

ESTABLISHING INDICATORS TO MEASURE GOOD RELATIONS

A framework document



*Co-funded by the European Union
Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme*



MINISTRY
OF THE INTERIOR



REGERINGSKANSLIET

Ministry of Employment
Sweden

etno

Advisory Board for
Ethnic Relations



Centre for Economic Development,
Transport and the Environment



This document has been issued as part of the Good Relations Project, supported by the European Union Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme (2007-2013). The information contained in this document does not necessarily reflect the position or opinion of the European Commission. The sole responsibility lies with the authors and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.

Date of issue: August 2014

Photos: Shutterstock

Graphic design and layout: Grano Oy

CONTENTS

- SUMMARY5
- 1. INTRODUCTION6
- 2. TACKLING XENOPHOBIA AND OTHER FORMS OF INTOLERANCE8
 - 2.1 EUROPEAN LEGISLATION AND POLICIES 9
 - 2.2 DEVELOPING THE CONCEPT OF GOOD RELATIONS IN THE UK AND NORTHERN IRELAND, FINLAND AND SWEDEN 10
- 3. A FRAMEWORK FOR GOOD RELATIONS:
THE FOUR BOXES MODEL 15
 - 3.1 CONCEPTUALISING GOOD RELATIONS AT LOCAL LEVEL 15
 - 3.2 MEASURING GOOD RELATIONS 17
 - 3.3 PROMOTION OF GOOD RELATIONS: TOOLS AND METHODS 18
 - 3.4 IMPACT EVALUATION 18
- 4. MEASURING GOOD AND BAD RELATIONS..... 19
 - 4.1 ESTABLISHING THE INDICATORS: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS..... 19
 - 4.2 INDICATORS TO MEASURE GOOD RELATIONS..... 20
- 5. LESSONS LEARNED22

- ANNEX 1
 - TABLE 1A: GOOD RELATIONS INDICATORS DEVELOPED IN FINLAND: THE DOMAINS OF ATTITUDES AND PERSONAL SECURITY..... 23
 - TABLE 1B: GOOD RELATIONS INDICATORS DEVELOPED IN FINLAND: THE DOMAINS OF INTERACTION WITH OTHERS, AND PARTICIPATION AND INFLUENCE..... 24

- ANNEX 2
 - TABLE 2A: RISK FACTORS FOR XENOPHOBIC ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED IN SWEDEN: INDICATORS FOR THE DOMAINS OF ATTITUDES AND PERSONAL SECURITY 25
 - TABLE 2B: RISK FACTORS FOR XENOPHOBIC ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED IN SWEDEN: INDICATORS FOR THE DOMAINS OF INTERACTION WITH OTHERS AND PARTICIPATION AND INFLUENCE 26



Eugenio Marongiu / Shutterstock.com

SUMMARY

This framework document describes the formulation process of indicators for measuring good relations. The indicators have been developed within the context of the transnational Good Relations project. This document presents the process through which the concept of good relations was formulated in Finland and Sweden. The initial idea is based on a model adopted from the Good Relations Measurement Framework (GRMF) developed in Great Britain. This document is not intended to include any official statements, guidelines, recommendations or proposals from the governments in the participating countries.

The European Union and its member states have put in place a number of legal and policy responses to tackle discrimination, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance. As regards the focus of the Good Relations project, it differs considerably from each other in the three participating countries.

The framework for good relations ("Four Boxes model") developed within this project includes the following four key components, which are closely inter-related and complementary to each other:

- **Conceptualising good relations:** In order to develop local policies to promote good relations and to combat xenophobia and other forms of intolerance, the initial goal within the Good Relations project was in defining the focus of these policies. The main focus was on relations between ethnic and religious groups. This focus differed somewhat in Finland and Sweden due to local contexts within which the project was carried out in the respective countries. Following the British GRMF, the four domains of good relations included in the Good Relations project are attitudes, personal security, interaction with others, and participation and influence.
- **Measuring good relations:** In order to identify areas that require policy measures locally, evidence on the state and progress of good relations have been identified. Information on the gaps and areas of concern related to good relations at the local level has been gathered. Measuring the level of good relations allows for targeted policies, as well as for monitoring change and development.
- **Promoting good relations:** Based on systematic monitoring and information gathering, carried out locally, gaps, needs and successes related to combating xenophobia by promoting good relations can be identified. By using such information, appropriate and targeted measures to promote good relations can be developed and implemented in line with the needs of the local community.
- **Impact evaluation:** Impact evaluation means assessment of interventions according to their results, impacts and needs they aim to satisfy. In improving good relations evaluation is useful in terms of determining how well particular activities and interventions have achieved their goals and objectives, as well as in terms of assessing how well the intended participants have been reached.

Based on the experiences in Great Britain, local level indicators for good relations were developed. In Finland, a broad set of indicators and measurements was established with the intention of developing a specific survey to be conducted at the local level. The partner in Sweden focused on developing indicators useful for understanding the need to prepare for managing xenophobic activities. The intention is to utilise existing data sources. The indicators and measurements in both models are categorised under the four domains of good relations (attitudes, personal security, interaction with others, and participation and influence).

1. INTRODUCTION

This framework document describes the formulation process of indicators for measuring good relations. The indicators have been developed within the context of the transnational Good Relations project. This document presents the process through which the concept of good relations was formulated in Finland and Sweden. The initial idea is based on a model adopted from the Good Relations Measurement Framework (GRMF) developed in Great Britain.

The idea is to systematically define good relations, while providing a practical framework and examples through which key actors can measure the state of and implement measures to promote such relations. This document is not intended to include any official statements, guidelines, recommendations or proposals from the governments in the participating countries. The present document contains examples of indicators and measurement tools that can be used by local level actors as an inspiration for their work on good relations.

