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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>The ‘Accession 8’ countries that joined the EU in 2004 (see glossary, Appendix 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>Department for Work and Pensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>European Economic Area (the EU plus Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>English for Speakers of Other Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMO</td>
<td>House of Multiple Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPR</td>
<td>Institute for Public Policy Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>Job Seeker’s Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINo</td>
<td>National Insurance Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT</td>
<td>Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKBA</td>
<td>United Kingdom Border Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>Workers’ Registration Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YHRMP</td>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber Regional Migration Partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the many people who sent in reports and information for this report. The project was helped by an advisory group. Thanks to Bill Adams, Yorkshire and Humber Regional TUC; Patrick Bowes, Yorkshire Forward; Mark Gamsu, Government Office Yorkshire and Humber; Steve Ibbetson, Hull City Council; James Paton, Yorkshire and Humber Assembly; Nick Pontone, Yorkshire and Humber Chambers of Commerce; Professor David Robinson, Sheffield Hallam University; Jim Steinke, Northern Refugee Centre; Mani Thapa, Refugee Action.

The following people provided data and information or took part in discussions that helped to shape the report: Maite Barnett, Yorkshire Universities; David Brown, Yorkshire and Humber Regional Migration Partnership; Adil Khan, Humberside Police; Dr Sophie Haroon, West Yorkshire Health Protection Unit; Daniel Norton, University of Leeds; Chief Constable Gary Parker, West Yorkshire Police; Dr Susy Stirling, Government Office Yorkshire and Humber; David Young, Local Government Yorkshire and Humber.

Sue Adamson produced the maps and charts in this report. Thank you to Ian Aspinall and Amanda Crossfield at Yorkshire Futures for commissioning this work and providing guidance throughout the project.
Summary

In the last decade the numbers of migrants coming to the UK has peaked and there has been intense political and social interest in asylum and immigration issues. This literature review, undertaken by the Centre for Research on Social Inclusion and Social Justice at the University of Hull for Yorkshire Futures, synthesises the regional literature on refugees, asylum seekers and migrants to highlight key themes and identify research gaps and recommendations.

The review found that:

1. The Yorkshire and Humber region has received a significant proportion of international migrants in Britain. Under a government dispersal programme, around 20% of asylum applicants in the UK are supported in the region and between 2002 and 2008, 177,770 adult non-UK nationals registered for work. In 2007, the region’s universities had over 27,000 international students. Many migrants are temporary; it is not known how many stay long term.

2. Asylum seekers experience poverty and social exclusion and are vulnerable to poor physical and mental health. Children experience interrupted educations. Access to education for adults has been severely restricted due to cuts in funding. Refugees experience very high unemployment and multiple barriers to employment, despite having a great desire to work. Integration has been promoted through a regional integration strategy, informal networks, refugee community organisations and churches.

3. Most research on ‘new’ migrants is about migrant workers from eight of the countries (‘A8’) that joined the EU in 2004. Many live in private rented housing and often experience poor, unsafe and overcrowded conditions. There is little available data on migrant health needs; registration with doctors is thought to be low. Schools face challenges in responding to mid-term arrivals and in some areas are unfamiliar with providing English language support. Cost and long working hours restrict access to English classes for adults.

4. Migrant workers contribute to the regional economy filling labour gaps in low skill jobs despite many having a good level of education. Poor English language skills create risks for health and safety in the workplace and limit possibilities for improving work conditions. Migrant workers are vulnerable to exploitation in the workplace.

5. Research gaps exist on family joiners, dependants, children and young people, women, migrant workers from countries other than Poland and outside the EU and international students. There is little work on how the social experience of migrants affects interaction with formal institutions or services.

6. The needs of asylum seekers, refugees and migrants must be recognised within existing policies, decision-making structures and strategies, in addition to targeted provision and initiatives being developed to respond to the particular needs of different migrant groups.
Background

Migrants have come to Yorkshire and Humber for hundreds of years. The last ten years have seen the introduction of a system to disperse asylum seekers around the UK, a rise in the number of immigrants and a change from large groups from a few countries to a ‘superdiverse’ migrant population, under a constantly shifting policy environment.

New migrants in the last ten years include: asylum seekers, refugees who gain status following a claim for asylum and ‘Gateway’ refugees resettled from refugee camps; international students; family joiners (spouses or dependants); work permit holders or point based migrants; migrant workers from the A8 countries that joined the EU in 2004 (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovenia and Slovak Republic) and the A2 countries that joined in 2006 (Romania and Bulgaria); and irregular migrants who overstay, enter illegally or are trafficked.

Refugees and asylum seekers

Asylum seekers are supported with housing and weekly payments by the UK Border Agency. Cash support is set at 70% of Income Support; poverty and social exclusion are central features of their lives.

- Dispersal housing is often in deprived areas. Many asylum seekers get support from compatriots, creating a desire to live in close proximity. Ethnic divisions and fear of information exchange mean others avoid people from their country. On receipt of a positive asylum decision, refugees face challenges in moving onto benefits or finding work and securing housing. Refused asylum seekers are highly mobile as they are reliant on others for survival.

- Asylum seekers are vulnerable to poor health as a result of past experiences of trauma and their precarious status in the UK. Health services may struggle to respond to complex needs - some specialist services have developed. Translation and interpreting is vital, however, working with interpreters increases appointment time.

- Refugee and asylum seeker children are likely to have had a disrupted education due to conflict, flight and frequent moves in the UK. Pockets of expertise in teaching refugee children who speak English as an additional language have developed. Children are important brokers of integration. They tend to learn English more quickly than adults and can manage mixed identities well.

- Adult Education colleges providing English as a Secondary Language (ESOL) classes have been a key feature of life for asylum seekers. However, cuts in funding have reduced access to ESOL even though learning English is expected for integration and employment. Despite multiple barriers, refugees are recognised as motivated students.

Data on migrants in Yorkshire and Humber

Asylum seekers are dispersed to eleven local authorities in Yorkshire and Humber.

- Around 30,000 asylum seekers from 117 countries have been dispersed since 2000
- Iraq, Zimbabwe, Somalia, Eritrea and Iran were the top five nationalities 2002-2007
- There are 15,000 or more refugees in the region

In 2007 there were 27,270 international students at Yorkshire Universities.

In Yorkshire and Humber, 2002-2008, 177,770 non-UK nationals registered for a National Insurance Number from 99 countries.

- 39% (70,050) were A8 nationals, of which 66% (46,290) were from Poland.
- The top five nationalities were Poland, Slovak Republic, Latvia, South Africa and Pakistan.

Recent arrivals have increased international migration to North Yorkshire, East Riding and the Humber. Most migrant workers are in Leeds, Bradford and Sheffield.
Asylum seekers do not have permission to work so without employment, volunteering can provide a vital chance for to build skills, learn about UK society and contribute. Refugees can work, yet face multiple barriers including employer attitudes, language, qualifications not being recognised, health problems and lack of references. Despite their desire to work, refugee unemployment is very high. Those working are likely to be employed below their skill level.

Refugees and asylum seekers are exposed to risks to their safety ranging from lack of awareness of safety measures in the home to threat of detention and deportation to countries where they fear persecution. Several studies advocate that refused asylum seekers should be given status and allowed to work, especially those from countries to where it is dangerous or difficult to arrange return.

New Migrants

There was a sharp rise in migration when new members joined the EU 2004 but numbers have recently fallen. Migrants come to work, learn English, join family and friends and broaden their horizons, and include Roma people fleeing persecution. Many migrants are short term and have returned. The availability of work will affect future migration trends.

Many A8 migrants live in private rented sector housing characterised by poor, unsafe standards and overcrowding. They may be unaware of their rights and face unreasonable charges and high rent. Take up of social housing is very low. Employees in accommodation tied to employment may avoid complaining as they fear losing their job.

There has been no dedicated Yorkshire and Humber study on the health needs of new migrants. Uptake of health services is thought to be low because of low levels of GP registration, the population being largely young and fit for work, and migrants returning home for health care. Lack of knowledge of health systems can lead to inappropriate use of accident and emergency facilities.

The arrival of children in areas unfamiliar with international migration has created new challenges for schools, particularly Catholic schools. Mid-term arrivals can make it difficult for schools to obtain sufficient funding for English language support. While some schools

A regional perspective

The regional focus aims to facilitate sharing knowledge across Yorkshire and Humber and reflects the increasing role of regional governance. This report is one of the first comprehensively to bring together findings on asylum seekers, refugees and migrants.

Over 120 studies since 1999 were found. Most studies on refugees and asylum seekers were conducted in Leeds and Sheffield, due to their large dispersed asylum seeker populations and established agencies. Thirteen of 51 studies on migrant workers were conducted in Hull or the Humber. Detailed analyses of A8 migrants in other sub-regions are restricted to a few studies.

Only one or two studies were found in smaller towns and rural areas highlighting the lack of knowledge on migrants and service providers outside the main urban centres.
Multi agency groups have formed to address gaps in provision and to develop welcome packs. Churches and libraries (that offer free internet access) are central sites for socialising and disseminating information.

**Key research gaps**

- The experiences of migrant workers from countries other than Poland, especially non-EU migrants.
- A skills audit of migrants and mechanisms for accessing appropriate employment.
- The numbers, needs and location of families, women, children and young people.
- The challenges for employers of migrants and possibilities for supporting them.
- Secondary migration and migrants’ length of stay in the region.
- Migrant-centred perspectives.

Gaps in data can be improved by services monitoring country of origin (not just ethnicity); attention to smaller migrant populations; and provision of regional level migration statistics.

**Recommendations**

- The rights and needs of new migrants must be promoted within existing decision making structures and policies on deprivation, cohesion and diversity, especially in Local Strategic Partnerships.
- Local authorities should use public health and housing regulations to address poor housing conditions.
- Migrant health mapping to be undertaken to guide services sensitive to the needs of different groups of migrants.
- Increase funding and availability of English classes.
- A dedicated strategy for addressing exploitation in the labour market.
- Continue and extend myth-busting and awareness work.

The summary is available to download from: www.yorkshirefutures.com
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1. Introduction

1.1 Background

This research was commissioned by Yorkshire Futures, with help from the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Migration Partnership, to draw together, synthesise and summarise the literature on refugees, asylum seekers and migrants in Yorkshire and Humber. It was undertaken by the Centre for Social Justice and Social Inclusion at the University of Hull.

Yorkshire Futures is the Regional Intelligence Network for Yorkshire and Humber. It provides an information and intelligence service to inform policy and improve decision making.

Yorkshire and Humber Regional Migration Partnership (YHRMP) is a partnership of organisations in Yorkshire and the Humber from the statutory, voluntary, community and private sectors that work to ensure appropriate and accessible advice, services and support for asylum seekers, unsuccessful asylum seekers, new refugees and migrant workers (see Appendix 4, Structures for migration work).

1.2 About this report

The report has five sections:
- An introduction to the report
- Available data on migrants in Yorkshire and Humber
- Refugees and asylum seekers: key trends and issues from research
- New migrants: key trends and issues from research
- Ongoing research, research gaps and a summary of recommendations

The appendices provide a glossary of terms, sources of information on policy and practice, information for migrants, structures for migration work and a full alphabetical bibliography.

We hope that the report will be useful to people in a range of positions involved in planning and delivering policy and services for asylum seekers, refugees and migrants in regional bodies, local authorities and the voluntary sector.

1.3 Literature sources, scope and range

This review includes research and other literature that relates to asylum seekers, refugees and migrants in Yorkshire and Humber since 1999. It also incorporates findings from some national reports that include substantial data from the region, or which relate to regional issues.

The review was undertaken from August to November 2008. Literature was found through keyword searches of electronic databases and a call for literature sent out on email lists. The call was sent out through regional and national refugee, migrant, social policy, academic, statutory and voluntary networks to solicit information about research and publications. Agencies involved in service delivery were encouraged to send in unpublished reports or data from organisational monitoring—a valuable, often overlooked source of grounded and up-to-date information (Esterhuizen and Crosland, 2004). We received information from charities, community organisations, advice centres,
the police and the National Health Service. Keyword searches using Yorkshire, Humber, Bradford, Hull, Leeds, Sheffield, York, refugee, asylum seeker, A8, Polish, and migration were made on the IngentaConnect, Web of Knowledge, Google Scholar and JSTOR databases. Bibliographies previously produced by the authors and written by the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Migration Partnership were also used.

Literature sources can be categorised as follows:
- academic research and academic publications including journals and books
- research reports
- policy planning documents including strategy documents and briefings
- proceedings from events, conferences or seminars
- articles in practitioner magazines and newsletters
- reports from service delivery organisations including annual reports and monitoring data.

The intention is to provide a synthesis of the main themes. Each subsection begins by summarising the key issues and research gaps relating to that topic. The original texts can be accessed for more detailed analysis on particular points. This study has been carried out within a compressed timeframe in order to provide a review at a critical moment to guide developing research agendas in the region. It is therefore not necessarily completely comprehensive, as not all the information gathered could be included and new reports are continuously emerging.

The report reviews literature on international migrants. It does not discuss internal migration within the UK (of long term residents), or nomadic or transient peoples, such as Gypsies and Travellers, with the exception of Roma from EU accession states. This is a regional study focusing on research undertaken in Yorkshire and Humber. There is a large volume of literature undertaken in other regions and nationally. Key recent national studies include:
- Citizens Advice (2005) *Home from home?*
- Robinson and Reeve (2006) *Neighbourhood experiences of new immigration*
- Audit Commission (2007) *Crossing borders*
- Institute of Community Cohesion (2007) *New European migration*.

**Practice examples**
The report includes seven boxes that provide practice examples intended to illustrate how agencies, support groups and employers have responded to the needs of migrants in two ways: service provision, and developing new policies or strategies. The examples aim to cover the main themes of the report and include work on housing, health, children and young people, safety, employment and integration. Projects working with new migrants were harder to find as they tend to be in early development in comparison to work with refugees and asylum seekers.

Further examples of practice that provide learning points are available on the Yorkshire Futures ‘What Works’ database (www.yorkshirefutures.com).

**Key themes in the literature**
There is a strong focus in the literature on the impact of migrants on public services. There are three notable factors of this focus.

1. The recognition that local authorities have a key role in ‘building and promoting community cohesion and integration’ (Local Government Association, 2008).
2. The research agenda is driven by funding from local councils and think tanks responding to a perceived public and political interest in the effect on public services.

3. Resource allocation has historically been a prominent aspect of public debate surrounding large groups of immigrants for over 200 years (Schuster and Solomos, 1999; Bloch, 2002a; Winder, 2004; Craig, 2007b). The current interest in public spending in relation to migrants should be seen in this context.

The idea of ‘impacts’ is not straightforward: it may be helpful to distinguish between short-term and long-term impacts, and between impacts on residents or migrants and on services (Craig et al., 2004). Impacts are varied and depend on the specific local circumstances of demography, labour market and economy, the ‘stretch’ already being experienced on services and previous experience in dealing with diverse communities and cohesion issues (Institute for Community Cohesion, 2007a: 45). Both temporary and longer-term migrants have an impact on translation services, employment support or language courses (Experian, 2007). The notion of impact often seems to have negative connotations, but it is equally observed that the arrival of new migrants can invigorate local businesses and services, especially in areas of declining population (Matthews, 2006a; Adamson et al., 2008). There is great variation in the Yorkshire and Humber region between areas of increasing or declining population, and between multicultural cities and rural areas with less experience of international migration.

The experiences of different types of migrants are similar in some respects. Common issues identified in the literature were problems of social exclusion, poor quality housing, experiences of racism or discrimination and poor awareness of available support among migrants. The unpredictable nature of migration flows and the need for responsive and flexible approaches from supporting agencies emerges in studies on refugees and migrant workers. Equally, immigration status, rights and entitlements, nationality, ethnicity, age, gender, language, and form of migration differentiate migrants’ experiences by shaping access to services and welfare, ease of movement within the UK and in return migration and the right to work. Migrants of all types are people who are often considered ‘hard to reach’. The population is relatively small, mobile and often socially excluded so most of the evidence base comes from qualitative studies.

Reflecting the evidence base and tender guidelines, the report focuses on migrant needs and service provision. This inevitably leans towards cases and examples that illustrate or highlight problems and inadequacies. It should be remembered that many asylum seekers, refugees and migrants are highly resilient and self-reliant. The main interest of this report is to understand the difficulties they face as a result of their social and economic position and the policy or service responses.

1.4 Defining migrants

Migrants are people who move to live in another country. It is common to define a migrant as someone staying for a year or more, to differentiate them from visitors and tourists. Some migrants make repeat short visits. For other terms used in this report see Appendix 1, Glossary.
Asylum seeker
Asylum seeker is the term used to refer to someone who has applied for protection in the UK and is awaiting the outcome of their application.

Refugee
Refugees include people who apply for asylum on arrival in the UK and receive a positive determination on their case, and those who arrive with refugee status as part of a settlement programme. Refugees have the same rights as citizens but after 2005 refugee status was reduced from indefinite to leave to remain for five years (and only longer pending a review).

EU migrant
EU migrants have the right to live or work in the UK. They include migrants from ‘old’ and ‘new’ European countries. EU migrants include Roma, gypsies or travellers.

EU accession migrant
EU accession migrants are nationals of eight of the new countries that joined the EU in 2004: Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovenia, Slovakia (A8), and of Bulgaria and Romania (A2) that joined in 2006. A8 migrant workers are required to register with the Workers’ Registration scheme and are not eligible for income-related benefits until 12 months continuous employment is completed. A2 migrant workers are subject to stricter restrictions and may work only in certain sectors. For clarity in this report, the terms ‘EU accession’ and A8 or A2 will be used where appropriate to differentiate this group from other types of ‘new migrants’.

Migrant worker
A migrant worker is someone who has left their country of origin and works in another. There are often multiple reasons why a person chooses to migrate to a particular country at a certain time, so the term ‘economic migrant’ has limited relevance.

Non EU migrant
This category is a catch-all term to refer to many different forms of migrants who come from countries outside the EU. This includes international students, au pairs, migrant workers who are part of the Highly Skilled Migrant Programme (HSMP) or with another type of work permit or point based entry, those coming to join family (family joiners), ministers of religion, artists and sportspeople. This group includes irregular migrants who enter clandestinely, or overstayers who entered legally and remain after their visa entitlement has run out. Asylum seekers and refugees are also non-EU migrants. It is increasingly common and useful to differentiate EU and non-EU migrants due to the harmonisation of migration policies within the borders of Europe.

New migrant
A new migrant may be someone in any of the above categories. In this report we define ‘new’ as someone who has arrived in Yorkshire and Humber in the last ten years (since 1999). We separate refugees and asylum seekers from other types of new migrants because of their different rights, entitlements, and experiences of forced migration.

---

1 Refugee status, Indefinite Leave to Remain (ILR), Exceptional Leave to Remain (ELR), Discretionary Leave (DL) or Humanitarian Protection (HP). See Brown (2008b) who identifies 43 ‘types’ of refugee status.

2 A total of ten countries acceded to the EU in 2004 - the A8 countries plus Malta and Cyprus (A10), but citizens of Malta and Cyprus are not subject to the restrictions put in place for A8 nationals.
The following chart summarises the different types of migrants (see also Appendix 1, Glossary).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>refugee</th>
<th>refugee status</th>
<th>Humanitarian Protection</th>
<th>Discretionary Leave</th>
<th>Exceptional Leave to Remain</th>
<th>Indefinite Leave to Remain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>asylum seeker</td>
<td>dispersed</td>
<td>‘Subsistence only’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refused asylum seeker</td>
<td>Section 4 refused asylum seeker</td>
<td>destitute refused asylum seeker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trafficked person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irregular migrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| migrant worker            | EU migrant Iceland Liechtenstein Norway Switzerland | EU 15 migrant | EU accession migrant | A8 migrant A2 migrant |
| non-EEA migrant worker    | high skilled migrant | skilled migrant | low skilled migrant | youth mobility and temporary migrant |
| family migrant            | family joiner | dependant               |                     |                            |
| international student     | EU student | non-EU student          |                     |                            |

(Adapted from ‘Who are migrants’ by Dave Brown, YHRMP with kind permission.)

### 1.5 A regional perspective

The Yorkshire and Humber perspective of this report is intended to assist with sharing knowledge and information within and across the four sub-regions and reflects the increasing role of regional governance (see Appendix 4, Structures for migration work). This report is one of the first in the region comprehensively to bring together findings on refugees, asylum seekers and migrants.

