluation practice and to support the broader community of experts and implementing organizations in enhancing the quality of peace practice.

Conclusion.

Two issues are particularly important to take into account when Measuring Social Inclusion and Cohesion. The first is that all contexts are different, and that the tools used to undertake such measures need to be those that are agreed to be important to the context and the goals of the people within it. Therefore, a widely respected analysis, shared across communities, which ensures appropriate objective setting and indicators through which to divine success is critical to the successful measurement of social inclusion and cohesion programs within and between divided and violent societies. In addition, it is vitally important to understand that social integration or cohesion is not an end-state that societies can achieve, and hence rest upon such achievements, but a dynamic process within which, in our increasingly mobile world, issues of social inclusion, cohesion and

coexistence and the continual flux and the management of such flux over the next century will be at the core of our work for a secure and more peaceful world.