Chapter 1 presents the Good Relations Project. Chapter 2 briefly presents legal and policy remedies at European level, and gives a general overview of existing methods of dealing with good relations at a legal and policy level in the UK, Finland and Sweden. The "Four Boxes Model" of good relations, developed by the project, is described in chapter 3. The process of establishing indicators to measure good relations is presented in chapter 4, along with practical examples from Sweden and Finland. Finally, lessons learned are presented in chapter 5.

This document is primarily targeted at actors in governments, governmental authorities, local governments, municipalities and non-governmental organisations in the EU member states.





GOOD RELATIONS PROJECT

Good Relations was a transnational project running from November 2012 to October 2014, co-financed by the Fundamental Rights and Citizenship (FRC) Programme of the European Union (2007-2013). The aim of the project was to combat racism, xenophobia, antigypsyism, islamophobia, anti-Semitism, afrophobia and other forms of intolerance by promoting good relations between people from different backgrounds. The project addressed key objectives and priorities of the FRC Programme and the European Commission's Annual Work Programme 2012 for the FRC¹.

The development of indicators within the project was largely based on the *Good Relations Measurement Framework*, published by the British Equality and Human Rights Commission in 2010.²

Coordinated by the Finnish Ministry of the Interior, the project had partners from the Swedish Ministry of Employment, the Northern Ireland Council for Ethnic Minorities (NICEM), the Finnish Advisory

Board for Ethnic Relations (ETNO) and the Centres for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment of Southern Finland, Pirkanmaa and Southwest Finland. The Finnish Ministry of Employment and the Economy was an associate partner. Furthermore, several public authorities at governmental, regional and municipal levels, various associations, foundations and civil society organisations, advisory boards and agencies contributed to the project through national project working groups in Finland and Sweden.

With the support of a consultative partner from Northern Ireland, the project established a set of indicators for the measurement of good relations, tested methods and tools to promote good relations, and provided information on them at the national and EU level. As one of the key results, a toolkit for promoting good relations for local-level actors was published.³

1 ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/files/awp_rights_2012_en.pdf

2 Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010), Research report 60: *Good Relations Measurement Framework*. Andrea Wigfield and Royce Turner, Policy Evaluation Group

3 A more detailed description of the project can be found at the Ministry of the Interior's website: www.intermin.fi/en/development_projects/good_relations

2. TACKLING XENOPHOBIA AND OTHER FORMS OF INTOLERANCE

The European Union and its member states have put in place a number of legal and policy responses to tackle discrimination, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance. In chapter 2.1, we will give a brief overview of these remedies

at the EU level. Chapter 2.2 will briefly introduce the national legislation and policies to combat xenophobia, racism and other forms of intolerance and to promote good relations in Finland, Sweden and Northern Ireland of the UK.



KEY CONCEPTS

Xenophobia means fear or hatred of people because of their ethnic or national origin, or religious or cultural background. Anti-Semitism, islamophobia, afrophobia and antiziganism are examples of xenophobia. Xenophobia consists of ideologies, values and perceptions that are in conflict with the principle of fundamental human rights and equality.

Direct discrimination means that someone is treated less favourably than someone else is, has been or would be treated in a comparable situation on grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation.⁴

Indirect discrimination means that an apparently neutral provision, criterion or practice would put persons having a particular racial or ethnic origin, a particular religion or belief, a particular disability, a particular age, or a particular sexual orientation at a particular disadvantage compared with other persons, unless the provision has a legitimate purpose and the means used to achieve that purpose are appropriate and necessary.⁵

4 In line with the Council Directive 2000/43/EC implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin ('Racial Equality Directive') and the Council Directive 2000/78/EC establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation ('Employment Equality Directive').

5 Ibid.

2.1 European legislation and policies

There are a number of legal responses to tackle discrimination, xenophobia and other issues negatively influencing social relations. Prohibition of discrimination is a central part of both international and European legal systems. Legal responses to discrimination are usually based on prohibitions of different forms of discrimination, definition of both the scope and the target groups, judicial and/or administrative procedures to protect victims, special bodies and public duties to promote non-discrimination and equality.

For example the European Union non-discrimination directives⁶ require changes to legal frameworks of all Member States to promote equality and to tackle discrimination. General and special duties to promote non-discrimination can be seen as preventive elements of anti-discrimination legislation. However, the actual content of these duties are usually left open (excluding the special duties) and hence different types of actions (equality plans or schemes, equality impact assessment procedures) are developed in different countries.

The European legal system provides Member States with powers to intervene in racist and other hate speech, and in other hate crimes. Public display or dissemination of opinions or other messages that threaten, slander or insult any group on grounds of race, skin colour, national or ethnic origin, religion or conviction, sexual orientation or disability, or on other corresponding grounds is punishable. The general grounds for increasing the severity of sanctions (aggravating circumstances) are used for preventing hate motivated crimes like xenophobic hate crime.

6 Council Directive 2000/43/EC implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin ('Racial Equality Directive') and Council Directive 2000/78/EC establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation ('Employment Equality Directive').

The Council of Europe has put forth a number of legal instruments to protect fundamental human rights in Europe. The European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)⁷ legally binds its member states to guarantee a list of human rights to everyone, not just citizens, within their jurisdiction. The European Social Charter includes both rights to equal opportunities and equal treatment in matters of employment and occupation plus protecting against discrimination on the grounds of sex. Such protection is also found in the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, the Convention on Action Against Trafficking in Human Beings and in the Convention on the Access to Official Documents.

The EU, through the Employment Equality Directive prohibits discrimination on the basis of religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation in the area of employment; the Racial Equality Directive prohibits discrimination on the basis of race or ethnicity in the context of employment, but also in accessing the welfare system and social security, and goods and services. The Gender Goods and Services Directive⁸ expands the scope of sex discrimination to the area of goods and services.