The review identified:
- 125 regional studies involving primary or secondary research and discussion papers. Of these, 55 relate to asylum seekers, 51 to refugees and 43 to migrants (some overlap).
- The substantive issues most frequently covered are employment (31), asylum system or support (26), housing (27), integration or community cohesion (27) and health (21).
- Education of children, though not a main focus of any study, emerges within several studies. Adult education features more frequently.
- The least common topics (3 to 6 reports each) are safety and police, children and young people, and welfare or benefits. Only one study focused on legal representation for asylum seekers.

Leeds features in 32 studies, almost all on refugees and asylum seekers. In Hull/Humber, four out of 14 studies and in Sheffield 10 out of 16 studies relate to asylum seekers or refugees with the others referring to migrant workers. It is likely that Leeds is dominant in research on refugees and asylum seekers because it has the largest population of asylum
seekers in the region, a regional UKBA office and a One Stop Service (Refugee Council), a strong voluntary sector and two universities active in research. Thirteen of the studies on EU migrants had been conducted in Hull or the Humber, far more than any other city or subregion. About half of the regional studies on EU migrants feature quantitative analysis of DWP and NINo data. The other half includes qualitative interviews, often with support workers or employers and less often with migrants. The review has uncovered one or two studies in Barnsley, Calderdale, Dewsbury, Doncaster, North East Lincolnshire and Selby. Three studies included the East Riding of Yorkshire, three cover North Yorkshire, while five were undertaken in Bradford. This shows a particular lack of migrant research in smaller towns, villages and rural areas, though increasing movement of new migrants to North Yorkshire is beginning to trigger studies where previously little work has been done.

The literature on EU accession migrants tends to be more general, providing an overview of key issues reflected in the themes of this report. Studies of new European migrants tend not to expose complexities and few are grounded in migrant perspectives. This reflects the urgency of service providers wishing to establish a base of understanding of this new group. This is now the opportune moment to improve more nuanced understandings relating to particular themes. In contrast, literature on refugees and asylum seekers provides more detail on specific issues, reflecting a field that has developed more fully over almost a decade of dispersal. The research gaps that emerge from this review are listed in more detail at each subsection and in Section 5.2.

It must be remembered that migrants tend to move between different forms of employment, types of support and social networks. Insecure accommodation and employment encourages high mobility within the region and the UK. A regional focus therefore has its limitations and attention to national trends must also be taken into account to understand fully the situation in Yorkshire and Humber.

1.6 International migration to Yorkshire and Humber

There has been migration into the Yorkshire and Humber region for hundreds of years (Westmorland, 2006; Craig, 2007b). In the UK, immigration rose at the end of the 19th century when Irish people formed the largest immigrant group (Bloch, 2002a) and as Jews fled persecution in Europe leading to the first immigration legislation, the 1905 Aliens Act. Jewish refugees arrived in the port of Hull and travelled across the country with the hope of leaving from Liverpool to go to America. Many of them stayed and made a marked contribution to prosperity in the region through prominent businesses such as Marks and Spencer and Burtons. Leeds and Bradford still have distinctive Jewish communities (Kudenko and Phillips, 2009). Chinese migration has continued since this period. Seafarers who worked in the UK merchant navy from countries such as the Yemen and Somalia settled in Immingham and Grimsby from the 1930s onwards. Military personnel including Polish airmen who fled the Nazis and fought alongside the allies gave rise to settlements in places such as Bradford and Scunthorpe.

The period of post-war reconstruction after the Second World War created a need for labour that encouraged fewer immigration controls and generated large migrations from Ireland, the Caribbean and South Asia in the 1950s and 1960s. Yemenis came to Sheffield to work in steel manufacturing and are the longest established Arab communities in the UK (Searle, 2007). A study in 1951 (Bulbring, 1954) estimated there to be 5,660 refugees
in Bradford from the European Volunteer Workers Scheme under which around 84,000 people displaced as a result of the Second World War came to the UK from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Yugoslavia (Bloch, 2002a). Clustered settlements resulted from chain and labour migration into specific trades from particular neighbourhoods or villages in South Asia (see Knott, 1994). An announcement of a forthcoming Commonwealth Act introduced to stem numbers led to a peak in migration in a ‘beat the ban’ rush ahead of 1962 (Robinson et al., 2003).

In 1973, 3,000 Chilean refugees were granted settlement in the UK, and since the 1980s the UK accepted UNHCR resettlement programme refugees from South East Asia (1985-1995), Vietnam (1975-1992), Bosnia (1992-1997) and Kosova (1999) (IPPR, 2005). Dispersal was attempted for these groups, though insufficient planning led to poor reception and high rates of secondary migration (Robinson, 2000; Robinson et al., 2003). Yorkshire and Humber received refugees in these programmes (see McCarthy, 1995), most recently from Bosnia, Montserrat, and Kosova (Westmorland, 2006). The experience of refugee resettlement in the 1990s resulted in the formation of some specialist council teams, the establishment of a regional Refugee Council office and developed expertise which put Yorkshire and Humber in a relatively strong position to engage in the asylum dispersal process introduced in 1999 (Westmorland, 2006).

Migrant populations that arrived throughout the twentieth century tend to be classified as minority ethnic groups. Literature on ethnic minorities, race and multiculturalism is not included in this review and can be accessed for more information on earlier groups of migrants (e.g. Stillwell and Phillips, 2006; Stillwell et al., 2006; Jayaweera and Choudhury, 2008). Long-established migrants may face continuing difficulties in accessing welfare and employment provision on an equal footing (Craig, 2007a). The children and grandchildren of migrants born in the UK may not consider themselves as migrants: the extent to which someone classified as a refugee or migrant identifies with the label is an individual decision and may change over time.

The focus of this report is migration since 1999, a significant period in studies of migration in the UK for three reasons. First, in 1999 the system to disperse asylum seekers across the country on a ‘no choice’ basis was introduced. Secondly, the last decade covers a period of rapid change in the nature of migration. Net immigration rose from 48,000 to 148,000 from 1997 to 1998 and has remained at over 150,000 each year since (National Statistics, 2006). Not only has migration increased, but the characteristics of migrants have changed considerably from large numbers of people from a small number of countries towards a migrant population that is ‘superdiverse’ in country of origin, migration channel, legal status, and so on (Vertovec, 2006; Vertovec, 2007). Thirdly, there have been wide-ranging and frequent changes to the immigration system with four major parliamentary immigration acts over six years.
2. Data on migrants in Yorkshire and Humber

This section provides a summary of available regional data on refugees, asylum seekers and migrant workers, as well as highlighting some limitations in using statistics to understand migration.

2.1 Sources of statistical data on migration

The following table summarises the type, source and geography of key statistical data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data*</th>
<th>From year</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Report and website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum applicants</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>Annual asylum statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- in dispersal accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly asylum statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- on subsistence only support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk">http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/rds/immigration-asylum-stats.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum decisions</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Annual asylum statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Removals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly asylum statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk">http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/rds/immigration-asylum-stats.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Control of immigration-category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk">http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- dependants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/rds/immigration-asylum-stats.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8 WRS registrations</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>North East region</td>
<td>Accession monitoring report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/aboutus/reports/">http://ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/aboutus/reports/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8 WRS registrations</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Accession monitoring report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/aboutus/reports/">http://ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/aboutus/reports/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- age, gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- dependants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- work sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- intended length of stay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- benefits and tax credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- housing support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 applicants</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>North East region</td>
<td>Bulgarian and Romanian accession statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NINo registrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/aboutus/reports/">http://ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/aboutus/reports/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 applicants</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Bulgarian and Romanian accession statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- visa category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/aboutus/reports/">http://ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/aboutus/reports/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Work and Pensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINo registrations, non-UK nationals</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Local authority</td>
<td>Cross-tabulation tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parliamentary constituency</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/tabtool.asp">http://www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/tabtool.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government office region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The way in which statistics are disaggregated changes. Earlier reports may have less detail. Note that websites given were correct at time of writing. The presentation of statistics and websites are prone to frequent change. North East Region includes Government Office regions of Yorkshire and Humber & North East.
As this summary shows, most available data on immigration is kept at a national level. The quality and availability of regional data varies. Some data is available for asylum seekers and migrant workers. The Higher Education Statistics Agency has data on international students registered at UK universities. There is little data on other categories of migrants.

Other sources of data on migrants include the Labour Force Survey (LFS), International Passenger Survey (IPS) and Total International Migration (TIM) tables. These are undertaken by the Office of National Statistics (www.statistics.gov.uk) and provide data on broad trends at a national level. However, for the LFS and IPS sample sizes for international migrants or migrant workers are small, limiting their reliability and representativeness (IPPR, 2008). A detailed discussion of the LFS, and NINo, WRS and IPS data for understanding A8 migration is provided by IPPR (IPPR, 2008). For a discussion of the Labour Force Survey and its use for research on A8 migrants see Drinkwater et al. (2006).

### 2.2 Statistical data on migrants in Yorkshire and Humber

This section presents available data on the numbers of asylum seekers, refugees, refused asylum seekers, migrant workers, international students, family migrants and other non-EU migrants in Yorkshire and Humber.

There is no reliable source for other types of regional data on asylum seekers, refugees, or other types of migrants such as length of stay, out-migration, educational attainment, skills, occupations, place of work, income-level, pupils in schools, benefit recipients, and so on. A research project at Leeds University Geography department is working on combining available data to provide better statistics on international migration at a regional level (see Section 5.1).

#### Summary data for Yorkshire and Humber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asylum applicants</th>
<th>Migrant workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30,000 dispersed 2002-07</td>
<td>177,770 registered to work 2002-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>41% women, 59% men</td>
<td>44% women, 56% men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationalities</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top 5 Nationalities</strong></td>
<td>Iraq, Zimbabwe, Somalia, Eritrea and Iran</td>
<td>Poland, Slovak Republic, Latvia, South Africa and Pakistan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.1 Asylum seekers

Table 1 Asylum seekers accommodated in dispersal accommodation by local authority, 2001-2007, end of December

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>2001*</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calderdale</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklees</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Lincs</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,470</td>
<td>10,215</td>
<td>9,895</td>
<td>9,350</td>
<td>7,635</td>
<td>7,745</td>
<td>7,095</td>
<td>4,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Map 1 Asylum seekers supported in dispersal accommodation and those in receipt of subsistence only support, Yorkshire and Humber 2007, end of December

Source: Home Office Asylum Statistics 2007
Table 2 Asylum seekers in receipt of subsistence only support by local authority, 2001-2007, end of December

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>2001†</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklees</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Map 1, above, shows the concentration of dispersal accommodation in the main cities of Leeds and Sheffield. There has been no (official) asylum seeker dispersal to North Yorkshire and North Lincolnshire as not all local authorities take part in dispersal. However, subsistence only support statistics (Table 2) show that in 2002 and 2003 there were some asylum seekers supported in York, and there may also be secondary migration of refused asylum seekers or refugees to North Yorkshire. The proportion of asylum seekers accommodated in each local authority has remained broadly the same since 2002 (Table 3).

Table 3 Asylum seekers by local authority as a % of the total in dispersal accommodation in Yorkshire and Humber, end of December, 2002-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calderdale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Lincs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Home Office statistics. Figures may not total due to rounding.
The Yorkshire and Humber Regional Migration Partnership (YHRMP) estimates that asylum seekers dispersed to the region between October 2000 and December 2007:

- total approximately 30,000
- were from around 117 countries
- were mostly aged 17 to 44 (approximately 64%)
- 41% women and 59% men

Chart 1 Top ten nationalities of asylum applicants, Yorkshire and Humber, 2001-2007

Source: Home Office Statistics. Calculated by adding annual figures and ranking totals.

The top ten nationalities of asylum applicants supported in Yorkshire and Humber have fluctuated since 2001 (see Chart 1). Applications from Iraq declined sharply in 2004. Chart 2 shows the nationalities ranked 11-20 and clearly shows the incidence of applications of people from European countries, and their disappearance following accession. Applications from Poland and Czech Republic are likely to have been Roma people (see Section 4.1.5).
2.2.2 Refugees

On average, between 2000 to 2007, 23% of asylum applicants to the UK were granted some kind of status; 77% were fully refused (Home Office, 2008b). The percentage of full refusals peaked at 88% in 2004, having increased from 54% in 1999.

In 2006, Westmorland suggested that there was 15,000 to 20,000 new refugees in Yorkshire and Humber (Westmorland, 2006). YHRMP estimates the positive determination rate for asylum seekers in this region to be around 50%, considerably higher than the national average. The reasons for this are unknown and more research is needed. Influencing factors include

- A higher proportion of families to singles supported in the region than nationally. Some families have been given status in a family indefinite leave to remain (ILR) exercise (for cases dating from 2000 or before) and in a case resolution exercise on ‘legacy’ cases (from before April 2007) (ILPA, 2008). This is one reason for a decline in asylum seekers in dispersal accommodation in the 2008 figures (Table 1).
- Country of origin (Warm, 2004). Claimants from certain countries have a relatively higher percentage of success in asylum claims.
- People under the fast track system in detention centres around the UK have a very high refusal rate (around 95%). When they are removed from calculations the national average of positive decisions increases.
2.2.3 Refused asylum seekers

Some refused asylum seekers are supported with accommodation and vouchers, called Section 4 support (see Section 3.2.4). In November 2008, around 3,500 people were in Section 4 support in Yorkshire and Humber (YHRMP). It is believed that many other refused asylum seekers are supported by friends and rarely come into contact with support agencies or officials. Data on refused asylum seekers is therefore notoriously difficult to gather. In 2005, the National Audit Office reported a backlog of 155,000 to 283,000 people in the UK awaiting removal (National Audit Office, 2005). Local studies have sought to remedy the lack of data. In Leeds, a survey of destitute clients attending five agencies over a four-week period counted 118 individuals in 2006 which increased significantly to 331 individuals in 2008 when the survey was repeated (Lewis, 2007a; Brown, 2008a). These surveys provide baseline figures of destitute individuals attending services. A study by Leeds City Council estimated there to be a minimum of 1,350 destitute refused asylum seekers in the city (Brown, 2008a), but the actual figure is likely to be higher. Regional data would be improved if surveys were undertaken in other key dispersal cities.

2.2.4 Migrant workers

The two main sources of statistics on recent migrant workers are the Workers’ Registration Scheme (WRS) for A8 nationals and National Insurance Number (NINo) registrations for non-UK nationals. It is important to note that NINo registrations provide data on when a person registers for work, not the total number of migrants in the region, as there is no data on out-migration.

Boden and Stillwell have analysed NINo registration data for Yorkshire and Humber (2006), and Adamson et al. (2008) provide a detailed analysis of WRS and NINo data for the Humber sub-region which shows how gender, nationality and age differ across locations. Matthews has written several reports analysing WRS and NINo data in the Humber sub-region (Matthews, 2006b; Matthews, 2006a; Matthews, 2006c). Experian (2007) review data from WRS, NINo, IPS and the Annual Population Survey for West Yorkshire, North Yorkshire and Humber.

Table 4 NINo registrations non-UK nationals, Yorkshire and Humber, April 2002-March 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DWP
Map 2 (below) shows both the high numbers of recently registered migrant workers in the main cities and towns in West and South Yorkshire, and the distribution of migrant workers in all parts of the region. Unlike the dispersal of asylum seekers (see Map 1), the distribution of recent migrant workers extends throughout North Yorkshire.

**Map 2 NINo registrations non-UK nationals, April 2007-March 2008**

Source: DWP
Table 5 NINo registrations non-UK nationals, by local authority, financial year 2002-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>2670</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>2710</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>2360</td>
<td>4380</td>
<td>5080</td>
<td>5280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>2790</td>
<td>3020</td>
<td>2910</td>
<td>4610</td>
<td>6530</td>
<td>6170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calderdale</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirklees</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>2570</td>
<td>2650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>4110</td>
<td>4960</td>
<td>4730</td>
<td>7190</td>
<td>8380</td>
<td>8860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>3190</td>
<td>2910</td>
<td>3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Riding of Yorkshire</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Lincolnshire</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lincolnshire</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craven</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hambleton</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrogate</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmondshire</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryedale</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17670</td>
<td>18940</td>
<td>19960</td>
<td>36490</td>
<td>41330</td>
<td>42130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DWP
Data on migrants in Yorkshire and Humber

Chart 3 Top ten nationalities of non-UK NIino registrations, Yorkshire and Humber, 2002-2007

Source: DWP

NIino registrations rose from 18,130 in 2004 to 33,030 in 2005, indicating the steep increase in international migration when the new A8 member countries joined the EU. In Yorkshire and Humber 26% of all NIino registrations were from Polish nationals (2002-2008). Chart 3, above, shows how the proportion of registrations from Poland has risen in recent years. Polish nationals averaged 15.4% of NIino registrations over the period 2002 to 2006 (Boden and Stillwell, 2006), yet in 2007 formed 40% of NIino registrations (DWP).

NIino data is particularly useful in revealing groups of international migrants to the region otherwise invisible in the literature, which include high numbers of Pakistani and Indian workers, see Chart 3, above. Between 2002 and 2007 people from 99 countries registered to work in the Yorkshire and Humber region. Recent data shows over 1000 recent arrivals from 11 (non-A8) countries: Pakistan, India, South Africa, Philippines, Australia, France, Portugal, Malaysia, Germany, Spain and Ghana (see Boden and Stillwell, 2006). Despite the dramatic
increase in migration from A8 countries, most new NINo registrations since 2002 have been from people from outside the EU (YHRMP, 2008).

The total of 70,050 NINo registrations from A8 nationals in Yorkshire and Humber, 2002-2008, represents 39% of all non-UK NINo registrations (Table 6).

Table 6 NINo registrations, A8 countries, Yorkshire and Humber, 2002 to 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A8 country</th>
<th>NINo registrations</th>
<th>% of total A8 NINo registrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Rep</td>
<td>9,610</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep of Latvia</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep of Lithuania</td>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>46,290</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep of Slovenia</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DWP

2.2.5 Students

In 2007, 13% of all students in higher education institutes in Yorkshire and Humber were from outside the UK. There were 10% from outside the EU and 3% from the EU (Yorkshire Universities, 2008). In total, there were 27,270 international students in Yorkshire and Humber in 2007. These were not evenly distributed between the universities (Table 5).

Table 7 Students in Higher Education Institutions in Yorkshire and Humber, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A8 country</th>
<th>Total all UK, EU and non-EU students</th>
<th>% non UK students</th>
<th>Postgraduate</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Postgraduate</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total UK</td>
<td>2478425</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>48025</td>
<td>136220</td>
<td>48025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total England</td>
<td>2060400</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>39540</td>
<td>112640</td>
<td>49605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Bradford</td>
<td>13600</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Huddersfield</td>
<td>19740</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Hull</td>
<td>22275</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leeds College of Music</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leeds Met University</td>
<td>39310</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Leeds</td>
<td>33315</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leeds Trinity and All Saints</td>
<td>2690</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheffield Hallam University</td>
<td>29700</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Sheffield</td>
<td>25700</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>2450</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>York St John University</td>
<td>6435</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of York</td>
<td>13270</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Y&amp;H</td>
<td>206625</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3285</td>
<td>12855</td>
<td>3445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Higher Education Statistics Agency, provided by Yorkshire Universities
2.2.6 Family migrants

Family migrants include dependants and family joiners. Dependants (children under 18 or spouses) arrive with principal immigrant arrivals. In 2007, student migrants came to the UK with 16,700 dependants, work permit holders came with 37,700 dependants and asylum applicants with 4,870 dependants (Home Office). Family joiners arrive after other family members to join them in the UK and include, for example, spouses and children under 18 granted leave to enter. In 2007, 42,200 migrants were admitted as a spouse or fiancé(e) and 7,150 children were granted leave to enter. Somerville (2007) estimates that family members accompanying migrants or joining family already in the UK make up approximately 18% of migrants. However, he describes a ‘family gap’ in data and analysis partly because there have been few policy changes relating to family migrants over the last decade (Somerville, 2007: 10). Despite forming a considerable proportion of immigrants, spouses, dependants and children are largely invisible in migration research and regional data is not available.

2.2.7 Other types of EU and non-EU migrants

There is little readily available data on migrants not captured by asylum statistics, WRS or NINo data. Other types of migrants include:

- Migrants who are not workers (and so do not appear on WRS or NINo data).
- People making return visits who already had a NINo from a previous visit.
- Irregular migrants who enter clandestinely or have overstayed.