European Court of Human Rights, in the process of hearing alleged human rights breaches caused by member states of Community law, has developed a body of judge-made law known as the 'general principles' of Community Law. These general principles reflect human rights protection principles found in national constitutions of member states and human rights treaties, in particular the ECHR. One of the key documents is the Charter of Fundamental Rights⁹ which is a legally binding

7 Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, Rome, 4.XI.1950

8 Council directive 2004/113/EC of 13 December 2004 implementing the principle of equal treatment between men and women in the access to and supply of goods and services

9 Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (2000/C 364/01)

document. EU institutions are bound to comply with it. The EU Member States are also bound to comply with the Charter, but only when implementing EU law.

These legal remedies have been followed by EU policy papers¹⁰ and funding programs¹¹ to support member states in developing effective non-discrimination policies. EU support for positive measures has focused mainly on making discrimination visible (data collection), capacity building of civil society actors and European networks, and awareness-raising activities.

A wide range of activities have been developed to reach these goals around Europe since the adoption of first Community action programme to combat discrimination in 2001. Today, the policies against discrimination in Europe often combine elements of data collection (researches, discrimination monitoring), support to both victims of discrimination and NGOs representing minority groups, different forms of awareness-raising (diversity charters, media campaigns for breaking stereotypes, diversity days, training of professionals etc.), equality mainstreaming (equality plans, equality impact assessment), and positive action (reasonable accommodation, procurement policies, target recruitment etc.).

2.2 Developing the concept of good relations in the UK and Northern Ireland, Finland and Sweden

The focus of the Good Relations project differs considerably from each other in the three partner countries. In this chapter, we will give a short overview of how these three countries; Finland, Sweden and Northern Ireland of the UK - approach good relations in the framework of this project.

Good Relations in the UK and Northern Ireland

Good relations is a developing concept. It is neither commonly used nor widely understood in the UK. The development of the concept began with the Race Relations Act 1976¹² in which local authority (the equivalent municipality) is under the obligation to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity and good race relations between people of different racial groups¹³. This duty was extended to all public authority under the Amendment Act of 2000. This imposed a legal duty "when a public authority in carrying out its functions have due regard to the need: (a) to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination; and (b) to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups."¹⁴

The concept of good relations has been extended further by the Equality Act 2010 to encompass other diversity grounds: age, disability, gender, religion and/or belief, sexual orientation, transgender, as well as race. The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED)¹⁵ is thus in place.

10 For instance, Green Paper on equality and non-discrimination in an enlarged EU (COM(2004) 379 final).

11 For example, Community Action Programme to combat discrimination (2001-2006), EQUAL Community Initiative (2000-2006), Community programme for employment and solidarity - PROGRESS (2007-2013), Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme (2007-2014), and Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme (2014-2020).

12 The first Race Relations Act was enacted in 1965 and subsequently amended in 1967 and the 1976 Act was the main provision over more than 2 decades with three reviews on the effectiveness of the 1976 Act in various periods until it was finally amended in 2000 as result of the MacPherson Report: the Inquiry into the murder of Stephen Lawrence.

13 Section 71 of the Race Relations Act 1976

14 Section 71 of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000

15 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010

In the UK, therefore, racial equality and good relations are like the two sides of a coin. Discrimination cannot be tackled and the equality of opportunity is limited unless the relationship and/or tensions between groups are dealt with. In May 2012 the British government announced the review of the PSED in order to examine whether it is operating as intended. While there is "broad support for the principles behind the Duty, the review has found the main challenges lie in its implementation, which varies considerably across the public sector".¹⁶

The Race Relations Act was never extended to Northern Ireland, due to the legacy of conflicts between the ethnic Irish, who are predominantly Catholic, and the ethnic Ulster Scot and/or British, who are predominantly Protestant by religious affiliation. In the early 1990s, the civil society, including human rights organisations, the Committee on the Administration of Justice, ethnic minority communities, notably the Chinese, Traveller and the Indian communities, with the support from the trade unions and the human rights and equality bodies, demanded a ban on racial discrimination.

“Racial equality and good relations are like the two sides of a coin”

The Race Relations (Northern Ireland) Order was finally enacted in 1997. The following year the British and Irish Governments signed the Good Friday Agreement,¹⁷ which included a specific clause under Chapter 6: Rights, Safeguard and Equality of Opportunity.

16 The Review Report can be found at: www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-independent-steering-groups-report-of-the-public-sector-equality-duty-psed-review-and-government-response

17 The official name is The Agreement reached in the Multi-Party Negotiation, 10th April 1998.

The Equality Duty was then enacted under Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act of 1998. The new legal obligation requires public authorities, when carrying out their functions, to have due regard to the needs to promote equality of opportunity and have regard to the desirability of promoting good relations between different racial groups.¹⁸

In May 2013, the Northern Ireland Executive published the 'Together: Building a United Community' (TBUC) Strategy,¹⁹ improving community relations between the Catholics and the Protestants, and continuing the journey towards a more united and shared society. In June 2013, an Advisory Group was set up to review the existing Good Relations Indicators and a formal consultation process was finished at the end of March 2014.²⁰

Concurrently, the Office of the First Minister and the deputy First Minister were preparing a new revised Racial Equality Strategy for Northern Ireland²¹ for the next decade. A separate Advisory Group was set up in September 2013 to review the existing Good Relations Indicators.

18 Details can be found at the Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998: A Guide for Public Authorities. www.equalityni.org/sections/default.asp?secid=8&cms=Publications_Statutory+duty&cmsid=7_43&id=43; and Promoting Good Relations: A Guide for Public Authorities. www.equalityni.org/archive/pdf/Good%20Relations%20Summary%20Guide.pdf

19 <http://www.ofmdfmi.gov.uk/index/equality-and-strategy/good-relations/together-building-a-united-community.htm>

20 The consultation document can be downloaded at: <http://www.ofmdfmi.gov.uk/index/about-ofmdfmi/ofmdfmi-consultation-zone/consultation-good-relations-indicators.htm>

21 <http://www.ofmdfmi.gov.uk/race-equality-strategy.pdf>

Good relations in Finland

In Finland, the main focus of good relations policies lies on ethnic relations, and the concept of good relations is primarily examined as part of integration and immigration policies. A specific policy for good relations is non-existent in Finland, and the concept of good relations is still ambiguous and fairly unknown to both public authorities and the general public.

In the context of the Good Relations project activities carried out in Finland, promoting good relations refers to activities which aim at combating racism, xenophobia, antiziganism and other forms of intolerance. The notion of good relations also refers to cooperation and positive interaction between people from different backgrounds, equal opportunities for all and to a safe living environment.

Since 2008, Finland has developed a national system for monitoring on discrimination, and a hate crime study is carried out annually. As regards the monitoring of relations between people with various backgrounds, certain aspects of good (ethnic) relations are included in a number of longitudinal surveys, such as the immigration, youth and family barometers. Furthermore, relations between groups of people with different backgrounds have been discussed in a great number of qualitative research programs. However, there are no longitudinal studies that focus on all those aspects of good relations identified by this project, and virtually no studies that encompass all equality strands from this point of view.

Within the Finnish legislation, there are provisions on equality, equal treatment and non-discrimination in the Constitution, the Non-Discrimination Act, the Act on Equality between Women and Men, the Criminal Code and labour laws. Furthermore, the Administrative Procedure Act requires that public authorities treat their customers on an equal basis.

Under the Constitution (731/1999), everyone is equal before the law regardless of their sex,

“The concept of good relations is still ambiguous and fairly unknown to both public authorities and the general public”

age, origin, language, religion, conviction, opinion, health, disability or other reason that concerns his or her person.²² The Non-Discrimination Act (21/2004) prohibits direct and indirect discrimination, harassment and instructions or orders to discriminate on the grounds of age, ethnic or national origin, nationality, language, religion, belief, opinion, health, disability, sexual orientation or other personal characteristics. The Act also requires all public authorities to draw up an equality plan.

The Government Integration Programme for 2012-2015²³ has a general objective to "support participation by immigrants in all sectors of society, while reinforcing the foundation for good ethnic relations and smooth interaction between various population groups". The Programme also demands "commitment of all administrative branches to equality, non-discrimination and the prevention of racism, as well as the promotion of positive attitudes".

In the new migration strategy for Finland,²⁴ growing diversity is regarded as a "valuable resource" on the one hand, but as a "risk of a growth in inequality in society" on the other. One of the fundamental principles of the Strategy is that "diversity is part of everyday life". The acceptance of diversity, according to the Strategy, is based on the core values of Finnish society, such as the inviolability of human dignity, and on everyone's responsibility

22 www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/2004/en20040021

23 www.tem.fi/files/34181/TEMjul_27_2012_web.pdf

24 www.intermin.fi/en/development_projects/future_of_migration_2020

to engage in positive interaction and to eliminate prejudice in their everyday life.

Furthermore, the national Advisory Board for Ethnic Relations aims to "promote good ethnic relations and ethnic equality, as well as mutual interaction and cooperation in the various component areas of immigration policy". Their aim is also to "help promote organisational activities among immigrants", and to "provide information about immigration policy and ethnic diversity as a social resource and make both topics better known".²⁵

In summation, the key elements of good relations - as they are defined in the Good Relations project - have been largely identified through different policies in Finland, but there has been very little or no discussion on the combined impact and systematic improvement of good relations. Very little or no analysis has been done on the criteria for "good" or "bad" relations, for the purposes of monitoring them.

Good relations in Sweden

In Sweden, several different policies and forms of legislation are in place to prevent discrimination, xenophobia and similar forms of intolerance. However, the concept of good relations is rarely used and fairly unknown and the policies are not necessarily conceptualised as policies for good relations.

“There is a need for a comprehensive approach to xenophobic activities”

On the legislative level, the Swedish Discrimination Act prohibits discrimination on the grounds of sex, ethnic origin, religion or other belief, disability, sexual orientation, transgender identity or expression, and age.

²⁵ www.intermin.fi/en/equality/advisory_board_for_ethnic_relations_etno/functions

There are also several criminal law provisions targeting acts or statements that are of a xenophobic, homophobic or discriminatory nature. The penal provision for agitation against a national or ethnic group protects against threats or contempt for an ethnic group or other group of people on grounds of race, colour, national or ethnic origin, religious belief and sexual orientation.

Hate crime statistics are published annually in Sweden. On instruction from the government, the statistics are to be developed on an ongoing basis. The statistics are based primarily on reported crimes and are structured to reflect whether the perpetrator's motive was based on the victim's ethnic background, religious belief, sexual orientation or transgender identity or expression.

The Swedish National Agency for Education has been tasked by the Government to take action at schools to raise awareness on xenophobia and other forms of intolerance in 2014-2017.

At present, xenophobic messages are spread to a great extent on the internet. Therefore, the Government has commissioned the Swedish Media Council to coordinate the national activities in Sweden within the Council of Europe's campaign *No Hate Speech Movement*. Unfounded statements, half-truths and myths about e.g. costs and problems related to immigration build on prejudices, xenophobia and sometimes on pure hatred. The Government's website www.regeringen.se/faktaominvandring aims to refute some of the most common myths with facts.

The Government supports activities against xenophobia by distributing state aid to civil society organisations that operate in this area.

Commissioned by the Government, the Swedish Police develops activities to tackle hate crimes. Therefore, a two-year EU project on right-wing extremism has been implemented within the framework of the Government

action plan to safeguard democracy against violent extremism.

The Government has also taken special measures against afrophobia, anti-Semitism, antiziganism and islamophobia. These measures include allocating funding for a mapping of afrophobia in today's Sweden. In addition, the Government has initiated dialogue on islamophobia with different actors in Sweden and in Europe with the aim of sharing experiences on both challenges and good examples of initiatives against islamophobia.