In addition, it is helpful to remember that people recorded as EU nationals include recent non-EU migrants granted citizenship in those countries. This group includes people granted residency as a result of continuing commitments to former colonies (such as Angolans and East Timorese in Portugal; Western Saharans and Latin Americans in Spain). Others may be refugees granted status in other EU countries who are technically EU migrants but may have different needs similar to those of refugees granted status in the UK.

Irregular migrants

Irregular migrants (also known as ‘undocumented’ or ‘illegal’ migrants) remain the most difficult to assess in terms of size or service needs. A report by IPPR on irregular migrants in the UK outlines some of these difficulties (IPPR, 2006). Irregular migrants include overstayers who entered legally but have stayed after their visa entitlement expired. Some people may breach conditions, for example, by working while on a tourist visitor visa. In other cases, people enter the country illegally either smuggled by choice, or coerced and trafficked by criminal elements. Others may enter legally then become trafficked into a range of illegal occupations, notably the provision of sexual services, or work under conditions of forced labour (as defined by the International Labour Organization). Research studies are underway in the region to identify the scope and nature of irregular and forced labour (see Section 5.1), but the results of this difficult research work will be only publicly available after some time. Some evidence of forced labour in the UK is available through the work of investigative journalists (Gupta, 2007; Pai, 2008) and the Joseph Rowntree Foundation funded study on modern slavery (Craig et al., 2007).
2.3 Limitations of statistics for understanding migration

Asylum statistics
Publicly available Home Office statistics show only the number of asylum seekers supported at any one time in dispersal accommodation, so cumulative calculations do not reflect the number of asylum seekers dispersed to Yorkshire and Humber. It is also not possible to calculate the number of refugees in Yorkshire and Humber because there are no regional asylum determination, detention and removal statistics. Contract holders providing housing under the asylum support system have access to more detailed data but it is generally not publicly available, partly due to data protection and the reluctance of private providers to share information. Furthermore, multiple categories of refugee (Brown, 2008b) create a complex picture. Some people not technically classed as refugees may have fled persecution and consider themselves as refugees broadly conceived. Examples include the Sangatte work visa holders (Jordan and Brown, 2006), or people who are forced migrants but enter under a visa category.

Workers’ Registration Scheme (WRS)
The Workers’ Registration Scheme was introduced to monitor citizens of the countries (except Malta and Cyprus) that joined the European Union in 2004 and the type of work they are doing. Following twelve months uninterrupted work, individuals on WRS may apply for a residence permit and are no longer required to register with WRS. The WRS is due to be relaxed on 1 May 2009 (but can be extended for two years). A8 nationals will have the same rights as other EU/EEA nationals, and WRS data will no longer be kept. There are several limitations of WRS data for understanding migration:

- In the Home Office quarterly accession monitoring report Yorkshire and Humber is treated as part of a North East region which includes all of the North East, so it has limited value for regional analysis (though local authorities have access to regional WRS data).
- Individuals are not required to de-register if they leave employment or leave the country. Hence, WRS data shows only the numbers of A8 migrants who register for work, not the number of A8 migrants in the region or the UK.
- WRS does not include people who are self-employed.
- Some people do not register, so the number of EU migrants could be as much as twice the number recorded by WRS (NYSP, 2008).

National Insurance Number (NINo)
A national insurance number is required by all individuals in the UK undertaking legal employment. However, NINo registration does not neatly reflect rates of immigration, as individuals may apply for a NINo some time after arriving in the UK. This is the case, for example, with refugees gaining status (and the right to work) after a period as an asylum seeker. For this reason, NINo data on A8 nationals may not tally with WRS data for the same time period. Additionally, WRS data records a person’s place of work, whereas NINo records their place of abode. Discrepancies between the two data sets may show the extent of cross-authority movement as many migrants reside in one place and work elsewhere.
This section concentrates on literature about refugees and asylum seekers in Yorkshire and Humber. A background section gives brief descriptions of the asylum process and dispersal. The material is then organised according the themes relating to service provision that emerge from the literature: housing, health, children and young people, adult education, employment, safety and integration.

**Key issues**
Addressing the complex needs of asylum seekers is made difficult for service providers due to
- problems of poor housing
- frequent moves within the dispersal system, or between different support types
- stress created by the asylum determination process
- threat of detention and removal
- language barriers
- experiences of past trauma that create mistrust and lack of confidence.

These issues create barriers to refugees and asylum seekers in accessing help and challenges for services providing support. Equally, many refugees and asylum seekers are engaged in formal volunteering or informal assistance that contributes greatly to enabling agencies to do their work.

**Key research gaps**
- Longitudinal research on refugees: housing, employment, wider integration issues.
- The survival mechanisms and decision making of refused asylum seekers.
- The effects of the New Asylum Model on asylum determination, access to services, experiences of dispersal housing and future integration.
- The experiences of asylum seekers, established residents and supporting services in smaller dispersal towns and the incidence of secondary migration to local authorities not part of dispersal.

**Five key regional studies**
Craig et al (2004a) *The quality of life of asylum seekers in Sheffield and Wakefield.* Available from g.craig@hull.ac.uk
- Findings on experiences of dispersal reception, housing and access to services from 57 interviews and 7 group discussions with asylum seekers.

BMG (2004) *Research into refugees in Yorkshire and Humberside.* Contact info@bmgregresearch.co.uk
- Findings from stakeholder interviews, an estimate of the profile and location of refugees, and a survey of 424 refugees on employment and training experiences.

- Summary of findings from interviews with 11 service providers and 23 forced migrants at different stages of the asylum process about the role of formal and informal welfare agencies and the strategies of forced migrants in meeting their basic needs.
3.1 Background

In policy, the term asylum seeker describes someone who has claimed asylum in the UK and is awaiting an outcome on their claim. Asylum seekers are offered accommodation and weekly payments by the United Kingdom Border Agency (UKBA). Accommodation is provided on a ‘no choice’ basis through a system of dispersal to towns and cities around the UK (see Section 3.2 below). Asylum seekers are not allowed to work.

Dispersal to towns and cities across the UK was introduced in 1999 to relieve the ‘burden’ on local authorities in London and the South East (Boswell, 2001). Somerville (2007: 68) estimates that a minimum of 100,000 individuals were dispersed across the UK between 2000 and 2006. The Yorkshire and Humber region has received about 20% of all asylum seekers dispersed in the UK. Analysis of the top ten countries of asylum clearly demonstrates a close correlation with global affairs and conflicts (Westmorland, 2006). This link with unpredictable sources of persecution and unrest make asylum flows difficult to anticipate and plan for.

On receipt of a positive determination and a grant of leave to remain an asylum seeker becomes categorised as a refugee and is (in principal) entitled to work or to receive mainstream benefits. However, numerous categories of status complicate entitlements (see Brown, 2008b). Refugees may also arrive in the UK already with status under the ‘Gateway’ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) resettlement programme. Refused asylum seekers who receive a negative determination on their case have their support removed (if they are adults without children under the age of 18).

Refugees and asylum seekers are part of the migrant spectrum, but may be differentiated from other migrants in terms of their experiences of forced migration, exile, rights and access to services. They also share many similarities with other migrants in terms of social experience, connections with, and separation from, family and friends in other countries. It is important to remember that in wider use the word refugee describes people forced to migrate as a result of persecution, regardless of their legal status in receiving states.

As it is very difficult to conduct large scale surveys with refugees, only a few small scale surveys have been conducted in the region. Most of the research reviewed is qualitative.
3.1.1 Asylum determination

Before April 2007, people making a claim for asylum were required to travel to Liverpool or Croydon to make a statement. Following this interview, Home Office officials would make an initial decision on the asylum case. Between 2000-2007, between 80-88% of cases were refused at this initial stage and most applicants would appeal against this decision. At some time after the initial refusal a date for an appeal hearing would be given—months or even years later. Around 20% of appeals were granted (ICAR, 2008).

In April 2007, the New Asylum Model (NAM) was rolled out nationally following a pilot in Leeds and in other locations from April 2006. The new system aims to deal with all asylum applications from application to final resolution within six months. Central to the operation of this tight timetable has been the appointment of individual Case Owners (Refugee Council, 2008), responsible for their own cases from the start through to a ‘resolution’ (granting leave to remain, or refusal and removal). The introduction of Case Owners has been coupled with a tight process of contact management. Asylum seekers are required to report frequently to Home Office reporting centres, such as Waterside Court in Leeds (see Section 3.7, below).

Achieving a positive determination in an asylum case is very difficult and dependent upon decent legal representation. While some applicants are happy with the legal support they receive (Wilson, 2001), it is suggested that too often legal representation does not ensure that cases receive adequate and ‘fair’ consideration (Wilson, 2001; Dawson, 2002; Craig et al., 2005a; Lewis, 2007a). Asylum seekers are entitled to free representation under legal aid at the first stage of their claim, but even this basic support has sometimes been undermined in the New Asylum Model because of the speed of the system. A third of respondents in a Refugee Council NAM survey (2008) that included individuals in Yorkshire and Humber had only seen their legal representative after their substantive interview rather than before. The level of provision across the region varies and there are few organisations with the expertise to undertake Judicial or Statutory Review cases, so legitimate appeals may fall out of the system (Community Legal Service, 2004).

In 2004, legal aid was drastically cut and many law firms were forced to withdraw from immigration work. See Burnett (2008c) for a fuller discussion of these changes and their consequences. Following the initial refusal, cases are means-tested: only those deemed to have a significant likelihood of success at appeal can be supported. Individuals whose cases fail the means test are left to complete their own papers or pay for legal representation. Even when a lawyer is secured, whether paid or through legal aid, the quality of representation is not uniform. Asylum seekers have reported refusal of their claims as a result of papers not being completed within time limits, or lawyers not appearing on the day of hearings. The withdrawal of legal aid has left asylum seekers exposed to exploitation by unscrupulous advisors who charge extortionately for poor advice (Burnett, 2008c).

The case of Manuel Bravo has attracted national interest. He was an Angolan man living in Leeds who committed suicide in the Yarl’s Wood detention centre to avoid deportation, leaving behind his son. Manuel was forced to represent himself when his solicitor failed to show at his tribunal hearing. A critical piece of evidence was disallowed because it was not on headed paper. The case ‘sent a shockwave through Leeds churches’ and helped to motivate the establishment of a charity in the city that aims to provide free legal advice for asylum seekers unable to find adequate legal support (Lewis, 2007a: 41).
The annual reports, briefings and newsletters of local organisations working with asylum seekers in the Yorkshire and Humber region include discussion of the numerous concerns about the way the asylum determination and support systems operate. There is not space in this report to review UK policy. Analysis of asylum law is largely covered in national studies, for example the final reports of the Independent Asylum Commission (available at www.independentasylumcommission.org.uk) provide a detailed analysis of the problems with the asylum system. Video testimonies from the hearings held in 2007 which informed the inquiry, including one in Leeds, can be viewed on the internet: www.humanrightstv.com/series/4.

3.1.2 Refugees
On receiving a positive determination, refugees have up to 28 days notice of removal of their asylum support, during which time they must find a new home, register for benefits, obtain a national insurance number, possibly arrange school transfers for their children, and begin to seek training or employment (Warm, 2004). In reality, bureaucratic failure often reduces this to less than two weeks (Carter and El Hassan, 2003). All of these tasks are made difficult as new refugees lack a ‘paper trail’ including official identification and utility bills, while Home Office papers may not be recognised as a form of identity (e.g. see Dwyer, 2008).

The new status of refugees presents a challenge for policy and service delivery: there is a view that people should be left to get on with their lives. Yet unfamiliarity with UK governance structures and the needs that result from forced migration may require long-term support and advice. Those suffering trauma as a result of persecution may need support over many years. These issues affect the ability of refugees to access adequate support and help. As Robinson et al. (2007: 30) note, they are rarely the ‘skilled players of the welfare system they are portrayed to be in media representations’.

Under a government ‘Gateway’ settlement programme people living in UNHCR-run refugee camps are selected for resettlement (Home Office, 2006). Yorkshire and Humber has played a central role in Gateway. Refugees from Liberia, Burma and the Democratic Republic of Congo have been resettled in Sheffield and Hull (Westmorland, 2006; Hynes and Mon Thu, 2008). These individuals arrive in the UK with refugee status, do not go through the asylum system and receive a 12 month support package. The extent to which this support is sufficient for new arrivals with no contacts or financial resources to gain sufficient familiarity with systems is variable and likely to depend upon English language skills (Bazzie et al., 2007). For some, the timeframe may not be adequate to deal with complex needs arising from life in a refugee camp and its disempowering effects. The effect of trauma can mean refugees fear authority and lack confidence in accessing services (Hynes and Mon Thu, 2008).

Once granted leave to remain, refugees merge into the general population; they are only identified in decennial census counts and small scale studies. Knowledge on refugees is insufficient and requires further investigation. Longitudinal research could help to improve understandings of how many refugees remain in Yorkshire and Humber and the influences on their decisions about choice of place to live, employment and other aspects of integration.
3.2 Housing

**Key issues** Compulsory dispersal severely inhibits housing choice and security for asylum seekers, and continues to influence refugee settlement. Negative experiences can encourage secondary migration.

**Research gaps** Longitudinal research to capture decisions and movements of refugees who may have particular ongoing support needs. The effects of the New Asylum Model on housing experiences and on the destitution of refused asylum seekers.

3.2.1 Asylum seeker dispersal

Asylum seekers are not entitled to mainstream benefits or social housing, but are supported by UKBA under a separate system. After applying for asylum, they are offered dispersal housing in locations around the UK on a ‘no choice’ basis. Asylum-seekers receive cash support collected at Post Offices, set at 70% of income support (Temple et al., 2005; Somerville, 2007). Poverty and social exclusion are central features of life for asylum seekers (Craig et al., 2005a; Dwyer and Brown, 2005; Robinson and Reeve, 2006; Lewis, 2007b).

Dispersal was designed for areas with available accommodation, existing multi-ethnic populations and the scope to develop voluntary and community support services. In practice, however, securing accommodation in areas of low demand has taken precedence over other factors (Carter and El Hassan, 2003; Robinson et al., 2003; Griffiths et al., 2005; Robinson and Reeve, 2006). Plans for language clusters attempted to group people within the region, but this system was often abandoned, or more closely adhered to by local authorities than private accommodation providers (Dawson, 2002). Housing offered was generally ‘unpopular’ and ‘hard to let’ and concentrated in deprived areas (Carter and El Hassan, 2003). Dispersal was also created as a punitive measure explicitly intended to deter asylum claims (Hynes, 2007; Sales, 2007). This is despite research on asylum destination decision-making that shows asylum seekers rarely have any choice in their destination country. If they do have a choice, family connections, colonial ties and political freedom influence a desire to seek asylum in the UK (Day and White, 2001). Negative media portrayals help to furnish repressive state responses with moral credibility (Finney and Robinson, 2008).

3.2.2 Dispersal housing

In Yorkshire and Humber about half of dispersal accommodation is managed by local authorities, the other half by private providers. The balance differs between localities. Private provision has been found to be clustered within a few neighbourhoods or estates (Craig et al., 2005a; Lewis, 2007b), while local authority housing covers more areas in cities and towns. Several studies note that housing provided through dispersal contractors is often of poor quality and inadequately maintained, especially that provided by private providers (Craig et al., 2005a; Dwyer, 2005a; Phillips, 2006). However, Craig et al. (2005a) also noted that one (private) non-profit provider in Sheffield was singled out by respondents for special praise (see also Carter and El Hassan, 2003). Despite accommodation frequently offering a stark, inhospitable environment, it is the place where asylum seekers spend most of their time trying to manage a life marked by boredom (Craig et al., 2005a; Lewis, 2007b). Poverty restricts possibilities for social activities, which may be felt all the more acutely by older refugees: ‘I can’t even go out for a coffee because there isn’t enough money for us to go’ (Age Concern and Refugee Council, 2008: 3). A new, confusing, highly-
technologised and sometimes hostile world can make leaving the house a major challenge, fostering social isolation (Hynes and Mon Thu, 2008). For asylum seekers, social interaction is largely restricted to visits to friends in their accommodation, making the house both the principal site for socialising and a place of exclusion and isolation (Lewis, 2007b; cf Sirriyeh, 2008).

The notion of the ambiguity of dispersal housing as a form of ‘support’ emerges in different ways in several analyses of asylum seekers’ experiences. Brown (2005) has examined how housing workers, who make regular visits to the accommodation to monitor clients, combine a potentially supportive role with surveillance controls. These visits contribute to a lack of control in the domestic space, which Lewis (2007b) suggests makes accommodation an ambiguous space: both a refuge from confronting the world outside and a source of discomfort and insecurity. The ambiguity of ‘support’ is extended to the voluntary sector as their co-option into the provision of support under dispersal and involvement in induction processes mean that asylum seekers do not always distinguish non-governmental refugee agencies from the Home Office (Hynes, 2007).

Difficulties in confronting a strange world create a desire to live in close proximity to co-nationals (Hynes and Mon Thu, 2008), driving secondary migration or ‘drift’ from dispersal or settlement sites (Dawson, 2002). However, the extent to which individual asylum seekers or refugees experience other co-nationals as supportive varies. The growth of populations from one country in an area can conversely lead to the proliferation of divisions and ethnic conflict carried from the country of origin (Lewis, 2007b). Fear of ongoing threats (either to family left behind, or on return to the country of origin) from spies and information exchange serves to foster secrecy as a key mechanism of social relationships among asylum seekers and to discourage some from seeking the support of others (Lewis, 2007b; Sirriyeh, 2008). Hence, though many asylum seekers rely on each other for basic survival and support, it should not be assumed that all are necessarily well-supported (Griffiths, 2000; Lewis, forthcoming). Hence, where language clustering has worked it may have sometimes been more to the advantage of agencies organising services (such as interpreting) and may not always benefit asylum seekers’ social lives (contra Dawson, 2001; Dawson and Holding, 2001). This finding destabilises a wholehearted promotion of ‘multicultural’ centres and clustering as universally desired by, and better for, migrant groups.

Dispersal to deprived areas has often been a difficult experience for existing residents and newly arrived asylum seekers. A backdrop of predominantly hostile political, media and public debate conveys a sense of threat posed by the numbers of asylum seekers and by a perceived deviancy of migrants (Finney and Robinson, 2008). Finney and Robinson (2008) note that this moral panic on asylum threatens community cohesion locally, as dispersal brings the contentious issue of asylum to the local level, creating forced settlement in which neither asylum seekers nor the receiving population have any choice about living in the same place. In research comparing local media representations in Leeds and Cardiff at the start of the dispersal policy, inaccurate and negative portrayals were found to be more prevalent in Leeds (Finney and Robinson, 2008), which is likely to have fostered hostile views and behaviour locally. The more positive portrayals in Cardiff demonstrate that local media can take the initiative to alleviate fears and challenge stereotypes. Indeed, the sometimes more favourable construction of EU migrant workers in the press may explain fewer reported instances of harassment and abuse in comparison to
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Asylum seeker dispersal has also created positive changes: ‘I believe it has helped to regenerate communities through having houses maintained and lived in, through use of local shops and community resources, and it has enriched the cultural mix of our region’ (Westmorland, 2006; see also Craig et al., 2005 and Hunt, 2008).

3.2.3 Refugee housing

Attention to the asylum process and the focus on achieving status as an ‘end’ result sometimes means the significance of problems associated with becoming a refugee are underplayed (Warm, 2004). Transitions in immigration status create anxiety, insecurity and uncertainty and bring a change in available support and rights. There is a need for ongoing support (MacKenzie and Forde, 2008), especially as refugees risk becoming homeless in the gap between losing their asylum support and finding new accommodation (Carter and El Hassan, 2003). ‘Move on’ support is regarded as critical to securing housing and thereby longer term integration (Phillips, 2006) (see Section 3.8, Integration). New refugees have the right to apply for help under homelessness legislation and their priority level is assessed in the same way as any other applicant, which allows some discretion in interpretations of ‘vulnerability’ (Robinson et al., 2007). When dispersal began, cities in the region had ‘low demand’ housing areas but now refugees face finding housing amid housing shortages, particularly in the social housing sector (Lukes et al., 2008), pressures which seem likely to grow. The short transition period means refugees enter the housing market hurriedly and are exposed to considerable potential for exploitation from unscrupulous landlords. The challenges of finding suitable accommodation may worsen with shorter determination times under NAM as refugees will have had fewer opportunities to develop links (ECOTEC, 2007).

Existing studies indicate that refugees live in a mixture of private-rented and social housing, or stay with friends or relatives (MRUK, 2005a; Phillips, 2006; Robinson et al., 2007). Some Registered Social Landlords have developed targeted provision and support for refugees, yet this is limited in many areas (Carter and El Hassan, 2003; Lukes et al., 2008). Secure housing is essential for creating feelings of safety that enable the development of a sense of home and a sense of belonging (Rutter et al., 2007; Sirriyeh, 2008). For refugees it may take a long time and many moves before gaining more permanent accommodation. ‘Gateway’ refugees who experience a higher level of initial support have a distinctively shorter ‘housing pathway’ (Robinson et al., 2007). Different immigration categories are attached to varied bundles of rights and entitlements, promoting clear distinctions in the settlement experiences of different migrant groups (Robinson et al., 2007; Brown, 2008b).

Estimates of the number of asylum seekers receiving a positive determination who remain in the region range from around 50% (Carter and El Hassan, 2003; Westmorland, 2004; MRUK, 2005a) to up to 91% (BMG, 2004). Racial harassment and isolation are likely to cause refugees and asylum seekers to want to move, either during the asylum process or on gaining a decision, hampering integration (Robinson et al., 2003). Other concerns held by refugees that create a sense of an unsafe environment include visibly dilapidated buildings, high levels of crime, visible alcohol and drug taking or a sense of threat from young people gathered in public spaces (Craig et al., 2005a; Robinson and Reeve, 2006; Sirriyeh, 2008). These concerns might be seen as little different from those of the non-refugee population. Equally, having family and friends, feeling secure, welcomed and settled is likely to make asylum seekers more...
likely to remain in their place of dispersal after they received a positive asylum decision (MRUK, 2005a; Rutter et al., 2007). It is likely that some refugees come to the region from other areas of the UK on gaining a positive decision to be with friends or family. However, a local connection rule introduced in January 2005 means that refugees cannot immediately apply for social housing outside of the area where they were supported as an asylum seeker. This rule extends lack of choice into the period after gaining status, continuing the separation of friends and relatives under asylum dispersal (Lewis, 2007b: 97). Furthermore, lack of finances or of job opportunities may restrict refugees’ ability to change their place of abode (MRUK, 2005a) echoing a limiting feature commonly influencing the clustering of migrant groups in the UK over generations.

3.2.4 ‘Section 4’ support
When their case is refused following a final negative determination, refused asylum seekers are offered limited voucher support and accommodation known as ‘Section 4’ (or ‘hard case’) support. This is subject to complying with voluntary return, or if they meet one of four other restricted criteria, such as medical impediment to travel. Delays in considering applications for Section 4 mean that even if someone applies as soon as they hear of the refusal of their asylum claim, they may be left homeless and destitute in the gap between leaving dispersal accommodation and awaiting the outcome of a Section 4 application. In two Leeds surveys of destitute asylum seekers 19% of 101 individuals surveyed in 2006 (Lewis, 2007a) and 27% of 266 individuals surveyed in 2008 (Brown, 2008a) were waiting for Section 4 to begin, indicating that this is a major cause of destitution.

Section 4 support is intentionally punitive, or ‘low threshold’, based on the premise that it should not provide an incentive to stay in the UK (Lewis, forthcoming). The use of vouchers in Section 4 is the subject of unreserved criticism from refugee agencies and support groups. Research in Sheffield (Northern Refugee Centre, 2007) highlighted numerous problems with the voucher system. People, including those with mobility problems, cannot pay for public transport and are left to walk long distances (up to 1-2 hours) to get to major supermarkets that accept vouchers. Supermarkets that accept vouchers are more expensive than local shops. To obtain cash recipients are forced to sell vouchers, losing face value, while using vouchers in shops can result in losses if change is not given. Vouchers affect social life by making it difficult to ‘top up’ mobile phones, and have psychological effects where individuals experience shame and stigma at the till trying to pay with a voucher that identifies them as an asylum seeker.

Research in Leeds (Lewis, 2007a) reports that agency staff dealt with complaints about the quality of Section 4 housing including poor (or no) heating or hot water, dirty carpets and bed sheets, mice, damp and lack of cooking utensils. Elsewhere it is reported that a pregnant woman slept on the floor, too afraid to complain that her room had no bed (Burnett, 2007b). It is hoped that a plan to bring contract Section 4 holders in line with those offering accommodation under dispersal (Section 95) will improve problems with accommodation, including gaps in provision (Lewis, 2007a). However, Brown (2008a) found that there are still significant numbers of people being evicted from dispersal accommodation while a Section 4 application is pending, as mentioned above, up to two years after the claim of improvements was made. Given the pressure already placed on agencies and individuals supporting destitute refused asylum seekers, improving this administrative cause of destitution seems a priority.
Although designed as a short term measure to prevent the destitution of those awaiting return or unable to return for various reasons, the lengths of time people are supported and the numbers of people in the Section 4 system have steadily increased. Under a system guided by a principle of ‘conveying the concept of return’ (Burnett, 2007b) there is little incentive to improve standards of provision. Large numbers of people in the Section 4 system come from countries to which it is dangerous or difficult to arrange return and are effectively abandoned in a limbo, suffering as a result of intentionally punitive policies.

3.2.5 Refused asylum seekers and destitution
Refused asylum seekers not on Section 4 support are destitute and reliant on others for help. This means they are a highly mobile population, having to go wherever they can find a means to survive (Craig et al., 2005a; Dwyer, 2005b; Lewis, 2007a). Hidden homelessness is considered to be widespread among refused asylum seekers (Dwyer and Brown, 2005). Friends providing support may become fatigued and the destitute individual is forced to move to another town or city where they may know someone who can help, or are left on the streets. The Leeds surveys of destitute individuals attending services counted 29 people sleeping rough in 2006 and 40 in 2008. The surveys indicate that Leeds is a significant hub of support within the region as around a third of destitute people attending services had previously been supported elsewhere (Lewis, 2007a; Brown, 2008a). Difficulties of poor quality dispersal housing mentioned above, may be compounded as individuals host others to save them from sleeping on the streets (Craig et al., 2005a). In the larger cities, specialised services have emerged to attempt to support destitute asylum seekers (for example, see box below, ASSIST). These agencies provide a vital lifeline, but face many challenges in providing these services. The lack of support options for destitute clients leave staff demoralised (Lewis, 2007a).

ASSIST: Keeping destitute asylum seekers alive in Sheffield
Asylum Seeker Support Initiative-Short Term is a project in Sheffield that helps destitute asylum seekers. Set up in 2003, it helps by
• finding night shelter for those sleeping rough
• finding temporary accommodation with host families
• paying a small weekly grant for food and basic living expenses
• advising about other sources of assistance available
• giving free or subsidised bus pass vouchers to those with serious medical problems, and pregnant women who would find it difficult to walk
• finding longer term solutions by assisting clients to pursue their asylum claims
• raising awareness to the problem through events and talks.

ASSIST is dependent upon the generosity of volunteers who provide shelter in their homes, and on charitable donations to provide weekly payments for those in the most critical of circumstances.

Supporting destitute asylum seekers is very challenging work. It has been made more difficult as a result of the speed of the new asylum model, which aims to make an initial decision in six weeks, and final determination in six months. Asylum seekers are only in the country for a short time before being refused asylum and having their support removed. This means that some people are not receiving sufficient legal representation, and individuals are not being informed of advice available to them.

For more information see www.assistsheffield.org.uk or contact ASSIST on 0114 2754960, admin@assistsheffield.org.uk
3.3 Health

**Key issues** Poor physical and mental health results from past experiences of trauma and insecurity in the UK. Mental health issues are especially prevalent and complex.

**Research gaps** The consequences of billing for secondary care, exclusion from services, use of alternative medicine, and the effects of changes in nutrition and lifestyles on health for all asylum seekers, especially refused asylum seekers. Most studies relating to health have been undertaken in Leeds; the health needs of refugees and asylum seekers and responses of health services in other places require attention.

Asylum seekers are recognised as having particular health needs that relate to their treatment and precarious status in the UK, and to past experiences of trauma. These factors mean asylum seekers are vulnerable to poor physical and mental health (Wilson et al., 2007; Haroon, 2008) and have an ongoing need for therapeutic support. Hospitals, GP services and other NHS services are unequally affected across the region, reflecting the concentrations of dispersal housing in certain neighbourhoods. This also means that interpreter costs fall disproportionately on some PCTs (Gamsu, 2008). It is worth noting that of twelve regional studies dedicated to health issues, eight were undertaken with or relating to, health services in Leeds. The remainder constituted one study each in Wakefield (Mirza, 2004), Hull (Martin, 2007), Sheffield (Iroko, 2008), and the Yorkshire and Humber region (Wilson, 2002).

3.3.1 Access to health services

In the early stages of dispersal health services were hindered by lack of organisation and poor information exchange in the dispersal system. Until 2003, the National Asylum Support Service was centrally managed from Croydon. This hampered communication and a lack of any data on individuals being dispersed made it difficult for health services to anticipate or plan responses (Wilson, 2002). Since then asylum support management has been regionalised, and a health sub-group has formed to feed health issues into the regional strategic migration group.

The provision of specialist language services is considered as a basic requirement for working with refugees and asylum seekers in a health setting (Wilson, 2002). Health services make wide use of telephone interpreting services. Face-to-face interpreting may be more appropriate for extended or complicated consultations, but coordinating patient appointments with booking an interpreter can be difficult. The use of family as interpreters for discussing sensitive health matters is noted as problematic and inappropriate (Rodger, 2008). The language barrier can cause frustration and increases consultation time threefold (Wood, 2001); it is necessary to book double appointments to provide enough time (Williams, 2008). Furthermore, receptionists who may not have access to translation facilities have initial contact with asylum seekers and often struggle to ascertain the problem and solution (Williams, 2008). Clearly, poor levels of English and lack of English language tuition (see Section 3.4 Adult Education, below) have a cost impact at every level of provision of services.

Understanding entitlement to health care is particularly complicated, and clear guidance is needed for health professionals (Haroon, 2008; Rodger, 2008). Likewise, lack of understanding of institutions and systems among asylum seekers prevents them from
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The denial of secondary care has had far-reaching consequences for access to healthcare for all migrants owing to health care professionals checking immigration status, promoting a perception among migrants that they may not be eligible (see Refugee Council, 2006; and Lewis, 2007a). It has been routine for secondary care to be denied, or for refused asylum seekers to be billed. The restrictions have sometimes been interpreted too strictly because of confusion over entitlements (Cassidy, 2008). A High Court Ruling in April 2008 clarified that failed asylum seekers are ‘normally resident’ and therefore eligible for free health care, but confusion over eligibility is likely to have a lasting effect in dissuading asylum seekers from accessing care. The potential consequences of billing for maternity care are particularly worrying, as women are discouraged from attending antenatal appointments (Goodwin et al., 2006), or may be giving birth at home unaided (Refugee Council, 2006).

Two health needs emerge as particularly significant in providing health services for refugees and asylum seekers: communicable diseases and mental health.

3.3.2 Health concerns

Practical problems faced by asylum seekers in managing complex (legal, social, health) systems, the cost of travel and navigating with limited language are not compatible with rigid appointment systems (Williams, 2008). Language barriers and missed or late appointments can negatively influence GP surgeries towards registering asylum seekers (Wood, 2001). There is very little work on the needs of disabled refugees and asylum seekers, who may suffer from a lack of awareness of entitlements among supporting agencies, and poor communication and confusion between asylum support and social services over responsibilities for support (Roberts and Harris, 2002). Research with Somali women in Leeds (Athwal and Fitzsimons, 2006) found that, compared to regular exercise and access to fresh food in Somalia, adjustments to life in the UK such as changes in diet and level of activity, the British climate and the prevalence of stress related symptoms led to an increase in medical needs and frequency of appointments. The effects of FGM (female genital mutilation) cause problems of urinary infections, menstruation, pain and childbirth, but could be easily missed through lack of awareness among medical practitioners.

Asylum seekers may arrive from countries where immunisation is uncommon (Haroon, 2008). Incidence of infectious diseases such as tuberculosis (TB) and HIV may be higher and therefore impact on local services (Allan and Clarke, 2005). Screening for TB and HIV is offered to asylum seekers during induction at an initial health assessment. However, problems with accessing GP surgeries reduces the likelihood of diseases being identified at an early stage, increasing the risk of infection and causing preventable suffering for patients (Cheedella, 2006). Prevalence of HIV is likely to mirror that in the country of origin; asylum seekers who have experienced sexual violence may have been placed at particular risk (Allan and Clarke, 2005: 306). Again, problems with poor housing and unemployment may make it more difficult to provide advice and information to those diagnosed, requiring more time from genito-urinary medicine centres.

3 The Department of Health was preparing to appeal against the decision in November 2008.
HIV/AIDS services in Leeds were reviewed in research in 2003 (Allan and Clarke, 2005) which showed that service users were appreciative of being supported by an approachable, sensitive service able to provide good factual information to counter stigma and misconceptions of the virus picked up in countries of origin. While some individuals with HIV received vital support from partners, others were socially isolated or unable to tell friends or family about their status, leading Allan and Clarke to suggest that befriending or mentoring schemes be developed. Information about HIV/AIDS, female genital mutilation (FGM) and other sexual health matters, their relation to asylum claims and sources of help are covered in a handbook on Sexual Health, Asylum Seekers and Refugees by the Family Planning Association (Wilson et al., 2007).

3.3.3 Mental health
Mental health issues are highlighted as prevalent among refugees and asylum seekers. This prevalence necessitates specialised therapeutic services and complicates addressing any type of health need. Mental illness may not be expressed for reasons of stigma or culture. Post-traumatic stress is thought to be under diagnosed (Haroon, 2008). Asylum seekers often experience severe trauma from persecution that may include rape, genocide, ethnic cleansing and violence. These difficulties are often worsened by separation from family and experiences of racism that create fear in daily life in the UK (Mirza, 2004). It is increasingly recognised that the treatment of asylum seekers in the UK compounds past trauma and creates new, immediate stresses and problems that obstruct the recognition and treatment of mental health concerns (Mirza, 2004; Athwal and Fitzsimons, 2006; Martin, 2007; Williams, 2008). Experiences of disbelief and rejection associated with asylum case refusal, and the constant fear (or experiences) of detention and removal leave asylum seekers exposed to intense anxiety and vulnerable to sudden and traumatic rupture in social relationships (Iroko, 2008).

Services are often not sufficient in capacity or sensitivity to respond to the level of mental health need among refugees and asylum seekers. Individuals may lack confidence in mental health services due to feelings that trauma is not understood, being met with doubt or disbelief when presenting with serious complaints, being prescribed medication with little explanation, and perceptions of a culturally insensitive ‘white’ service (Mirza, 2004) found that some refugees and asylum seekers had encountered stereotyping by health staff that blocked access to care. This included not being informed of available support due to a perception that individuals get support ‘within their own community’, or of being cast as having a ‘bogus’ asylum claim, leading to mental health complaints not being believed. In recognition of the mental health needs of asylum seekers, specialist services have developed in the region including Solace-surviving persecution and exile (see box, Solace).

The exacerbation of mental health problems as a result of treatment in the UK is acute for refused asylum seekers, who may present with especially complex needs resulting from sleeping rough, exclusion from services, and the distress caused by destitution. The highly limited options available to support destitute refused asylum seekers makes addressing their needs particularly demanding, and leaves staff emotionally drained (Lewis, 2007a). Health services report an increase in the number of refused asylum seekers who experience a significant deterioration in their health as a result of destitution (Cheedella, 2006; Goodwin et al., 2006; Gamsu, 2008; Williams, 2008). The desperate and seemingly intractable situation of destitution has serious consequences for the health of refused asylum seekers. Of 61 destitute asylum seekers surveyed about
mental health by Leeds agencies in 2008, 26% discussed ending their own lives (Burnett, 2008b). In research conducted in Leeds, one refused asylum seeker said: ‘At night I can’t sleep. I see my life is in danger... I do not have any feeling in my body. When I see the past I see death. When I see the present I see no hope. If I kill myself everything will finish’ (Lewis, 2007a: 33). Regaining control by achieving a positive resolution to an asylum claim and having the ability to work are significant factors to improving health (Williams, 2008). Despite the challenges and problems of access to health services, it must be recognised that refugees and asylum seekers are fleeing persecution and conflict, and are seeking to re-establish their lives productively and creatively (Wilson et al., 2007).

Solace-surviving exile and persecution
Solace provides counselling and advocacy to asylum seekers and refugees. The organisation, based in Leeds, was established due to a recognition that the mental health needs of asylum seekers and refugees were not being met by mainstream services. This was partly because of language barriers, and because many health professionals felt ill-equipped to deal with the multiple traumas from which many asylum seekers and refugees suffer. About a third of their clients are victims of torture, rape and other forms of persecution-problems which are exacerbated by living in exile with an uncertain future. Solace:

- has nine volunteer counsellors
- runs a women’s advocacy service to help address practical problems with housing, education or health issues
- offered between 25-30 counselling sessions a week in 2008
- gives specialist training to interpreters that highlights confidentiality and specific skills required for working effectively with people who have experienced trauma.

One client said:

‘Solace really helped me to get back on my feet. The therapy helped me be strong again. It was not just the therapist who helped me but all the people working at Solace who gave me a lot of support and very helpful advice.’

During 2008, Solace began delivering counselling in Bradford and is hoping to expand its services to Hull and Wakefield in 2009. Funding constraints, however, have limited the potential to offer more counselling to asylum seekers and refugees both in Leeds and across the region.

The work of Solace was highlighted in an Independent Asylum Commission hearing which can be viewed here: http://www.humanrightstv.com/episode/244. The site also contains a moving testimony of the personal experience of one of their clients.

For more information including the 2008 Annual Report, see www.solace-uk.org.uk or contact Solace, 0113 2491437, info@solace-uk.org.uk
3.4 Children and young people

**Key issues** Children experience interrupted education and have been associated both with improved school attainment and low achievement in other cases.

**Research gaps** The treatment of unaccompanied asylum seeking children, including a review of the extent to which existing recommendations have been met (Dawson and Holding, 2001; Wade et al., 2005), and a regional assessment of ongoing changes in support for this group. The educational progress of refugees who arrived as children after they reach 16 years old.

Children and young people make up a significant part of the asylum seeker and refugee population in Yorkshire and Humber. Data from the Yorkshire and Humberside Consortium for Asylum Seekers and Refugees (now called YHRMP) shows that since 2002 more families than single people have been dispersed to the Yorkshire and Humber region (Westmorland, 2006). This pattern is not uniform across nationalities. Iraq and Eritrea feature in the top five single nationalities dispersed to the region, but not in the top five family nationalities, while Congo and Pakistan are in the top five family nationalities, but not in the top five single nationalities (see Westmorland, 2006). Understanding more about the balance of single to family asylum applicants is important in order to plan for school placements and other children’s services, and in calculating the working age population.

### 3.4.1 Children and education

Refugee children often suffer from a disrupted educational background and may have spent time out of education as a result of conflict, poverty, flight, and dispersal in the UK (Wilson, 2001; Wade et al., 2005; Rutter et al., 2007; Sporton and Valentine, 2007). Children may have been exposed to ‘adult’ experiences of conflict and persecution, such as carrying a gun, or may have previously been in predominantly unwaged labour to support the household economy (Sporon and Valentine, 2007). After arrival in the UK, children may experience long delays before they can access a school (e.g. see Craig et al., 2005a: 56), and the high mobility of asylum seekers who are frequently moved within the dispersal system and even detained (see Section 3.7.2) may further disrupt schooling. Gaining a school place may be especially difficult for those arriving mid-term, or at age 15, and adjustment to new educational environments takes time (Wade et al., 2005).

Anxiety, experiences of bullying or racism, and difficulties with English can mean that asylum seeking children and young people need substantial reassurance from teachers, carers and social workers (Wade et al., 2005).