As part of the work against i.a. anti-Semitism, the Government has allocated special funding for a prize to be awarded in memory of Raoul Wallenberg. Moreover, the Government has appointed a commission against antiziganism.

For this particular project, the Ministry of Employment has identified an area where methods and tools are not fully developed, implemented and evaluated in Sweden: the area of responding to xenophobic acts. Several incidents during the last few years

have shown that there are growing tensions and mobilisation from xenophobic groups in Sweden. This shows that there is a need for a comprehensive approach to xenophobic activities.

The focus of the Good Relations project in Sweden has therefore been on action to strengthen the preparedness of local authorities to respond to xenophobic acts. The aim was to incorporate xenophobia, as a social risk, into the risk and vulnerability analyses carried out by county administrative boards and municipalities, and strengthen the municipalities' capacity to discover, prevent and eventually respond to xenophobic acts. For this purpose, the Swedish national working group of the project included NGOs, government agencies and municipalities, in order to take into account both the expertise in the field and those who work directly within the municipal bureaucracy. Together with these actors, the project in Sweden tried to raise the awareness on the need to be prepared to respond to xenophobic acts.



3. A FRAMEWORK FOR GOOD RELATIONS: THE FOUR BOXES MODEL

In this chapter, we present the framework developed by the Good Relations project for defining the concept of good relations, measuring the state and development of relations between people with diverse backgrounds, promoting good relations by targeted measures, and evaluating the impact

of these measures. The framework has been named the "Four Boxes model" as per its four key components illustrated in the Figure 1. These key components are closely inter-related and contain elements that complement each other to form a coherent whole.



Figure 1: The Four Boxes Model of Good Relations

3.1 Conceptualising good relations at local level

The starting point for developing local policies to promote good relations and combat xenophobia and other forms of intolerance is to define the focus of these policies. Within the Good Relations project, the actors aimed at creating a joint view on what exactly is meant by good relations, which domains and diversity strands are relevant in formulating a more complete description of good relations within a particular local context.

Within this project, the main focus has been on ethnic and religious relations, but the concept of good relations can be extended to encompass other diversity strands as well, such as age, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, health or disability. The conceptual starting point of this project was the British Equality and Human Rights Commission's (EHRC) *Good Relations Measurement Framework (GRMF)*, which covers all the equality strands, therefore providing an extensive approach to the concept of good relations.

In line with the GRMF, the four domains of good relations included in the project's approach are **attitudes, personal security, interaction with others,** and **participation and influence.** The rationale behind each of these domains is described briefly below, following the descriptions used by the EHRC in the UK.²⁶

It is worth noticing that there are interactions, complementarity and interdependence between the four domains and the indicators within. Thus, none of the domains and indicators alone can be taken to fully indicate the state of good relations in any given local scenario.

DOMAIN 1: ATTITUDES

Attitudes towards others are viewed as the essence and core of good relations. According to the GRMF, "some types of (positive) attitude are necessary for good relations to exist". Attitudes, and resulting behaviour, have an impact upon the three other domains of good relations. The GRMF suggests that the way people perceive others and the way they believe that others perceive them affect "whether people attend public events, join community organisations or communities of interest or participate in political parties, and how they perceive their relative levels of power and influence compared to others and how they react to this".

DOMAIN 2: PERSONAL SECURITY

Personal security, both emotional and physical, is the second domain of good relations. The GRMF claims that "the extent to which individuals and their friends and/or relatives feel safe in a variety of public spaces (and, to some extent, private spaces) is a good indicator of their level of perceived personal



safety, and this in turn affects their behaviour and ability/opportunity to interact with others". According to the GRMF, negative attitudes "can sometimes lead to outright hostility and aggression and can in turn lead to a number of different types or kinds of reactions, including a reduction in the frequency with which individuals or groups of individuals visit or occupy public places; an avoidance of interacting with others in public places; altered behaviour in public places; or an avoidance of visiting certain public places altogether."

²⁶ For a more detailed conceptual analysis, see: Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010), *Research report 60: Good Relations Measurement Framework*. Andrea Wigfield and Royce Turner, Policy Evaluation Group; and Equality and Human Rights Commission (2009), *Research report 42. Good Relations: a conceptual analysis*. Nick Johnson and John Tatam. Institute of Community Cohesion (iCoCo).

DOMAIN 3: INTERACTION WITH OTHERS

Interaction with others provides one of the most fundamental measurements of good relations. The GRMF suggests that "a lack of interaction with a diverse range of people can lead to segregation in communities. If such segregation becomes entrenched and results in groups of people leading 'parallel lives', where people have little or no contact with those who are different from themselves, this can lead to a lack of understanding, perpetuate stereotypes and result in negative attitudes towards others and therefore 'negative' good relations."

DOMAIN 4: PARTICIPATION AND INFLUENCE

Finally, the level of participation and the experience and opportunities to influence provide the fourth domain of good relations. The GRMF proposes that "participation is one of the outcomes of people's experience of good relations. A person living in a place where he or she feels welcome, where attitudes towards them are positive, where there is a high level of emotional and personal security, and a high level of interaction, is more likely to participate in community activities and events". The GRMF claims that it is important to capture that "some kinds of participation can lead to conflict and tensions". According to the GRMF, it is also important to explore the complex relationship between influence, autonomy, empowerment and good relations. The GRMF suggests that "having the experience and opportunities to influence means individuals are more likely to enjoy good relations, but it does not guarantee that they do so. [...] There is, however, little doubt that a lack of experience and opportunities to influence can have a negative impact upon an individual's experience of good relations."

3.2 Measuring good relations

Prior to setting targeted policy goals it is useful to collect information on the gaps and areas of concern related to good relations at local level. When carried out on a regular basis, it is possible to map trends and developments in good relations over time. For this purpose, a set of measurable indicators is needed.

Two possible approaches to the development of such a measurement tool have been identified within the Good Relations project: either to utilise existing sources that are relevant to the issue of good relations, or to create a specific survey focusing on good relations. These two approaches can also complement one another. Regardless of which option is chosen, the process starts by identification of the relevant indicators and measurements for each domain or area of good relations.