In the earlier stages of dispersal it was found that some schools were full or were reluctant to admit asylum seeker children (Dawson and Holding, 2001; Wilson, 2001). The unpredictability of asylum flows and of consequent dispersal makes planning difficult. As systems to respond to dispersal have developed, improvements in communication have aimed to reduce problems with school admissions. Within the region, schools in dispersal areas are most affected: some are in ‘multicultural’ locations yet were unfamiliar with the high diversity and particular needs of refugees, while other schools were unfamiliar with pupils from minority backgrounds. The complex needs of refugee and asylum seeking children can create a strain for schools, particularly if the resources or training to respond to these new educational needs are not readily available (Robinson and Reeve, 2006: 18).
However, over time some schools and teachers have developed expertise in working with children who have experienced trauma, and in teaching children who do not speak English as a first language (see box in Section 4.4.1 on International New Arrivals, for example).

Support for children who speak English as an additional language (EAL) is funded by the Ethnic Minorities Achievement Grant (EMAG). Nevertheless, this provision is not necessarily sufficient, and, as Rutter et al. (2007: 74) explain, ‘this funding has decreased at a time when the numbers of children requiring EAL support continues to increase’. Even where support is provided it is often to a basic level, or not offered if some competence in speaking English is shown, damaging the long-term achievement of children and their chances for developing academic literacy (Rutter et al., 2007). Children are left in lessons they do not understand and forced to pick up English ‘by osmosis’, or rely on help from fellow pupils (Sporton and Valentine, 2007: 16). Improving English may also be affected by speaking another language in the home (Sporton and Valentine, 2007), which parents may promote as a means of maintaining cultural identity. Although parents’ own lack of formal education may limit their ability to help with homework, Sporton and Valentine’s research in Sheffield notes the establishment of Somali community after-school homework clubs.

In relation to unaccompanied minors, Wade et al. (2002) note that progress in educational careers can be helped by strategies that strengthen young people’s social networks and that help to promote self esteem, self efficacy and resilience. Such security can be difficult for asylum seeker children to attain if they have to move schools, undermining their ability to develop relationships with teachers and peers (Sporton and Valentine, 2007). Although asylum seeker or refugee children have sometimes been associated with improved attainment and are seen as motivated contributors to school life (Dawson and Holding, 2001), certain refugee nationalities are represented in the lowest achieving groups (Rutter et al., 2007). Somali children in Sheffield (the third largest ethnic minority group) have been consistently at the bottom of achievement tables (Sporton and Valentine, 2007). Education provision in further education colleges is particularly significant for refugees who arrived late in their educational career and may have struggled to pass examinations at 16. There is, however, little research that examines young refugees’ progress post-16 (Rutter et al., 2007: 89).

### 3.4.2 Children and integration

Children can be important brokers of integration, as they tend to learn English and adapt to British culture more quickly than adults (Stanley, 2001), and provide opportunities for parents to mix with other adults in playgrounds and nurseries (Lewis, 2007b; Adamson et al., 2008; Hunt, 2008). Young people are adept at handling the challenges and benefits of the mixed identities and affiliations of living in a new country (Valentine and Sporton, 2008), but also have specific needs as they face transitions to adulthood that are often accompanied with insecure immigration status (Sirriyeh, 2008). These adaptative qualities can also place pressure on children and young people, as they are often relied upon to translate and to advocate and represent the family when interacting with services (Dawson, 2001; Dawson and Holding, 2001; Stanley, 2001; Sporton and Valentine, 2007; MacKenzie and Forde, 2008).
Equally, lack of childcare options (Athwal and Fitzsimons, 2006) can inhibit the possibilities for parents with younger children to mix, access education, or other services. Single parenting may be particularly isolating when contrasted with familiarity with extended family networks and group parenting in countries of origin (Hunt, 2008). Children's advanced capacity with speaking English and their ability to identify with English lifestyles as a result of schooling can create intercultural differences between the generations. Young people may feel their parents do not understand their lives, or their experiences of trying to integrate in the UK (Sporton and Valentine, 2007). As discussed, refugees who flee as children may be more likely to have experienced gaps and interruptions to their education than adult refugees, which can hamper their capacity for integration and future employment prospects. Just as children's experiences of life in the UK are linked to those of their families, the integration possibilities for adults are affected by their children, prompting Rutter et al. (2007) to advocate that refugee integration programmes (discussed further in Section 3.8) should include children in support and assessment interviews.

3.4.3 Young separated refugees

Young separated refugees who arrive alone are supported as unaccompanied asylum seeking children in the mainstream looked after care system. They may have specific needs, are especially prone to isolation, and twice suffer the uncertain, destabilising experience of awaiting a resolution to their claim for asylum as their cases are reconsidered once they turn 18. Further to the problems in accessing education mentioned above, young separated refugees may face additional barriers to further and higher education as they lack role models or advocates, may be inappropriately housed, face mental health issues and lack life skills needed for independent living (Stevenson and Willott, 2007). The difficulties they face as refugees are compounded by the disadvantage faced by looked after children in general. Stevenson and Willott (2007) spoke to organizations who accused local authorities of blatant disregard for the Hillingdon judgement that made explicit the responsibilities of local authorities to provide leaving care support to unaccompanied asylum seeking children to the age of 21 (or 24 if in full time education).

For young separated refugees, lack of access to education takes away any structure from daily life, exacerbating boredom and arguably building apathy and contributing to declining mental health (Dawson and Holding, 2001). Research in 2001 found ample space for improvement in the treatment and support of unaccompanied asylum seeking children (Dawson and Holding, 2001). The limitations of social service support, problems of age assessment and difficulties of transition at the age of 18 were further emphasised by University of York research (Wade et al., 2005). Given ongoing changes in the looked after system, proposals for the dispersal of unaccompanied asylum seekers (Richmond-Coggan, 2007) and a general lack of attention to young people in research on refugees (Sirriyeh, 2008), the experiences of young separated refugees in Yorkshire and Humber require further investigation.
3.5 Adult education

**Key issues** Prior to cuts to ESOL in 2007, attending college provided opportunities for social interaction and building skills. Refugees experience multiple barriers to higher education.

**Research gaps** The consequences of cuts in funding in reduction in college attendance for asylum seekers’ mental health and their capacity to access services, socialise and integrate.

Further education colleges and community centres have played a central role in providing English as a Secondary Language (ESOL) and other training courses for refugees and asylum seekers. Attending college for ESOL and training in other basic skills such as computing was a key feature of life for asylum seekers while their claim was being processed (Dawson and Holding, 2001; Stevenson and Willott, 2007). Asylum seekers have a great desire to learn English and engage quickly with educational opportunities (Craig et al., 2005a). Attending college also put refugees and asylum seekers in contact with career and personal advisors who have often played a critical role in supporting them to access other services and learn about the UK (Wilson, 2001).

Numbers accessing courses have reduced significantly since universal entitlement to free ESOL training was withdrawn in 2007. Subsequent changes slightly improved access for asylum seekers still awaiting an outcome to their claim after six months (and those aged 16-18). Cutting ESOL provision has clear consequences for the capacity of asylum seekers to learn English, understand British institutions, mix with other people, and remain active and occupied while they await the outcome of their claim. Frontloading ESOL provision is an efficient use of resources as over the long term individuals may accumulate barriers to learning (Baynham et al., 2007) and lack of English is a major barrier to employment, as discussed next in Section 3.6. Even before these changes came into effect and certainly since, a call for more accessible and appropriate English language provision is commonplace in most of the literature. Demand for ESOL far outstrips supply in many areas (Baynham et al., 2007). Provision of ESOL for asylum seekers has been effectively removed despite increasing demands that for ‘integration’ and ‘citizenship’ refugees should learn English and contribute to society. This contradiction is likely to become an increasing concern for asylum seekers and supporting agencies who universally identify language barriers as the most significant problem in service provision, and can only worsen refugee unemployment (see Section 3.6) and further impede integration (see Section 3.8).

Young refugees are considered highly aspirational and motivated (Stevenson and Willott, 2007), despite multiple disadvantages that limit opportunities for study and the difficulties of interrupted education, experiences of trauma and insecurity of status in the UK. The difficulties of poverty, social exclusion and inadequate accommodation already mentioned have a pervasive impact for refugees, affecting education and access to further or higher education (Stevenson and Willott, 2007). These issues and the superdiversity of students present challenges to ESOL teachers, meaning that a ‘one size fits all’ approach is unlikely to deliver effective provision (Baynham et al., 2007). Stevenson and Willott (2007) note that lack of trust or stigma may mean young refugees do not access support needed to help overcome low self-esteem, lack of confidence and insecurity. They also found that a lack of understanding of further and higher education options can lead to mistakes in education choices that effectively prevent progressing to a chosen career or subsequent courses. Poverty can impede taking up educational
opportunities, from simply paying for a bus to get to college (Craig et al., 2005a) to the charging of asylum seekers in higher education at prohibitively high overseas student rates (Stevenson and Willott, 2007).

Older refugees may find training and education particularly challenging, especially if they have no past experience of education or have mobility problems (Age Concern and Refugee Council, 2008). Asylum seekers and refugees wishing to access higher education or take up professional employment must usually obtain an IELTS (International English Language Testing System) certificate, but there is a lack of provision, and courses can cost up to £1000, with the test costing an additional £90 (Stevenson and Willott, 2007). Universities generally do not consider refugees as a specific widening participation target group. The continued under-achievement and under-representation of refugees in UK higher education despite high levels of aspiration represents a failure by educational institutions and support services to provide adequate advice and guidance (Stevenson and Willott, 2007).

3.6 Employment

**Key issues** Refugee unemployment is very high despite a great desire to work, due to multiple barriers to employment.

**Research gaps** Reliance on voluntary sector employment projects, and the emerging influence of the new Refugee Integration and Employment Service in improving statutory support for refugees in accessing employment.

3.6.1 Asylum seekers, work and volunteering

Asylum seekers no longer have permission to work\(^4\). Dependency on state benefits is highlighted as an uncomfortable and unfamiliar experience for people used to being in employment (MacKenzie and Forde, 2008). Concerns over resources and welfare voiced in negative media portrayals (Craig et al., 2004; Craig et al., 2005a), and sometimes in verbal abuse in the streets or in Post Office queues is particularly difficult for asylum seekers to accept, given their great desire to work and be self-sufficient (Lewis, 2007a; Lewis, 2007b). The denial of a right to work for asylum seekers is widely taken to be a waste of skills and talents that could be contributed to the local community and economy (Dwyer and Brown, 2005; Adie et al., 2007; Lewis, 2007a; Hunt, 2008; MacKenzie and Forde, 2008), and is a particularly disempowering element of the asylum process. Previous occupations or professions are a strong source of identity and long periods spent not using skills negatively affects mental health (Hunt, 2008).

Volunteering can provide a vital chance for asylum seekers who do not have permission to work to build skills, to learn about UK society and to socialise (Wilson and Lewis, 2006; Hunt, 2008; MacKenzie and Forde, 2008). Moreover, volunteering is also an important way for people who have been through the asylum process to feel able to reciprocate the help they receive (Hunt, 2008). The difficulties of negotiating the asylum process can, however, be a barrier to volunteering, and the benefits of volunteering are not understood by

---

\(^4\) It used to be the case that asylum seekers could apply to the Home Office for permission to work after six months in the UK, but this right was withdrawn in 2002. Asylum seekers may now apply for permission to work if they have not received an initial decision within 12 months.
Refugees and asylum seekers (Wilson and Walker, 2006; Age Concern and Refugee Council, 2008).

For asylum seekers whose cases are refused, a lack of any state support (if they do not sign up to ‘Section 4’ support, see Section 3.2.4) means they may be compelled to seek employment in the informal market and are especially vulnerable to very low pay and other forms of exploitation (Lewis, 2007a). Women may be particularly vulnerable and risk coercion into sex work (Hunt, 2008).

3.6.2 Refugee unemployment
Refugees who receive a positive determination on their case and are granted leave to remain have permission to work and to access mainstream benefits. However, refugees experience particular barriers to finding any work, and especially in finding work that uses their qualifications, experiences and skills (Back to Work Company, 2003). Unemployment among refugees is considered to be very high, despite many of them holding qualifications and work experience (Bloch, 2002b), and despite their great desire to work. In a survey of refugees in Yorkshire and Humber, 39% were in employment, 43% were claiming job seekers’ allowance (JSA) and 9% not on JSA were actively seeking work, demonstrating a high rate of unemployment (BMG, 2004). In a national survey of 400 refugees in London and four dispersal regions (including Yorkshire and Humber) by Bloch, (2002b) only 29% were working. The Home Office refugee integration strategy states that unemployment among refugees is estimated to be six times the national average (Home Office, 2005b), far higher than for any other disadvantaged or minority ethnic group in the UK (Stevenson and Willott, 2007). This limited information suggests refugees are the most disadvantaged group in the labour market (Bloch, 2002b) (with the possible exception of gypsies and travellers). Employment is widely considered as fundamental to facilitating integration (Hunt, 2008); being out of work has broad social and health consequences for refugees.

3.6.3 Barriers to employment
Barriers to work include employer attitudes, language, lack of recognition of qualifications, health problems, lack of references and lack of UK work experience (Bloch, 2002b; Hunt, 2008). A diversity mapping exercise in Yorkshire and Humber (Williams, 2006) showed that there is limited information about asylum seekers, refugees and migrants available to employers. This may cause suspicion among employers that creates barriers to employment and prevents both refugees and employers from benefiting from using their skills. The stigma associated with the refugee label and confusion over right to work combined with a lack of provable work experience can dissuade employers from taking on refugees (BMG, 2004). Older refugees may suffer additional barriers to employment as a result of perceived age discrimination, poor health or caring responsibilities (Age Concern and Refugee Council, 2008). The deficiencies of ESOL provision are again reiterated in relation to employability as poor English skills are recognised as the biggest barrier to finding work and hamper engagement with services able to provide support and advice (BMG, 2004). A lack of understanding of refugees’ predicament and backgrounds, poor cultural awareness, language barriers and prejudice or stereotyping among staff in Job Centre Plus are identified as barriers to refugees gaining adequate support in job seeking (Dwyer, 2008). In addition, their poor understanding of benefit regulations and a lack of adequate or appropriate information means refugees may easily lose benefits and quickly fall into serious problems resulting from consequent homelessness and poverty.
3.6.4 Support into employment

For those in employment, skill underutilisation is the most prominent issue identified in literature about both refugees and other types of new migrants. Despite this, there is insufficient evidence in this region on employment and skills of refugees in their country of origin, how this relates to employment in the UK, and a lack of findings relating to women (Brown, 2007). The approach of the Job Centre to encourage people into any form of work and restrictions on the amount of training and education that can be accessed while receiving JSA undermine efforts by refugees to retrain or improve their entry position in the job market (Dwyer, 2008). There is potential for this situation to improve for those refugees who will benefit from the new Refugee Integration and Employment Service (see Section 3.8).

Again, the deficiencies of mainstream services in providing a service sensitive to the needs of refugees has precipitated the formation of several specialised voluntary sector organisations that focus on assisting refugees find appropriate employment, training and education (see Refugee Access directory, Appendix 3). Some refugees may bring professional experience from their country of origin while others have not previously been in paid employment, particularly young people who lack experience and skills. It is therefore important that employment and training initiatives aimed at refugees address both issues: enabling more skilled refugees to access appropriate employment; and providing job entry and employment training schemes for those with little work experience (BMG, 2004).

3.7 Safety

**Key issues** Although seeking protection, refugees and asylum seekers are exposed to widespread risks from threat of hate crimes to detention and risk of removal to countries where people fear persecution.

**Research gaps** Rate of crime and victims of crime; the effects of fear of detention or removal on daily life for all refugees and asylum seekers. Homelessness of released detainees.

The literature broadly agrees that in many respects the environment of asylum seekers in the UK provides little security for the safety they seek in escaping persecution. Any failing in the asylum determination system or the quality of legal support to protect those seeking sanctuary from persecution is a major failing in meeting international requirements for providing safety. Establishing safety is a pressing need for refugees, yet is often delayed due to precarious conditions already outlined such as barriers to secure employment and housing, and experiences of discrimination or hate crimes. Lack of English and lack of familiarity with UK systems exposes people to various day-to-day risks. Across the region, police forces have been engaged in sharing information to reduce crime and improve safety for refugees and asylum seekers (for example, see box, People United Against Crime-information work in South Yorkshire).
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People United Against Crime-information work in South Yorkshire

People United Against Crime (PUAC) is an organisation that works on crime reduction. The organisation was founded by South Yorkshire Police in 1996.

In 2005, with Home Office Purposeful Activities funding, they provided training in community safety to 149 asylum seekers and refugees. The training was delivered at the purpose built LifeWise ‘citizenship centre’ in Rotherham by the Fire, Police and Ambulance services and covered issues including fire safety and reporting crime. In addition, 25 people went on to receive a First Aid qualification and have been able to volunteer as first aiders in their local communities.

The project engaged 49 asylum seeker volunteers in a variety of roles including as steering group members, presenters, and interpreters. This helped to improve their communication skills, learn slang terms and reduce social isolation.

PUAC continues to work with asylum seekers, refugees and migrants in South Yorkshire in a number of ways including:

- working with drug, alcohol and sexual health organisations to deliver training
- engaging and supporting asylum seekers, refugees and migrants as volunteers in their projects
- delivering training for volunteer interpreters
- working with refugees convicted of drink driving offences on UK law
- providing information on energy saving.

As well as providing training and education to potentially prevent health and social problems arising from a lack of knowledge, these projects also improve dialogue with different minority groups and provide opportunities for mutual exchange and learning about cultural norms and differences.

For more information see www.people-united.org/asylumseekers or contact PUAC, 0114 275 8688, info@people-united.org

3.7.1 Hate crimes, racism and discrimination

Although the asylum seeker dispersal system was partly intended to reduce social tensions resulting from the high concentration of asylum seekers in the southeast, it also succeeded in dispersing social tensions, racism and xenophobia (Boswell, 2001; Robinson et al., 2003). A generalised sense of being unwelcome communicated by negative media portrayals of asylum seekers and experiences of verbal abuse in public places undermines attempts by individuals and agencies to promote mutual understanding (e.g. Glazer, 2005) and to develop a sense of shared values and harmonious neighbourhoods (Carter and El Hassan, 2003; Craig et al., 2005a; Craig et al., 2005b; Robinson and Reeve, 2006). Racist incidents are likely to be under-reported. They range from forms of indifference and discrimination or institutional racism to public abuse or serious physical attacks (Burnett, 2008d). The negative impact of overt racism and more insidious forms of discrimination on the confidence, self-esteem and quality of life of migrants are hard to over-emphasise. Lewis (2007b) notes how a young black African woman in her research confined herself to her flat for a few weeks after being verbally abused and spat at while waiting at a bus stop. Experiences of racism, discrimination, and social tensions also featured prominently in research on A8 migrants, as discussed in Section 4.7.3 below.

There is no data on the rate of crime among asylum seekers, but it is thought that it is very low and that both refugees and asylum seekers are more likely to be the victims of crime.
There is also no evidence that destitute refused asylum seekers are pushed into crime (other than working undocumented), despite the difficulties of surviving without support. On the contrary, destitute refused asylum seekers and refugee community organisation representatives interviewed in research in Leeds (Lewis, 2007a) said that destitute asylum seekers avoid contact with the police as they were anxious that detection or law breaking could lead to removal to their country of origin where they fear persecution.

3.7.2 Detention, removal facilities and police

Detention and forced removal expose asylum seekers to great risks to their safety. Enforcement includes regular reporting requirements for asylum seekers, the operation of detention facilities, and enforced removal. Throughout their asylum claim and after, asylum seekers are expected to report regularly to reporting centres. In 2006, the reporting centre for West Yorkshire, Waterside Court, received 1500 people per week subject to reporting requirements or with applications pending (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2006b). Reporting is taken as a sign of reliability and failure to do so can lead to increased attention from the state and possible detention (Burnett, 2007a), regardless of the likelihood of facilitating removal.

Although people liable to detention under immigration rules should normally be managed through immigration facilities, local police officers often become involved for various reasons. In 2003-4 the Immigration Service used police detention for 31,033 nights (Burnett, 2007a). An inspection in 2006 showed that if detainees held at the Home Office facility at Waterside Court in Leeds could not be moved to a holding facility by the end of the day (either Lindholme or Manchester Airport) they would be moved to a local police station:

‘An officer at Bridewell police station confirmed that they frequently held people for IND [the Immigration and Nationality Directorate], often for a few days at a time, including those who arrived with little risk assessment but who had special needs. Sometimes they had to divert their own resources to find an officer to sit with detainees and ensure they came to no harm. Immigration detainees are not entitled to the range of safeguards applicable to people under arrest in a police station.’(HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2006b: 24)

Lindholme, a former Royal Air Force site near Doncaster, is one of ten immigration removal centres in the UK. Unlike some purpose built centres, it is run by the Prison Service and adjacent to a prison. The centre has been criticised for insufficient separation from the ‘parent prison’ with staff wearing prison uniform and carrying wooden staves, and a lack of good accessible legal advice (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2006a). This contrasted badly with private sector Immigration Removal Centres.

The frequent practice of using dawn raids in an attempt to secure arrests is condemned as terrifying and demeaning to the people involved, often including young children. In addition, families in Leeds were part of a pilot of a ‘Section 9’ policy which unsuccessfully attempted to encourage return by enabling children to be separated from parents (Home Office, 2007). These drastic and traumatising measures promote a broad sense of fear in the daily lives of asylum seekers (Burnett, 2008a). Destitution, detention, and the fear of removal has lead some to consider, attempt or commit suicide, for example, as already mentioned in relation to the case of Manuel Bravo (see also Burnett, 2008b). As Burnett (2007a) explains: ‘the potential of being detained is a monolithic and ever present fear’. Detention is a costly measure. The average
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estimated cost of holding a person in immigration removal centres, for one week in 2005-2006 was £1,230. Detention is meant to be used as a short term measure immediately prior to arranging travel home, but in practice it can be difficult to arrange travel documents. Individuals are sometimes detained only to be later released without explanation (Lewis, 2007a: 50), often into homelessness. National studies highlight the many problems with the enforcement regime, including the detrimental impact of detention on the mental health of detainees including children (for a local example, see Lewis, 2007a).

As noted in Section 2.2.3, hundreds of thousands of refused asylum seekers remain in the UK in destitution. One reason is that it is very difficult to arrange removal to certain countries because it is not possible to arrange a safe route for return due to ongoing conflict, lack of identity papers, and many other diplomatic or political reasons. Rutter et al. (2007: 64) estimate that there are up to 110,000 ‘asylum overstayers’ from countries experiencing serious ongoing conflict such as Afghanistan, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Zimbabwe. Enforced removals cost on average £11,000 and can therefore not be seen as a viable option for dealing with a large population of refused asylum seekers (National Audit Office, 2005; Lewis, forthcoming). Voluntary return provides a considerably cheaper (around £1,100 per departure) and potentially safer outcome for those being returned, albeit within highly restricted circumstances: ‘often voluntary return is not much of a choice; it is between bad and worse’ (see Lewis, 2007a: 52). However, several studies advocate that the most practical option for dealing with this group is through some form of regularisation that would grant permission to work, bring people into the system rather than keeping them at the margins and would enable people to support themselves and participate fully in society (Adie et al., 2007; Rutter et al., 2007; Lewis, forthcoming). It can further be argued that regularisation would create a safer environment, not only for refused asylum seekers, but for wider society.

3.8 Integration

Key issues There is a regional integration strategy. Long term, integration also depends on being ‘joined up’ with other policies, support for community organisations and informal networks.

Research gaps Very little is known about refugees not engaged with statutory integration projects, the inter-relation of formal and informal processes on integration and the role of religion and the church.

Public debate and media representations of issues relating to integration often stress the idea of refugee and migrants’ responsibility to learn about UK culture, improve their English skills and conform to perceived social norms. This approach is similar to ideas of acculturation or assimilation more common in other European countries or historically (up to the 1970s) in the UK. However, the model of integration in the UK developed in recent years by the government and regional bodies has adopted the idea of mutual change and appreciation with both ‘host’ and ‘newcomer’ populations adapting to each other.
3.8.1 Integration policy

The government has published two refugee integration strategies (in 2000 and 2005) that gave regional migration bodies the task of co-ordinating regional refugee integration. Yorkshire and Humber published its first regional strategy in 2003 and a revised strategy is due out in December 2008 (see box, below). In addition, there are local strategies in Sheffield and Barnsley and others are under development elsewhere, including Rotherham (YHRMP). The government funded a ‘Sunrise’ refugee integration programme piloted in Leeds and Sheffield, among other places (Westmorland, 2006). A pilot group of asylum seekers granted leave to remain were allocated a caseworker to provide advice and support on issues of housing, education and training (Rutter et al., 2007). This has led to the development of RIES (Refugee Integration and Employment Service) a nationwide programme. Again the speed of the New Asylum Model is recognised as a challenge for agencies working on refugee integration. RIES will only apply to NAM cases, yet the relatively short time that refugees will have been in the UK makes it less likely that they will speak English, understand ‘the system’ or be job ready (Lukes et al., 2008). While dedicated work on refugee integration is essential, ultimately for long-term integration to be successful approaches need to be ‘joined up’ with policies aimed at deprivation and neighbourhood renewal (Carter and El Hassan, 2003). Asylum and refugee issues have too often been addressed through centralised policies and practice. There is scope to ensure more local management through local strategic partnerships (LSPs) and community cohesion work. It is argued that refugees often face greater difficulties in integrating than other types of international migrants (Lukes et al., 2008). There is an emerging concern that the current focus on new European migrants could make it more difficult to secure resources and attention for the smaller numbers of refugees.

The approach of the Home Office and much UK research to integration has concentrated on institutional integration-employment, housing and education. However, leisure activities and informal social interactions may be equally or more important in influencing experiences of integration, feelings of security and in facilitating settlement (Griffiths et al., 2005; Rishbeth and Finney, 2006; Lewis, 2007b; Rutter et al., 2007). Conversely, racism and discrimination create barriers to integration. The integration study by Rutter et al. (2007) with refugees who arrived in the UK over the past fifty years including some living in Sheffield provides a detailed analysis of refugee integration and how institutional forms of integration and social interaction both influence identity, ‘Britishness’ and citizenship.
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Finding Sanctuary, Enriching Yorkshire & Humber
Integration Strategy for Refugees and Asylum Seekers in Yorkshire and Humber

The vision for refugee and asylum seeker integration in the region is: Refugees and asylum seekers find sanctuary in Yorkshire & Humber, become full members of society and contribute to all aspects of life in the region.

The first Yorkshire and the Humber integration strategy was launched in 2003, based on two principles:

1) Integration is a two-way process involving both asylum seekers/refugees and local/host communities.
2) Integration begins on day one.

In 2007, a new programme funded by Yorkshire Forward began to review the regional strategy and further develop integration work. The review aims to create an evidence-based approach drawing on integration literature, and grounded in wide consultation through:

- A consultation on the role of culture in integration.
  There were 37 responses from a range of organisations and individuals across the region.
- Three focus groups with refugees (Dwyer, 2008).
- 2,600 questionnaires were circulated through 40 organisations across the region in August and September 2008. There were 301 responses received from refugees and asylum seekers.

The new strategy will be available from December 2008. The strategy is being updated by the Yorkshire & Humber Regional Migration Partnership (YHRMP), which is the new name for the Yorkshire and Humberside Consortium for Asylum Seekers and Refugees. See Appendix 4, Structures for migration work.

For more information contact David Brown, Refugee Integration Manager, 0113 214 3946, david.2.brown@leeds.gov.uk

3.8.2 Processes of integration

Integration is not a one-off decision to conform or not to a ‘host’ society but involves different places and spaces of interaction where migrants may adopt certain identities (Lewis, 2007b). It may be appropriate to claim a British identity only at particular times and places to particular audiences (Valentine and Sporton, 2008). It is also noted that the same spaces or places may be conceived as ‘typically British’ in the UK, while being seen as ‘home-like’ to immigrants. Rishbeth and Finney (2006), in their study of the potential for visits to greenspaces to facilitate positive experiences of life in the UK, note how experiences of landscape and plants provide moments of familiarity and normality. The multiple benefits for refugees of visiting greenspaces prompt them to advocate that refugee projects make greater use of this free, overlooked resource (see also Rishbeth, 2006).

3.8.3 Refugee community organisations

Since 2000, refugee community organisations (RCOs) have developed in the main cities and towns of dispersal. RCOs are community organisations typically formed around single national, language or ethnic groups. In Sheffield and Leeds there are forums of RCOs that aim to provide a collective voice and be a strategic body for refugees and asylum seekers. Recent research into the development needs of RCOs in Leeds, Bradford and South Yorkshire revealed that RCOs provide services to over 1000 clients each month. Despite this significant contribution, only three of 73 RCOs were found to have a paid member of staff, the rest being entirely dependent on volunteers (Choksi et al., 2008). A national report counted 52 ‘established’ RCOs in Yorkshire and Humber, two with a full-time staff member, who serve 4,961 beneficiaries (Refugee Council and Refugee
Refugees supporting RCOs often have full time work limiting their availability and capacity (The Social Business Company, 2006).

RCOs balance attention to their home countries, including the organisation of cultural events and language classes, with support for their members with the issues they face in the UK (Lewis, 2007b). However, the difficulties created by inadequate legal representation and the destitution of refused asylum seekers are overwhelming for many organisations, and can eclipse other education and integration-focused activities (Griffiths et al., 2005; Lewis, 2007b; Choksi et al., 2008). Cultural events, music nights and parties provide a valuable safe environment for refugees to engage in familiar dress, language and dancing that can create a vital opportunity to socialise and build relationships following displacement (Lewis, 2007b), RCOs provide an important role in supporting and representing refugees despite the severe limitations caused by lack of office space, lack of equipment and the lack of training and support with governance and development (Carter and El Hassan, 2003; Dwyer, 2005a; Choksi et al., 2008). Some RCOs lack understandings of decision making structures and how they might be influenced (The Social Business Company, 2006). The significant role of RCOs, the challenges they face in doing so, and the importance for agencies and decision-making bodies to engage with RCOs are reinforced in several studies (Carter and El Hassan, 2003; Katalushi, 2007; Refugee Council and Refugee Action, 2007; Lukes et al., 2008).

Informal networks can be a vital source of information and support (MacKenzie and Forde, 2008), and may be more significant in facilitating integration and settlement for a larger number of refugees and asylum seekers than formal refugee community organisations with limited resources are able to reach (Griffiths et al., 2005). Furthermore, informal, grass roots networks may ‘be able more effectively to mobilise the needs of new arrivals collectively, as they are unconstrained by the necessarily narrower agendas and objectives of formal, often government-funded support groups’ (MacKenzie and Forde, 2008: 14).

### 3.8.4 Religion, worship and faith

Maintaining faith and religious worship can be particularly important for refugees in adjusting to life in a new country while dealing with profound insecurities and transitions (e.g. Bekalo, 2008). Churches and other places of worship may be the first place where newly arrived asylum seekers, refugees and migrants have the chance to engage with established residents. Churches, faith organisations and religious leaders in Yorkshire and Humber have contributed considerably to providing welfare, moral leadership and promoting the positive contributions of refugees; the establishment of numerous support organisations and strategies; and by lobbying at local, regional and national levels (see also Section 4.8.3). This contribution and the significance of religion in helping refugees and asylum seekers survive in adverse circumstances and establish new lives represent a significant research gap. The Churches Regional Commission for Yorkshire and Humber has produced a briefing paper, ‘Welcoming transient communities’ with basic facts, and a second one on migrant workers, to provide information to church and faith practitioners (The Churches Regional Commission for Yorkshire and the Humber, 2005; 2007). The particular contribution of church collections and faith-based projects in supporting and advocating for destitute refused clients is notable (Lewis, 2007a), and the Bishop for Ripon and Leeds, Right Reverend John Packer has drawn attention in the House of Lords to asylum seeker destitution.
4. New migrants

This section will look at literature on new migrants concentrating on A8 EU member states as most research focuses on this group. After a review of types of new migrants the literature is presented under the key themes of employment, health, housing, children and young people, adult education, safety, and integration.

Key issues
- A8 migrants live throughout the region, including areas less familiar with the experience of international migration creating challenges for schools, councils and other service providers.
- Many migrants live in poor quality, overcrowded housing causing risks to health and fire safety.
- New migrants fill labour gaps, but are vulnerable to exploitation in the workplace.
- Long working hours limit chances for migrant workers to learn English and meet local people, lack of English is a major barrier to integration and improvement in working conditions.
- A8 migrants are not eligible for benefits in the first 12 months, yet misconceptions about their preferential treatment could lead to neighbourhood tensions if not addressed.

Key research gaps
- Understandings of the needs, experiences and location of non-Polish A8/A2, non EU, international student, spouse, child, young people and older migrants.
- Longitudinal research that can capture migrants’ decisions and movements beyond the first six or twelve months, including influences on longer term settlement and family joining.
- Identifying and matching migrants’ skills and regional skill gaps; challenges for employers; and remittances sent home by migrants.
- Experiences of ‘local’ people in receiving neighbourhoods and the forms, extent and influences on discrimination and racist incidents.

Five key regional studies
- Breakdown of national data and findings from consultations and focus groups with employers, job brokers and A8 migrants on barriers to accessing the labour market and formal and informal support networks.

- Analysis of the arrival experiences, settlement and housing options and choices based on interviews with 39 migrants in four groups (Liberian Gateway refugees, Somali refugees, Polish migrant workers and Pakistani spouses) who arrived in the last five years.

Adamson et al. (2008) Migrant workers in the Humber sub-region. Available from g.craig@hull.ac.uk
- Findings from analysis of WRS and NINo data and 67 interviews with service providers on key migrant worker issues including housing, employment, education, interpretation, health, advice, community cohesion, tensions, migrant representation and data.
- Findings from interviews and focus groups with 89 participants (new A8 migrants, established communities and service providers) on work, community relations, and welfare including health, education, social security and English language provision.

North Yorkshire Strategic Partnership (2008) *A strategic review: Impact of inward migration from the EU accession states in North Yorkshire.* Available at www.nysp.org.uk
- A consultation document from a working group including public, voluntary, employer and migrant worker representatives that presents a breakdown of national data, issues faced by migrants, and proposals for developing strategic work.

### 4.1 Background

In this review we define new migrants as any international migrant who arrived in the region in the last ten years (since 1999). Refugees and asylum seekers are also new migrants, but their experiences of forced migration and the separate support systems make it helpful to consider them separately, see Section 3 above. This section reviews literature on other types of international migrants.

The term ‘new migrant’ has become widely used as a short hand for referring to arrivals from the A8 and A2 EU accession states. But the term is broader, encompassing people in other immigration categories including:
- family joiners (spouses, older relatives or children who come to join family in the UK)
- work permit holders
- international students
- other types of EU and non-EU migrants (such as au pairs, ministers of religion) (See definitions, Section 1.4 and Appendix 1, Glossary).

Most of the literature deals with the large numbers of migrants who have entered the UK since EU enlargement in 2004, especially Polish migrant workers who make up by far the largest group. Migrants who are not asylum seekers, refugees or A8 migrant workers are almost entirely invisible in the literature. Students, families and work permit holders are now briefly discussed, before turning to the literature on migrant workers in Yorkshire and Humber.

#### 4.1.1 Students

**Key issues** International students may form around a third of international migrants in Yorkshire and Humber, contribute to the local economy and are entitled to stay to work for two years.

**Research gaps** It is not known whether students stay to work in which high-skill areas, if their qualifications could fill skill gaps or if businesses could encourage students to stay in the region.

The financial benefit to the region of over 27,000 international students (see Section 2.2.5) is likely to be significant. It has been calculated that international students contribute about £12,400 to the GDP per year for each EU student and about £5,500 per year for each non-EU student, mostly spent on housing and food (Vickers and Bekhradnia, 2007).
It is therefore likely that much of this fiscal benefit—potentially around £200m—supports the local economy. International students of course bring non-financial benefits that include creating a multicultural learning environment for all students, and ‘goodwill’ derived from having graduates of UK universities in leadership positions in overseas countries (Vickers and Bekhradnia, 2007). It may further be suggested that there are specific regional benefits to hosting international students as they may go on to have continuing loyalty and awareness of the place where they studied.

Furthermore, students are entitled to stay for two years to work following completion of their studies and may be making a particular contribution in highly skilled sectors of employment in the region. Available figures for regional migration suggest that students may have formed up to a third of adult international migrants in the region in 2007. Students are therefore a key group of migrants who are highly educated with a British qualification and entitled to remain to work for two years, yet no data or research was found to suggest whether students stay to work in Yorkshire and Humber.

### 4.1.2 Family

**Key issues** Families with children under 18 have a greater need for services than single adults; families and children also help migrants feel secure, integrate and contribute to the diversity of the region.

**Research gaps** There are no regional statistics on family joiners or dependants. Little is known about how families, women, children or older relatives influence decisions about migration and settlement. There is a need to look at the situation of women on spouse visas fleeing domestic violence with no recourse to public funds.

Statistics on dependants or family joiners are not available at a regional level (see Section 2.2.6) so it is not known how many migrants are here with children or other family members, making it difficult to plan services adequately. Free movement within the EU allows for what is sometimes known as ‘yo-yo’ or repeat migration—where migrants move between the source and destination countries spending periods in each. This enables migrants to earn in a destination country and spend time at ‘home’ to maintain relationships with family and friends. This type of movement is generally not possible, or is much more difficult, for non-EU migrants subject to tighter immigration restrictions.

Families with children inevitably affect public services—children attend school, women may use maternity services and families are eligible for working family tax credit and other benefits. As will be discussed below, the impact of EU accession migration on public services is widely thought to be minimal, partly due to the predominance of single males. An increasing trend towards family groups and children joining ‘lead male’ migrants is noted by some (Kofman et al., 2007; Cook et al., 2008: 11) and this will change their needs. That said, children might be differentiated from spouses that barely feature in the literature. This is perhaps because spouses do not often access services as they join family which houses them and provides support (Robinson and Siddiqah, 2007). This security can rapidly disappear in the event of relationship breakdown. Women escaping domestic violence are particularly vulnerable.

---

5 This is calculated from available figures on international migrants in 2007: 45,680 adult foreign nationals registered for work in Yorkshire and Humber (DWP), 7,095 asylum seekers were accommodated in the region (Home Office), and 27,210 international students were registered in Yorkshire Universities (HESA). This does not include family joiners, irregular migrants or dependants.
violence face very difficult circumstances if they are on a temporary spouse visa with no recourse to public funds and find themselves isolated from family networks (Robinson et al., 2007).

In considering the impact of families and children on services it should be remembered that families are crucial in enabling migrants to function fully. The loss resulting from separation from family members creates anxiety and negatively affects wellbeing (Sales, 2007). Children are facilitators of integration and contribute diverse religious and cultural knowledge to their school’s learning environment (see Section 3.4.1).

### 4.1.3 Work permit holders and point-based migrants

**Key issues** Demand for labour has driven ‘managed migration’ in the interests of the UK economy; a debate dominated by economic value routinely fails to address social issues.

**Research gaps** Migrant workers include large numbers from ‘old’ EU countries, India and Pakistan: what are their experiences of living and working in the region? How do they compare to the experiences of A8 migrants or existing co-national groups? Are they less noticeable simply because of more established migration patterns?

Skills gaps have been filled through issuing visas under the Highly Skilled Migrant Programme, to au pairs and to Seasonal Agricultural Workers (for a clear description of the many categories of migrant workers see Citizens Advice, 2005). No regional data is available, published immigration statistics are national. In 2008, a new points system for non-EU migrants is being phased in. The new scheme is intended to simplify visa applications and to make it easier for the government to quickly change quotas according to perceived needs. This system is likely to close down entry for low skilled labour from outside the EU and alter the numbers and professions of highly skilled workers accepted (Home Office, 2005a).

There is a demand in the UK for cheap, mobile, flexible and exploitable labour. The number of work permits issued to foreign born workers rose from 40,000 a year in the mid 1990s to over 200,000 a year in 2004. This has encouraged a deliberate programme of ‘managed migration’ aimed at simultaneously restricting levels of asylum and immigration while actively encouraging the flow of temporary migration in the interests of the UK economy by expanding the existing temporary worker schemes and adding new programmes (Flynn, 2005). Despite the rhetoric of exclusion, control and migration management, the pro-globalisation stance of all three major political parties means there is an instinctive favouring of the free movement of labour (Jordan and Brown, 2006). The issue of migrant workers at times seems dominated by discussion of their economic value; their lives outside the workplace (Spencer et al., 2007) and wider social issues are infrequently considered. While some studies promote the economic contribution of migrants, others argue that by working and consuming, migrants help the economy to expand thereby reducing the net benefit of migrant-derived income to the economy (V. Williams, 2008).