Within the Good Relations project, challenges with utilising existing data sources have been highlighted. The information contained in various surveys, studies, statistics etc. is scattered. Their scope may also vary greatly in terms of the diversity strands and geographical areas that they cover. Most of these studies are usually carried out in different periods of time. In addition, most of them fail to provide detailed, local level information. An advantage with a specific survey is that it enables a clear focus on good relations. Such a survey, when carried out locally and repeatedly, will provide detailed and structured data on the current state of good relations and trends over time. In both cases, successful monitoring requires careful planning and coordination, as well as adequate human and financial resources.

3.3 Promotion of good relations: tools and methods

Stakeholders involved in the project have highlighted the importance of adapting measures to the local context. Based on systematic monitoring and information gathering, carried out locally, gaps, needs and successes related to combating xenophobia by promoting good relations can be identified. Such information can be used for the purpose of developing and implementing appropriate and targeted measures to promote good relations in line with the needs of the local community.

There is an abundance of anti-racist, non-discrimination, prejudice-reduction, diversity and equality programmes and interventions. Some academics, however, claim that many of these measures don't have sufficient evidence on how they actually affect intergroup relations.²⁷ Therefore, when planning local initiatives and interventions, it is advisable to look for some evaluation on their effectiveness in order to better understand the conditions under which they work best.

A fair number of tools and methods to combat xenophobia by promoting good relations were developed and tested within this project. These practices, together with a collection of other existing models on how to work against xenophobia by promoting good relations at local level, are presented in a separate Good Relations Toolkit for Local Actors.²⁸

3.4 Impact evaluation

Monitoring good relations, as presented in chapter 3.2, aims at mapping the general state and development of good relations, whereas the main objective of impact evaluation is to judge the outcomes and effectiveness of particular interventions. The importance of evaluating policies and interventions has been highlighted by different stakeholders throughout the process of creating the Framework for Good Relations. It may be difficult to identify cause and effect relationships without specific impact evaluation.

Impact evaluation means assessment of interventions according to their results, impacts and needs they aim to satisfy. Evaluation process helps determine how well particular activities and interventions have achieved their goals and objectives, as well as in terms of assessing how well the intended participants have been reached. Evaluation is also necessary in determining whether the outcomes obtained were the ones that were initially planned. In addition, evaluation enables a comparison of costs and benefits of activities, helps to identify possible failures and to make necessary changes in future interventions.

Further ideas and tips on impact evaluation of good relations activities are presented in the Good Relations Toolkit for Local Actors.²⁹

27 See e.g. Renko E., Larja L., Liebkind K., Solares E. (2012). *Selvitys syrjinnän vastaisen pedagogiikan keinoista ja käytännöistä* (Means and practices of anti-discriminatory pedagogy). Sisäasiainministeriön julkaisut 50/2012; Pittinsky, T.L. (2012). *Us plus them: Tapping the positive power of difference*. Boston, Massachusetts. Harvard Business Review Press.

28 www.yhdenvertaisuus.fi/welcome_to_equality_fi/library/

29 www.yhdenvertaisuus.fi/welcome_to_equality_fi/library/

4. MEASURING GOOD AND BAD RELATIONS

This chapter first describes the process of establishing a set of measurable indicators for good relations within the Good Relations Project (4.1). Secondly, the main outcome of

the project - the indicators and measurements of good relations, established in Finland and Sweden - will be presented (4.2).



4.1 Establishing the indicators: description of the process

In line with the framework created by the British Equality and Human Rights Commission, four key domains of good relations, namely attitudes, personal security, interaction with others and participation and influence were used as a basis for the indicators.

Consultations for the establishment of indicators were carried out at both national and transnational level. In order to start with the conceptualisation of good relations, the project teams from the Finnish Ministry of the Interior, the Swedish Ministry of Employment, and Northern Ireland Council for Ethnic Minorities held a seminar in Belfast in February 2013, and discussed the notion of good relations, especially within the context of Northern Ireland.

The project partners in both Finland and Sweden established National Working Groups for the purpose of supporting the implementation of national project activities.

The working groups involved public authorities, civil society organisations, advisory boards for different minorities, and other actors relevant to good relations. The project partner in Finland developed a broad set of indicators for measuring good relations, while the partner in Sweden focused on indicators useful for understanding the risk of xenophobic acts.

Information on existing policies and practices to promote good relations was gathered in both Finland and Sweden with the help of regional and local actors and stakeholders. In Finland, three civil society organisations representing ethnic minorities gathered information on existing measures to promote good ethnic relations at the local level. The surveys were carried out in the areas of Turku, Jyväskylä and Helsinki. In Sweden, a civil society organisation held a workshop in which various stakeholders discussed and assessed the quantity, quality and overall impact of existing activities and means of combating intolerant attitudes in future. In addition, 44 Swedish municipalities took part in a survey that focused on measures taken by the municipalities to prevent xenophobic

crises.³⁰ The national working groups helped to analyse the information, suggested indicators and supported the process of drafting the Framework.

The draft indicators were discussed in a transnational workshop with representatives of authorities, civil society organisations and academics from the three partner countries. The draft tables of indicators were then completed in Finland and Sweden respectively by adding specific measurements for each indicator, and by identifying existing sources of data that could be used for the purpose of measuring good relations.

4.2 Indicators to measure good relations

Chapter 3.2 presented two different approaches usable for the development of a measurement tool for good relations. One possibility is to rely on existing sources that are relevant to the local setting, whereas the other option is to create a specific survey focusing on good relations. The Good Relations project developed indicators by using both of these approaches: in Finland, a set of indicators and

measurements was established with a view of developing a specific survey to be conducted at local level. In Sweden, the indicators and measurements were developed with the intention of utilising existing data sources.