Xenophobic media portrayals shape migration policy. Somerville (2007: 136) suggests that the hasty implementation of the Workers Registration Scheme despite opposition from employers, questionable legality (in the context of reciprocal European social security agreements) and major gaps in the scheme (the self employed do not need to register) can only be explained as a knee-jerk reaction to tabloid pressure.
4.1.4 EU accession migrants

**Key issues** The recent rise in international migration to the region resulted from the accession of new countries to the EU in 2004, yet numbers are already dropping and could lead to labour shortages.

**Research gaps** There is little information on non-Polish A8 migrants, Roma, A2 migration (the experiences of Romanians and Bulgarians, and the effect of greater restrictions and SAWS on their experiences) and an absence of migrant-focused and gendered perspectives.

The UK, Ireland and Sweden were the only three existing European member states to allow relatively unrestricted migration from the A8 states at the time of accession. In April 2008, the IPPR estimated the current population of A8 and A2 nationals resident in the UK to be 665,000 (IPPR, 2008). This represents an increase of around 550,000 EU accession nationals since early 2004. Since 2007, the numbers of new migrants coming from Poland and other accession countries has decreased.

It is argued that several factors make it likely that migration from accession states will further reduce, while many of those already here will return:

- improvement in economic conditions in the new member states;
- as other EU member states loosen their restrictions on A8 and A2 workers, migrants will be diverted to other destinations (such as Holland, Cook et al, 2008: 11 or Italy, NYSP, 2008);
- declining birth rates in the mid 1980s in sending countries make it likely that the pool of likely migrants is getting smaller;
- devaluation of the pound sterling relative to the Polish zloty. (IPPR, 2008)

Recent EU accession migration since 2004 has been of a scale and speed not seen before in the UK, yet much of the flows are temporary (Experian, 2007). It is estimated that a total of around 1 million A8 migrant workers have arrived in the UK since 2004, but that around half have already left the UK (IPPR, 2008). It is not known to what extent a downturn in numbers is connected to saturation of the job market. Migration trends are likely to be affected if a continuing economic downturn leads to unemployment rising more slowly or quickly in the UK relative to other EU countries, leaving businesses at risk from a reversal of inward migration (Commission for Rural Communities, 2008). The opening up of the rest of the EU in 2011 will increase competition for labour, especially given the proximity of Germany to the A8 states (Kofman et al., 2007).

The majority of A8 migrants are young single males between the ages of 18-35 who arrive without dependants (Boden and Stillwell, 2006; Experian, 2007; Adamson et al., 2008; Cook et al., 2008). Polish nationals are now the largest foreign national group resident in the UK, up from 13th largest in early 2004 (IPPR, 2008) and are now likely to outnumber other established minority groups in some places; Polish NINo registrations in Leeds are higher than Bangladeshi and Chinese population figures from the 2001 census (Leeds City Council, 2007). A8 migration is distinct from patterns of previous international

---

6 There were 63,000 approved applications to the Workers Registration Scheme (WRS) in the UK in quarter 3, 2006 compared to 35,000 in quarter 3, 2008 (Home Office, 2008a).
migration. Migrants are more broadly distributed across the UK and the highest concentrations are spread between major centres, not just centred in London (National Statistics, 2007). Yorkshire and Humber is an attractive destination for A8 migrants\(^7\). This is due to the region having employment opportunities in a range of urban and rural industries, including seasonal employment that is in demand with migrants. Migrants may also come to the region because it is preferable to living in a big city such as London, or because they have friends or family already here (Experian, 2007).

At the time of the 2004 accession, there was a badly performing labour market in Poland, with low wages in comparison to existing EU member states (Drinkwater et al., 2006; MCC Consulting, 2008) and high unemployment (Bradford Central and Eastern European Working Group, 2006). Drinkwater et al. (2006) also suggest that a long history of migration from Poland to the UK facilitated the mechanisms for a migration network. Migrants from A8 countries who were ‘illegal’ at the time of accession became regularised (Spencer et al., 2007) and may well have facilitated the exchange of information and settlement process for new arrivals. However, migrants arriving at different times for various reasons may not form social networks simply because they come from the same country.

A report from the Central and Eastern European Working Group (2006) in Bradford confirms that the older settled and new ‘communities’ are not necessarily working together, apart from a Polish community centre being called on in crises to provide emergency accommodation. They state that there is a willingness to support new migrants, especially if provided with resources to form a relevant support network to cope with ‘unrealistic demands’ placed on ‘established communities’ and to respond to new migrants’ expectations of support.

### 4.1.5 Roma people

**Key issues** Roma people are likely not to have had the same opportunities of access to education, health and other services as people from the same countries of origin.

**Research gaps** Roma people are difficult to quantify yet their specific needs mean service providers require specialised guidance.

The population of EU accession migrants includes Roma people from Slovakia, Czech Republic, Romania, and Hungary who have a distinct culture and language and different needs from other migrants from the same countries. There have been various waves of Roma migration to the UK, linked to moments of repression or civil unrest. Roma from A8 countries previously supported as asylum seekers (see Chart 2, Section 2.2) became regularised and legally resident in the UK in 2004, but Grayson and Horton (2007) note some confusion among some local authorities and voluntary agencies about their legal status. Slovaks that registered for work in Sheffield, Rotherham and Barnsley are Roma who have arrived in a ‘classic chain migration’ since 2004 (Grayson and Horton, 2007: 6).

In Bradford it is noted that Czech and Polish Roma may be more likely to be part of family groups than non-Roma migrants (Bradford Central and Eastern European Working Group, 2006). Exact figures are impossible to calculate as Roma are classified by nationality in the statistics and may be nervous of identifying their ethnicity as they fear persecution and discrimination (Grayson and Horton, 2007). Roma people have suffered serious and protracted discrimination in their countries of origin, often denied basic rights enjoyed by

---

\(^7\) The whole North East region, including Yorkshire and Humber, received 10% of WRS workers 2004 - 2008 in fourth position in numbers of registrations after Anglia, Midlands and London (Home Office 2008).
other citizens of safe and secure living, education, decent employment and health. In the Czech Republic, Roma life expectancy is 12 years less than that of the general population (Mahoney, 2006). Consequent problems of poor health and illiteracy present challenges to services. Lack of education and employment experience means that Roma may be more likely to be employed in low paid, insecure work.

4.2 Housing

**Key issues** Concerns that migrants often live in crowded, unsafe, poor standard housing the effects of high take up of housing in the private rented sector and the future consequences of migration in planning future housing needs.

**Research gaps** Migrants are seen both to have improved deprived areas and to have created pressure in the private rented sector. Detailed studies are required to reveal localised effects to avoid generalised policy responses. Evidence of extent of overcrowding and the capacity for local authorities to use statutory powers to address breaches in housing regulations.

The recent arrival of numbers of migrant workers in the region has been characterised as a ‘private sector’ phenomenon: they come to work and are mostly living in private rented accommodation (GOYH, 2006). Settlement patterns of migrant workers within the region are therefore linked to employment opportunities, cheap, available private rental property and transport links (Matthews, 2006a; Yorkshire Rural Community Council, 2008). The need for cheap rental accommodation among new migrant workers creates concentrations largely similar to asylum seeker dispersal housing (see Map 1 and Map 2, Section 2). Most migration has been to multicultural sites in West Yorkshire, contrasting with migration to towns and rural areas in North Yorkshire that are experiencing unprecedented settlement of international migrants as a result of EU accession migration (NYSP, 2008).

In analysis, a useful distinction can be made between new migrants who may follow family, friends or other group members to similar clusters of settlement and ‘spatial pioneers’ who represent the early stages of a new immigration stream (Robinson and Reeve, 2006: 7). Migration to Leeds, Bradford and Sheffield is often largely to areas where there are established minority groups, yet some new migrants, including EU accession migrants, are living in less diverse neighbourhoods within cities or in rural areas. Small numbers in areas unfamiliar with international migrants can have a significant impact. In rural areas, the rate of migrants per hundred of the population can provide a clearer indication of their effects in an area than total numbers (Craig, 2006; Experian, 2007; Adamson and Craig, 2008). Discrepancies between WRS (place of employment) and NINo (residence) data indicate that some migrant workers live in one area and work in another (Matthews, 2006a). Migrant workers do not fit neatly into administrative boundaries (GOYH, 2006). Up to 60% of recent migrant workers in the Humber sub-region live in Hull, yet many work elsewhere in the region (Craig, 2007b). A8 migrants living in East Riding may work in Hull, Doncaster, York and Leeds, while there are also significant numbers who live in Hull but work in the East Riding (Matthews, 2006b).

4.2.1 Access to social housing

A8 migrants are not eligible for social housing in the first 12 months and even after that period few have sufficient housing needs to qualify (Cook et al., 2008), resulting in take up that could be as low as 1% (Roney, 2008). Nevertheless, research in Leeds with white, West Indian and Pakistani focus groups revealed that some people believe new migrants
get precedence in allocations of council accommodation, demonstrating a widespread lack of knowledge about the rules that govern A8 migrants’ access to welfare provision (Cook et al., 2008: 34). In research with Pakistani new migrants, Robinson et al. (2007) also found that awareness of social housing was low, and even in cases where people apparently met eligibility criteria they remained convinced they had no right to access. Because of poor standards and relatively high rents in the private rented sector, EU accession migrants may aspire to move into the social housing sector (once eligible after 12 months of registered employment) (Leeds City Council, 2007), which could further increase pressure on social housing over time. However, making lettings with registered social landlords available to migrants may help to drive new settlement patterns, with the potential of reducing a cycle of deprivation in inner urban areas characterised by poor quality housing (ECOTEC, 2007).

4.2.2 Private rented sector

The lack of any institutional support leaves new Polish migrants reliant on word of mouth and social networks to find accommodation, which may encourage some residential clustering (Gryszel-Fieldsned and Reeve, 2007). Polish migrants may hear about forthcoming vacancies from friends, lubricating a constant churning as people move in and out of shared accommodation (Robinson et al., 2007). Research in Sheffield found that, in comparison to other types of migrants such as asylum seekers or spouses, Polish migrants were able to exercise most choice over accommodation but are exposed to poor housing conditions (Robinson et al., 2007). Information passed through social networks may assist new arrivals in avoiding the worst housing, but the mobility of the population and lack of initial eligibility for social housing forces people into low standard private rented sector housing (Yorkshire Rural Community Council, 2008). EU accession migrants may be unaware of their rights as tenants, are not always provided with tenancy agreements and are sometimes charged unreasonably high bonds, or unfairly blamed for damage or presented with costs for repairs and upkeep (MRUK, 2005b; Gryszel-Fieldsned and Reeve, 2007). Research with Roma families in Leeds found that they may be reluctant to enforce housing rights for fear of eviction (Mahoney, 2006). However, the advantages of informal housing arrangements must be noted as new migrants benefit from being able to enter housing quickly without the barriers of requirements for character references or proof of identity in the form of bank details or utility bills (Robinson et al., 2007). Nevertheless, low pay and insecure employment creates precarious housing situations for EU accession migrants as losing employment can lead to homelessness, especially in the first twelve months, or if they did not register with the WRS (and are not accumulating the right of access to benefits) (Gryszel-Fieldsned and Reeve, 2007).

Several sources report a perceived increase in rent levels in the private rented sector considered to be driven by A8 migrants, (ECOTEC, 2007; Cook et al., 2008), but it is also argued that there has not been the level of expected rise in private rents (House of Lords Select Committee on Economic Affairs, 2008) as migrants put up with substandard housing in multiple occupancy in order keep accommodation costs low and maximise remittances (ECOTEC, 2007; Institute for Community Cohesion, 2007a; Adamson et al., 2008). It is also observed that some private landlords do not want to house migrants (Kofman et al., 2007). Research in Doncaster found contradictory responses that new arrivals could worsen problems in deprived areas but have also led to a perceived increase in property prices and improvements through use of empty properties (Kofman et al., 2007). In this respect, EU accession migrants may be filling housing voids by taking up housing rejected by others (MRUK, 2005b; Institute for Community Cohesion, 2007a; Robinson et al., 2007: 29). This contrasts with migrants from other countries joining family
already in the UK, such as Pakistanis who enter already occupied residences in ‘vibrant localities’, but which may be increasingly overcrowded (Robinson et al., 2007). If migrants begin to be joined by their families, or to consider their stay as longer term they are more likely to reject ‘transient’ accommodation and look for more permanent, better quality dwellings (Edge Analytics, 2007; Robinson et al., 2007; Adamson et al., 2008). The nature of future migration, whether it is short term or long term and whether migrants will be more likely to come with dependants, has implications for calculating future housing provision (Edge Analytics, 2007). Estimates of population growth are not straightforward as migration is unpredictable and variable so estimates based on current migration levels continuing may be inaccurate, especially given that migration from new EU states is dropping off.

4.2.3 Houses of multiple occupancy (HMOs) and poor housing standards

Many migrants are living in overcrowded properties in a poor state of repair, sometimes with a high fire risk (Institute for Community Cohesion, 2007a: 49). Adamson et al. (2008) found that across the Humber sub-region migrant workers are living in the worst forms of private rented accommodation, creating concerns for personal and domestic hygiene, fire safety, and overcrowded living conditions; a picture replicated in research in Sheffield (Robinson et al., 2007) and West Yorkshire (ECOTEC, 2007). A Goole housing officer noted ‘400-500 HMOs which are all overcrowded, all lack means of escape and decent fire precautions, all of them have got one toilet when there should be two or three, inadequate kitchen facilities’ (Adamson et al., 2008: 48).

Students on the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme (SAWS) being housed by farmers in caravans may also be vulnerable. While some sites are well-maintained, not all are licensed and some workers may be living in overcrowded caravans (Adamson et al., 2008). As they live and work onsite they are isolated from possible sources of support. Adamson et al. (2008) also note reports of deliberate exploitation where a company is said to be signing Polish workers up to contracts in English that they don’t understand that tie them into overpriced, substandard accommodation for six to twelve months (see also Institute for Community Cohesion, 2007a: 49). Poor standard tied accommodation is more prevalent in rural, agricultural sectors where it is difficult for migrant workers to access accommodation independently (Citizens Advice, 2005; Roney, 2008). Tied accommodation is also associated with hot bedding—where different people are expected to sleep in the same bed on a shift basis (The Churches Regional Commission for Yorkshire and the Humber, 2007; Adamson et al., 2008). The tying of accommodation to employment helps to perpetuate poor standards, as employees dare not complain for fear of losing their employment.

A survey by the Local Authorities Coordinators of Regulatory Services found that migrant worker housing issues in the private sector were a concern to almost all councils in the Yorkshire and Humber region (LACORS, 2007). Local authorities and the fire service can use their statutory powers to address breaches in housing regulations, but the exercising of these powers is hampered by non-registered landlords, distrust and fear of authorities among migrants, and limited resources for local authorities to be pro-active in addressing these problems (Adamson et al., 2008). Furthermore, there are no statutory minimum standard for houses not covered under HMO regulations (Yorkshire Rural Community Council, 2008).
4.3 Health

Key issues  Uptake of health services among EU accession migrants is low due to not understanding the health system, potentially low need, migrants returning to their home countries for treatment and low GP registration.

Research gap  A migrant health mapping exercise for Yorkshire and Humber is required to promote and guide the provision of services to migrant groups and to differentiate their needs.

There is little systematic information about the impact of new migration on the health system (Gamsu, 2008), but health matters arise in some qualitative studies. Overall, the impression is that EU accession migrants have had little impact on health services, due to the majority being young males who are fit to work. However, this impact has been varied across the region and for different parts of the health service, making generalisations difficult.

A8 migrants may return to their country of origin for treatment, and may not have a good understanding of how the health system in the UK operates, reducing take up. This lack of understanding can lead to inappropriate use of accident and emergency facilities, as some migrants do not understand that General Practitioners (GPs) are the main providers of primary care in the UK (Adamson et al., 2008; Cook et al., 2008). Research in Barnsley showed that migrant workers were much less likely than asylum seekers (who are usually registered as part of an induction) to have registered with a doctor (MacKenzie and Forde, 2008). Those with families may be more likely to register, providing a potential source of information on family settlement (Kofman et al., 2007).

Cook et al. report a perceived effect for maternity services in Leeds, owing to a lack of understanding of antenatal systems that results in women ‘just turn[ing] up’ to have a baby without having been properly screened. (Cook et al., 2008: 36). Overcrowded housing is linked to poor health outcomes resulting from damp, mould and the spread of infectious diseases (Mahoney, 2006). Longer term, general health problems could arise due to a high prevalence of smoking among men and lack of activity due to long working hours and lack of awareness of leisure opportunities (NYSP, 2008).

A mapping of the health needs of asylum seekers, EU accession migrants and international students undertaken in the North East (Rodger, 2008) found that PCTs had little information about EU migrant workers, while specialist teams had been developed to respond to asylum seeker health issues. Rodger (2008) suggests that a migrant health group could undertake collective work on issues such as producing translated materials, increasing GP registration by migrant workers and providing guidance on entitlement. The needs of asylum seekers or refugees, EU and other non-EU migrants should be differentiated as they present different challenges for health services (Gamsu, 2008).
4.4 Children and young people

Key issues A8 migration has increased pupil numbers in some places, especially in Catholic schools and created challenges for schools unfamiliar with supporting pupils learning English.

Research gaps A predicted increase in family joiners demands more detailed studies on the differentiated experiences of both pupils and schools in rural and urban contexts and on family relationships, childcare needs, child protection issues, child service provision and child/young people-focused perspectives of migration.

4.4.1 Education and schools

The main pressure on schools identified in the literature is the effect of ‘churn’ created by mid-term arrivals leading to problems with achieving numeracy and literacy and difficulties for local children’s services in investigating and monitoring transient families (Institute for Community Cohesion, 2007a; Local Government Association, 2008). In some areas the arrival of A8 migrants has significantly increased the numbers of pupils applying for places in Catholic secondary schools, for example in Leeds (Cook et al., 2008: 37) and in Hull where a Catholic school reports Polish children making up almost a third of the pupils (Adamson et al., 2008). Other schools are experiencing increasing diversity—one primary school in Hull has 28 nationalities among 200 children (Adamson et al., 2008) in a city until fairly recently considered almost monocultural (Dawson, 2001; Matthews, 2006c). Research in Leeds by Cook et al. notes limited capacity as a problem in placing increased numbers of migrant children (2008), yet conversely, in East Riding a general trend of pupil numbers falling made it easier to absorb new arrivals (Adamson et al., 2008).

As in all areas of planning for migration, schools suffer from a lack of preparation as they cannot know how many new children will arrive. Because children might arrive throughout the year, schools can miss out on funding if their monitoring returns are based on a January census of children. This lack of funding hampers language support, for example. The broad geographical spread of migrants across the region, especially in rural areas, means that some teachers have not previously had experience of teaching children who speak English as an additional language (Adamson et al., 2008). The rapidly rising demand from A8 children creates difficulties, as some schools were ill-prepared for taking significant numbers of children not speaking English at the same time. In some cases parents side-step the placement system by sending their children to schools that they learn about ‘through word of mouth’ (Adamson et al., 2008). Elsewhere, experience of working with recently arrived children of international migrants has developed specialised services and pockets of expertise (see box below, International New Arrivals in Leeds).

Despite the pressures, it must be noted that a research project in the south of England has shown that diversity in primary schools promotes harmony, and that both immigrant children and majority children tended to have higher self esteem and fewer problems with peer relationships, such as bullying, in schools with a higher proportion of ethnic minority children (Brown et al., 2008). In North Yorkshire where experiences of migration are new, schools have reported that migrant children have improved standards of performance and attitudes to learning (NYSP, 2008).
Education Leeds - International New Arrivals

Education Leeds Ethnic Minorities Achievement Team has developed an innovative programme to support international new arrivals. More than 130 languages are spoken by children in Leeds schools. Over 1300 children of asylum-seeking and refugee families attended Leeds schools between 2002 and 2007. The arrival of children from EU accession countries has increased the numbers of schools with international new arrivals.

With an increasing proportion of students from black and minority ethnic backgrounds, despite falling pupil numbers overall, taking an active approach to managing diversity has become a priority. The International New Arrivals Strategy supports schools by:

- Promoting statutory requirements for inclusion and equal opportunities under the Race Relations (Amendments) Act 2000 and Duty to Promote Community Cohesion 2007.
- An early response to calls for support. Schools can download materials and resources, including translated materials from an intranet collaboration zone.
- An extensive professional development programme for all levels of school staff to increase the capacity of every school.
- Working with senior leadership teams to set up appropriate systems of induction, assessment and teaching and learning programmes.
- A small peripatetic language support team working with schools on initial assessment and personalised learning programmes for students.
- Providing ESOL classes in schools for parents, and engaging families through welcome packs, DVDs and induction interviews.
- Setting up a centres of good practice in schools where visiting staff could view the latest resources and talk to experienced staff.
- Networks of staff across the city to meet together to discuss issues and share good practice.