The indicators and measurements in both models are categorised under the four domains of good relations (attitudes, personal security, interaction with others, and participation and influence). Each domain contains several indicators which help to identify the critical themes linked to that given domain. In addition, each indicator is divided in one or more specific measurements seen as necessary to monitor the state or progress within a particular indicator or aspects of it.

One singular indicator or measurement by itself cannot be taken as an indication of good relations or risk of a xenophobic crisis in a local context. Neither should these indicators and measurements be used for comparison between different geographical areas, since the local contexts always have a great impact on the outcomes of such measurements. There is a strong correlation between some of the domains and indicators, and sometimes they share the same underlying causal factors.



³⁰ The reports on these activities can be downloaded at http://www.intermin.fi/en/development_projects/good_relations/national_development_tasks

MODEL A

Local level indicators for good relations: Survey for local actors developed in Finland

Good relations at local level can be approached with the help of a special survey. A broad set of indicators can be useful when the goal is to get a general and comprehensive picture of the state and progress of intergroup relations at local level. The indicators and measurements chosen for this approach aim to cover all topical aspects of intergroup relations, with focus on both positive and negative factors of relations between people with diverse backgrounds. The lists of indicators and measurements are presented in the tables 1a and 1b (Annex 1).

The broad set of indicators and measurements presented in tables 1a and 1b is based on the idea of developing a specific survey on good relations, targeted at all citizens in a certain city, municipality, neighbourhood or school. Nevertheless, the survey outcomes can and should be complemented with relevant statistical data or research results.

Creating the actual survey questions or conducting local level surveys was not included in the Good Relations project's objectives. However, with a view of concretising the indicators and measurements, an exemplary list of questions was drafted and can be found at www.yhdenvertaisuus.fi/welcome_to_equality_fi/library/.

MODEL B

Analysis tool for risk factors for xenophobic activities, developed in Sweden

The second model of indicators focuses on factors that can affect the risk for xenophobic acts on local level. The set of indicators, measurements, sources of data and key actors presented in tables 2a and 2b (Annex 2) helps to study especially the absence of good relations in a local context. The model of indicators has been developed in cooperation with different stakeholders, such as the national working group in Sweden. A singular isolated indicator is by itself not an indication on that xenophobic activity can take place in the municipality. Nor is it at this stage possible to combine the indicators and domains in an accurate assessment of the situation without further developing the indicators. However, the indicators show which factors are relevant to take into account when initiating work against xenophobia on local level.

The indicators are categorised as either background/structural factors or urgent/acute factors indicating that the municipality should take action or closer monitor the developments. The indicators are divided in the four domains of good relations: attitudes, personal security, interaction with others and participation and influence.

It has proven difficult to find existing measurements and sources of data for the indicators on local level. The statistical sources available can indicate trends on national or regional level. This calls for completing the statistical indicators with qualitative information to understand the situation on local level. Moreover, non-governmental organisations and representatives for minority groups are important sources of information.

5. LESSONS LEARNED

The Good Relations project provided the opportunity to learn valuable lessons when it comes to establishing good relations measurement indicators at the local level:

- Good relations is still a fairly unknown concept. It can provide **a fresh perspective to policies** that aim to combat xenophobia and other forms of intolerance by way of concretising the key elements of good and bad relations.
- Using an **existing framework as a basis of discussions** (in this case the GRMF) helps to conceptualise good relations at a local level.
- It is necessary to take into consideration **local contexts and needs** when defining good relations and developing policies to prevent xenophobia.
- The practice of **monitoring good and bad relations** on a local level is currently **not widespread**.
- **Dialogue with civil society and minority groups** is useful in terms of assessing the policy gaps and implementing necessary measures to promote good relations.
- The concept of good relations can be approached from **negative as well as positive aspects**. The focus can be on the absence of prejudices, hatred, racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance. On the other hand, the focus can be on good relations, such as positive attitudes and positive interaction between people from diverse backgrounds.
- The scope of good relations policies can be **broad or focus on a specific issue** (e.g. the preparedness of local authorities to respond to xenophobic activities).
- **Data collection on sensitive personal information** for monitoring good relations has to be carried out with regards to safeguarding the anonymity of respondents and allowing for voluntary self-identification.

The Four Boxes Model developed within this project suggests for local level actors the following steps on how to start or develop their work on good relations:

- **Step 1** - Define the focus of good relations relevant to the local context
- **Step 2** - Gather information on good relations at local level
- **Step 3** - Use well-targeted measures to promote good relations
- **Step 4** - Evaluate the impact of these measures on good relations

ANNEX 1

Table 1a: Good relations indicators developed in Finland: The domains of attitudes and personal security

DOMAIN	INDICATOR	MEASUREMENTS
1. ATTITUDES	1.1 Respect & disrespect	1.1.1 Personal experience of being/feeling respected/disrespected
		1.1.2 Personal attitude towards various groups
	1.2 Prejudice	1.2.1 Personal attitude towards various groups
		1.2.2 General attitude towards various groups: a) personal opinion on general attitude, b) academic research on attitudes
		1.2.3 Official statistics/research on xenophobic/hate groups/movements
	1.3 Trust	1.3.1 Level of personal trust towards various groups
		1.3.2 Level of trust between various groups and authorities
	1.4 Valuing diversity	1.4.1 Personal attitude towards diversity
		1.4.2 Personal opinion on how society values diversity
		1.4.3 Official statistics on measures to promote diversity
2. PERSONAL SECURITY	2.1 Perception of personal safety	2.1.1 Personal experience of (in)security (physical, mental, socio-economical)
		2.1.2 Perceived (in)security
		2.1.3 Impact of (in)security
	2.2 Hate crime and discrimination	2.2.1 Discrimination: a) personal experience, b) perceived discrimination, c) official statistics and registers, formal complaints
		2.2.2 Hate and violent crime: a) Personal experience of being a victim of hate/violent crime, b) Perceived hate/violent crime, c) Official statistics on hate/violent crimes
		2.2.3 Measures to combat hate crime and discrimination (number of measures and amount of financial support)
	2.3 Identity and acceptance	2.3.1 Feeling comfortable with oneself
		2.3.2 Ability to be oneself
	2.4 Fundamental rights and access to justice	2.4.1 Awareness of fundamental rights
		2.4.2 Awareness of access to justice
		2.4.3 Personal experience of access to justice as a victim or witness of hate/violent crime

Table 1b: Good relations indicators developed in Finland: The domains of interaction with others, and participation and influence

DOMAIN	INDICATOR	MEASUREMENTS	
3. INTERACTION WITH OTHERS	3.1 Isolation & sense of belonging	3.1.1 Personal experience of isolation: a) Feeling of loneliness and isolation, b) Social networks	
		3.1.2 Sense of belonging to: a) Geographical entities, b) Social units	
	3.2 Availability of support	3.2.1 Personal experience of availability of support from a) Social networks (friends, family...), b) Public services	
		3.2.2 Personal willingness to give support to others	
	3.3 Ability to interact	3.3.1 Personal characteristics affecting the ability to interact with others	
		3.3.2 Confidence to interact with people from diverse backgrounds	
	3.4 Experience of and opportunities for interaction with a diverse range of people	3.4.1 Personal experience of interaction with a diverse range of people: a) Frequency, b) Context	
		3.4.2 Level of interaction between various groups in society: a) Personal opinion, b) Official statistics	
		3.4.3 Level of segregation in a) housing, b) employment, c) education	
		3.4.4 Measures to promote interaction between various groups: a) Personal opinion on the importance of the measures, b) Official statistics on the support for the measures	
	4. PARTICIPATION AND INFLUENCE	4.1 Participation in organised activities	4.1.1 Ways of participation
			4.1.2 Determinants/motives of participation
4.1.3 Barriers of participation			
4.1.4 Promotion of participation			
4.2 Influence		4.2.1 Personal experience of influence: a) Ways of participation, b) Experience of one's own influence through participation	
		4.2.2 Choice and control over one's own life: a) Personal experience, b) Perceived influence of others	
4.3 Trust in democracy and political institutions		4.3.1 Level of trust in political institutions	
		4.3.2 Voting in elections	

ANNEX 2

Table 2a: Risk factors for xenophobic activities identified in Sweden: indicators for the domains of attitudes and personal security

1. ATTITUDES

INDICATOR	EXAMPLE	MEASUREMENT	SOURCES	KEY ACTORS
1.1 Prejudice	1.1.1 Negative attitudes towards vulnerable groups 1.1.2 Identification with xenophobic ideologies	Perception of different groups in society Attitude to multiculturalism Attitude to immigration Political leanings	<i>Attitude surveys: Mångfaldsbarometern, World Values Survey, European Social Survey, Intoleransundersökningen (Living History Forum)</i> <i>Party preference surveys: Partisymptiundersökningen, SCB Allmänna val</i>	media school staff coaches youth workers commentators politicians NGO:s
1.2 Social and historical context	1.2.1 Social acceptance and reinforcement of attitudes, socialisation	Historical and current situation of xenophobic group on local level	<i>Media analysis</i> <i>SOM-survey</i>	
1.3 Xenophobia in public debate	1.3.1 Xenophobic ideas in public debate 1.3.2 Visible activity from intolerant groups 1.3.3 Xenophobic symbols in public spaces	Ongoing debate with xenophobic attributes Demonstrations, advertisement, actions Xenophobic graffiti	<i>Expo yearly report</i>	

2. PERSONAL SECURITY

INDICATOR	EXAMPLE	MEASUREMENT	SOURCES	KEY ACTORS
2.1 Economic insecurity	2.1.1 Economic insecurity	Income levels Unemployment numbers	<i>Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, Citizen surveys, the Public Health Agency of Sweden, SCB, Swedish Public Employment Service</i>	Police Security hosts Watchmen Night watchers Security coordinators Media Politicians NGO:s Minority organisations
2.2 Personal insecurity and vulnerability	2.2.1 Abuses due to group identity 2.2.2 Insecurity in near environment	Fear in near environment Experience of threat and violence Hate speech Hate crime statistics • Reports • Verdicts • Historical statistics		

Table 2b: Risk factors for xenophobic activities identified in Sweden: indicators for the domains of interaction with others and participation and influence

3. INTERACTION WITH OTHERS

INDICATOR	EXAMPLE	MEASUREMENT	SOURCES	KEY ACTORS
3.1 Interaction between groups	3.1.1 Contact between individuals from different groups	Friends from other groups Colleagues from other groups Daily interaction with people from other group	<i>SOM-survey, World Values Survey, European Values Survey, SCB,</i>	Recruiters Civil society Neighbourhood cooperation Municipality Government Private actors housing companies, schools etc. Meeting places Educators Government agencies
3.2 Structural segregation	3.2.1 Housing segregation 3.2.2 School segregation	Housing segregation Economic segregation between parts of city/municipality Segregated schools		
3.3 Social cohesion	3.3.1 Social capital/trust 3.3.2 Experience of cohesion	Trust in people in general Contact with neighbours Experience of cohesion		

4. PARTICIPATION AND INFLUENCE

INDICATOR	EXAMPLE	MEASUREMENT	SOURCES	KEY ACTORS
4.1 Participation in traditional democratic processes	4.1.1 Voter turnout 4.1.2 Trust in politicians	Participation in elections Been in contact with a politician Signed an initiative Participated in a demonstration Intention to candidate Could imagine doing something of the abovementioned	<i>Election statistics, SCB Opinion polls Citizen surveys, SOM-survey</i>	Election informants Democracy ambassadors Communicators Politicians Society informants Teachers
4.2 Other forms of influence on local level	4.2.1 Possibility for dialogue and initiative	Dialogue in municipalities Possibility for citizens' initiatives		