Education Leeds plan to continue work on sharing good practice with other authorities. They are also working to develop an accreditation programme for year 10/11 pupils to ensure they can access further education.

For more information see www.emaonline.org.uk or contact Pauline Rosenthall, Education Leeds, 0113 2144291

4.4.2 Understanding children and families

There is little data in the literature on children and young people’s needs beyond their position as pupils in schools. However, a ‘Polish case study’ by Leeds City Council (2007) interestingly notes a reliance on older family members, who may be brought to the UK for this purpose, to care for children due to the high cost of childcare and limited access to benefits. Given the tendency, already noted, that over time more families are coming to join single male migrants from EU accession countries, the needs of children and young people are likely to become an important area requiring the development of appropriate services. The absence of child and young people’s perspectives in research on ‘new’ migrants, especially those from EU accession countries, deserves attention.
4.5 Adult education

**Key issues** Cost of classes and a shortage of classes, especially at appropriate times, create barriers to access English language provision and other training.

**Research gaps** The long term consequences of cuts in ESOL funding for integration, wellbeing and use of potentially needed migrant skills.

A lack of availability and access to English classes is universally seen in the literature as problematic, despite the strong emphasis placed on the importance of learning English by the government, migrants themselves, service providers and other commentators. At the same time that governmental approaches to citizenship and settlement began prominently to emphasise an expectation and requirement for migrants to speak English, central funding for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) provision was severely reduced in August 2007. Consequently, new migrants from EU accession countries must now pay for classes, which is prohibitive for those on low incomes and has resulted in a reduction in take-up of ESOL classes (Experian, 2007; Adamson et al., 2008).

A shortage of classes, especially at appropriate times, or lack of understanding of adult education and training arrangements also inhibit access to education (Matthews, 2006a). Seasonal and unpredictable migration patterns give rise to peaks in demand which can be difficult to meet (NYSP, 2008). Because many migrants work in jobs that require little or limited English, and social time may be spent primarily with other non-English speaking migrants, opportunities to develop English are limited, creating a practical barrier to interaction between new migrants and existing communities (Institute for Community Cohesion, 2007b). Lack of technical English courses is a major barrier to higher skilled employment (NYSP, 2008). Conversely, when the new member states joined the EU, some migrants from those countries suddenly found Higher Education more accessible as they became eligible for reduced fees paid by EU citizens (in comparison to high fees for non-EU students) (Spencer et al., 2007: 55-56).

The withdrawal of funding was partly to encourage employers to make a greater contribution in providing English classes (Institute for Community Cohesion, 2007b), but this has not always been honoured (NYSP, 2008) and companies may be reluctant to provide support that could lead to employees leaving to get better work elsewhere (Cook et al., 2008). Language is identified by employers as the main barrier to making full use of skills of the migrant workers they employ (Matthews, 2006a), yet few employers try to make better use of skills through training or development, perhaps due to a view that migrant workers are a temporary or transient workforce.
4.6 Employment

Key issues Migrant workers meet labour shortages but are vulnerable to poor conditions and exploitation.

Research gaps Identification of migrants’ skills in relation to regional shortages and mechanisms to secure appropriate employment. The experiences of workers in rural areas, and in agricultural, leisure, social care and hospitality sectors. Remittances sent home by workers and their influence on length of stay. The challenges for employers of migrant workers, their understandings of regulations and how they can be supported to ensure good standards of employment.

Employers and employment agencies have played a significant role in bringing workers to the UK and the region by deliberately targeting recruitment in source countries and organising work and accommodation ahead of arrival (Matthews, 2006a; Experian, 2007). Clusters of migrants from specific A8 countries in certain parts of the region could result from targeted campaigns by employers, such as Latvians in the East Riding (Adamson et al., 2008: 5). Over time this influence may become less significant as chain migration develops, enabling the supply of workers through informal networks (Matthews, 2006a; Cook et al., 2008). It is projected that international migrants will continue to form a significant feature in the regional economy for some years (Experian, 2006; Edge Analytics, 2007), but there are also concerns over whether future migration will be sufficient to continue supplying labour needs (Matthews, 2006a).

In the Yorkshire and Humber region, A8 migrant workers constitute 0.8% of the working age population (Adamson et al., 2008). There are variations across the region. For the period 2004-2006 Hull had the highest rate at 1.6% of the working age population. In Bradford, which had the second highest absolute number of A8 NINo registrations after Leeds, A8 migrant workers made up 0.9% of the working age population (Adamson et al., 2008: 2). Meanwhile, the rural district of Ryedale (the smallest district in Yorkshire and Humber) had only 840 migrant workers, yet these make up 1.1% of the working age population (Adamson and Craig, 2008). Migrant workers are covered by UK employment law the same as any other employee but often work in poor conditions, as described below.

4.6.1 Sectors of employment

It is widely reported that A8 migrant workers are predominantly working in demanding, dirty and unpleasant jobs. These jobs are unpopular with the established population and the regional literature strongly argues that migrant workers have become heavily relied upon to fill these vacancies in the job market (Matthews, 2006c; Craig, 2007b; Experian, 2007; de Verny, undated). EU migrant workers are employed in agriculture and horticulture, food processing and packing, warehouse work, social care, hospitality (catering and hotels) and construction (Matthews, 2006a). A few EU accession migrants are taking up highly skilled employment, for example, Matthews cites the example of 300 dentists coming to Britain from A8 countries 2004-06 (Matthews, 2006a). Non-EU migrant workers are largely highly skilled as they are mostly recruited directly into particular posts, or enter to fill skill gaps through the Highly Skilled Migrant Programme.

Across West Yorkshire, North Yorkshire and the Humber there is a higher proportion of process operatives or other factory workers than in the UK (40% to 26%), and more warehouse operatives: 14% compared to 8% in the UK as a whole (Experian, 2007).
Migrant workers are thought to be making a significant contribution to the construction industry in the region (Experian, 2007), but are hidden as they are generally classed as self-employed and not registered with WRS. In a national survey of construction workers, 7% of those surveyed in Yorkshire and Humber were from outside the UK in comparison to 15% in the total UK sample (Nicholson, 2008). In the Humber, factory work has by far the highest number of WRS registrations (36%-63%), followed by farm workers in the East Riding (15%), warehouse operative in North Lincolnshire (15%), packer in Hull (5%), and HGV driver in North East Lincolnshire (8%) (Adamson et al., 2008). In North Yorkshire worker registrations show 26% in hospitality and catering, 16% in agriculture, 14% on factory production lines and 12% in social care (NYSP, 2008).

Despite a recognition of the need to consider the skills, qualifications and language issues of migrant workers at a regional level (Yorkshire and Humber Assembly, 2007), skill underutilisation, lack of recognising or valuing overseas qualifications and poor language provision leads to the perpetuation of migrants performing roles below their skills potential (Experian, 2007; Adamson et al., 2008). A 'low road' approach (high labour intensive production, low pay, long hours) (MacKenzie and Forde, 2006) in some sectors creates a continuation of low paid, low value added jobs creating limitations in the quality of employment not exclusive to new migrants (MacKenzie and Forde, 2008), which has wider effects on the regional economy. A lack of higher skills has been identified as a barrier to the growth of the economy in the Humber area (Matthews, 2006a). By not checking qualifications, employers miss an opportunity to discover potentially useful information about skills that may prove useful (Matthews, 2006a). The meaning of overseas qualifications may be unclear to employers, and qualifications may be difficult to verify. While some migrants speak English well, others arrive with little English, posing challenges for employers in training and daily operations in the workplace (Matthews, 2006a). Rapid ‘integration’ of migrant workers into the workforce (including acquisition of language skills) at the highest level they can attain is essential to maximise their economic contribution (SQW Consulting, 2008). Some employers are taking initiatives to support their migrant workers (see box below).

Employers developing strategies to adapt to migrant workers

Some employers in the region have taken the initiative to assist migrant workers in establishing their lives in the UK. Research in Leeds interviewed employers offering the following types of support:
• Helping employees set up a bank account
• Recognising skills and offering opportunities for career progression
• Offering English classes
• Training certain individuals in specialised language to help others in the work place
• Supporting flexible shift patterns to allow migrant workers to attend college.
(Cook et al., 2008: 15-16)

Employers often rely on other migrants to explain procedures to new workers. In some cases employers have trained workers to take on supervisory roles providing advancement for the employee, helping new workers by having an intermediary, and benefiting the company by improving efficiency.

Several studies recommend that employers should take more responsibility to assist with supporting the new migrants benefiting their workforce. There is a government expectation that employers benefiting from migrant workers should support their needs for English language provision and basic skills training (Institute for Community Cohesion, 2007b: 28).
4.6.2 Wages

EU accession migrants have a low average income earning on average little above the minimum wage (£5.52 in 2008). Research in the Humber identified some EU accession migrants paid below the minimum wage (Adamson et al., 2008). Analysis of wages of migrants in the UK reveals that A8 migrants and those from the rest of the world (except English speaking countries) earn approximately 30% and 20% less respectively than other EU migrants (Drinkwater et al., 2006) despite having high average levels of education. This situation is advantageous to employers who benefit from a higher quality workforce (Matthews, 2006a). Equally, Matthews (2006a) suggests that well-qualified migrants can have difficulties finding employment in their country of origin and may see better opportunities for appropriate employment in the UK, even if they have to undertake low-skilled work initially. There are already indications that migrants, especially Poles, who have the highest average levels of education, are beginning to progress into higher-paid employment requiring better English and skills. There is a perception of employment hierarchies, where skilled Polish workers with better English may improve their working conditions while migrants from other countries remain in lower skilled positions (Cook et al., 2008).

Despite anxieties, there is little evidence that migrant workers lower wages, but their apparent willingness to accept low pay may reduce the pressure on employers to raise wage rates (Matthews, 2006a). The general picture is that there is little evidence that recent migration has affected either unemployment or wage levels (SQW Consulting, 2008). Recruitment from overseas to fill vacancies for which there are few suitable local applications enables some businesses to increase both their output and workforce. However, this may also mean that the number of people in employment rises, while the number out of work does not fall (Matthews, 2006a). Matthews (2006a) points out that as long as local residents are not seeking the work that migrants take on the effects on unemployment should be minimal. In a study of worklessness in Hull and the Humber, Ryan and Nolan argue that there is no evidence for competition or impact on barriers to employment as a result of inward migration from EU workers. Indeed, migration from A8 (and A2) countries is identified as a means of ‘enhancing and enriching the quality and quantity of skilled workers’ (Ryan and Nolan, 2007: 12). However, emerging economic recession and rapidly rising unemployment at the time of writing may dramatically change the picture in certain localities or sectors, necessitating further investigation on the effects of migration on the labour market. There are mentions of refugees finding it harder to get work than Polish and other A8 nationals (Gryszel-Fieldsned and Reeve, 2007; Adamson et al., 2008), or that employers may prefer to employ EU nationals (MRUK, 2005b) due to confusion over refugees’ immigration status and right to work. Given the very high rate of unemployment among refugees discussed earlier (see Section 3.6) these concerns require investigation.

Remittances and repatriated savings could be significant in helping to recover depressed economies in sending countries (Drinkwater et al., 2006) and may ultimately lead to an improvement in conditions in accession countries and lower rates of migration to the UK (IPPR, 2008; MCC Consulting, 2008). In 2007, Poland received US$5bn in remittances, second in Europe and Central Asia after Romania (US$6.8bn) (Ratha and Xu, 2008). The great significance of remittances in supporting families and the local economy of

---

8 However, it is not known whether these individuals are below the age of 21 and therefore eligible only for the lower minimum wage levels for 16 to 21 year olds.
migrant-sending countries reminds us of the need to understand migration as a global phenomenon, and not to restrict analyses to local, regional or national interests and effects.

4.6.3 Employment conditions

Many employment agencies and ‘gangmasters’ (labour suppliers) are reputable firms that provide a valuable role in assisting migrants find work and make living arrangements. A company in the Humber region that employed many migrant workers placed migrant workers in the role of foremen which improved communication and the working environment (Adamson et al., 2008). In North Yorkshire it was found that in the best cases a company provides a dedicated welfare officer who will visit staff where they live to help deal with arising issues, such as repairs or TV licences (Davis, 2005). However, it is also reported that some employers and gangmasters exploit workers (GOYH, 2006; Matthews, 2006a; The Churches Regional Commission for Yorkshire and the Humber, 2007; Adamson et al., 2008).

Forms of exploitation range from poor employment practices or subtle manipulation of working regulations to blatant cases of denial of rights that meet definitions of forced labour and even slavery (Craig et al., 2007). Research in Barnsley found that working long hours for low pay was facilitated by a ‘common’ practice of waiving statutory protection through the opt-out clause of the Working Time Directive (MacKenzie and Forde, 2008). It was, however, unclear the extent to which this was a constrained choice: minimum wage employment acts as an imperative to work long hours to make a living. Migrant workers tend to work longer hours than UK born residents (NYSP, 2008). The high rate of employment among those registered with WRS (almost 100%) obscures situations of low pay or intermittent work that create insecure employment. It is frequently remarked that employers view A8 nationals as ‘good workers’ willing to work long hours for low pay at short notice. This flexibility seems of more advantage to the employer than the employee (MacKenzie and Forde, 2006), and the definitions of good working apparent in the literature equally describe conditions characteristic of poorly-protected workers employed in jobs with few opportunities for development. A perceived ‘hard-working attitude’ of migrant workers can cause tension in the workplace where established residents work alongside migrants (Davis, 2005).

More serious complaints include gangmasters failing to provide contracts of employment, pay slips or P45s; payment below the minimum wage; charging exorbitant arrangement fees; inventing pretexts to confiscate passports; charging excessive deductions from pay for transport, clothing or accommodation; and charging inflated rent for poor quality, overcrowded housing (Matthews, 2006a; The Churches Regional Commission for Yorkshire and the Humber, 2007; Adamson et al., 2008). Some of these poor conditions are perpetuated by employers who simply do not take adequate notice of employment law, while it seems that in other cases there is a systematic, illegal profiteering from the exploitation of workers. In cases where a low wage is being paid and irregular deductions being taken, employees may see little of their final wage, restricting their ability to make remittances, or to save to try to improve their situation. Illegal working may continue where employees believe they have been registered (with the WRS) but find they have not, and are therefore not eligible for benefits following 12 months of employment. Unscrupulous employment practices create ‘endemic insecurity’ for some workers (Adamson et al., 2008). Frequent moves or short term contracts can hamper completing the 12 month period of work, while it seems some agencies deliberately offer sporadic work to prevent individuals from saving enough to move on. Fear of reprisals can serve to dissuade workers from reporting on poor employment practices.
The Gangmasters Licensing Authority (GLA) was established in 2004 by the government in the wake of the Morecambe Bay cockle pickers tragedy in which 21 Chinese people lost their lives. Sectors covered by GLA licensing include agriculture, horticulture, food processing and packaging and shellfish gathering, but other sectors that employ many migrant workers such as catering, construction, domestic service or hospitality do not fall within its remit. This allows unscrupulous gangmasters to move workers to industries that are not policed (The Churches Regional Commission for Yorkshire and the Humber, 2007). It is noted that the importance of addressing poor standards is not simply a matter of protecting basic employment rights; poor standards among a minority of employers may undermine the reputation of others, affecting the supply of migrant workers. Unless migrant workers are treated with respect they may move out of the region, or to elsewhere in Europe where they feel standards are better (Matthews, 2006a; Adamson et al., 2008; Cook et al., 2008).

### 4.7 Safety

**Key issues** Crime rates are thought to be very low, apart from low level crimes that result from not understanding UK laws. Migrants may not report being the victim of crime because of fear of the police.

**Research gap** The forms, extent and influences on incidents of harassment, racism and discrimination.

#### 4.7.1 The police working with new migrants

In some respects the police is the public service which is most in touch on a day to day basis with changes in population, as they deal with complaints and reports of crime, encounter people on street patrols and work proactively with community organisations and representatives. Police forces in the region have often been proactive in seeking and exchanging information with support agencies and new migrants, and in addressing their concerns and lack of knowledge of UK systems (for example, in Leeds, Leeds City Council, 2007; and Doncaster, Yorkshire Rural Community Council, 2008).

One indication of the extensive contact that police have with the diverse population of migrants is their record of the use of Language Line, a telephone interpreting service. Between May 2007 and September 2008 Humberside police used Language Line for over 2400 calls in 58 different languages. The top five languages used were Polish (775 calls), Russian (325 calls), Lithuanian (242 calls), ‘Kurdish’ (including ‘Kurdish’ and Sorani, 229 calls) and Mandarin (123 calls). The sixth most used language was Latvian (108 calls).

From April 2007 to July 2008, West Yorkshire police used Language Line for 9931 calls in 66 different languages. The top five languages were Polish, Slovak, Urdu, Czech and Mandarin. This again highlights the dominance of Polish nationals but also indicates the needs of Chinese Mandarin speakers-a group barely mentioned in research on recent migration (Law, 2004); the continuing needs of refugee groups (represented among Chinese nationals, indicated by the ‘Kurdish’ group and likely to make up much of the diversity in languages); and the prevalence in West Yorkshire of Urdu speakers likely to be due to continuing new migrations of people from Pakistan. Dealing with the costs of this large uptake of interpreting has been a sensitive issue for the police. In 2008, the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) revealed that there has not been the ‘crime wave’ some commentators feared from EU accession migration, but that, in fact, the main impact on the police has been in interpreting costs (Dodd, 2008).
4.7.2 Crime
Clear indications of the rate of crime and victims of crime among recent migrant nationalities are not available. Data provided by West Yorkshire Police for this research indicates that the overall picture is that the crime rate among nationals from EU accession countries is slightly lower than for the general population. North Yorkshire police also report that crime rates are very low (Nicholson, 2008). Where crimes are reported, they tend to be low level crimes associated with not understanding UK law such as driving after drinking, driving without tax and insurance or carrying weapons. There are sometimes issues that cause ‘community tensions’ such as noise, public drinking or dumping rubbish in the street due to not understanding the system of refuse collections (Adamson et al., 2008). The main difficulty for police is making themselves understood when encountering a victim or offender who cannot speak English (NYSP, 2008). There are various safety consequences stemming from lack of English language skills, such as workers putting themselves at risk due to not understanding health and safety guidance (Spencer et al., 2007). Poor levels of English may also help to perpetuate illegal, dangerous or exploitative working practices as it can make it more difficult for workers to seek help or deal with issues that arise at work. Fear of crime and perceptions of high crime lead to feelings of insecurity, and may encourage out-migration. Migrants may be reluctant to report crimes, especially if they have had negative experiences of police in their country of origin (The Churches Regional Commission for Yorkshire and the Humber, 2007).

4.7.3 Racism, discrimination and ‘neighbourhood tensions’
It is very difficult to measure incidents of racism and discrimination because of the sensitivity of the issue, the likely underreporting of hate crimes, and the vulnerable position of migrants. Where local authorities, voluntary agencies and police have invested in networks of hate crime reporting centres, the true levels of racist abuse and violence are more likely to be reflected in monitoring. Although one study concludes that tensions are not widespread (Experian, 2007: 5, 49), racism, discrimination and tensions emerge across several studies (e.g. Law, 2004; Craig et al., 2005b; Grayson and Horton, 2007; Adamson et al., 2008; Cook et al., 2008; MCC Consulting, 2008) suggesting that these experiences do form a feature of the daily lives of new migrants in this region. Indeed, Grayson and Horton interviewed a mother who said ‘I miss the freedom, the children stay in the house because we are afraid’ (2007: 9), similarly to asylum seekers confining themselves to their accommodation to avoid a hostile world (see Section 3.2). Dedicated work on tensions is reported to have improved the situation, for example, in Hull (Adamson et al., 2008). Aside from a few dedicated studies (Craig et al., 2005b, 2009; Law et al. 2007), the occurrence of racism only emerges within wider studies, and there is a lack of analysis of the influences on racist incidents. This is an especially important gap to note, given that feelings of resentment and misconceptions about preferential treatment of migrants could lead to tensions if not addressed (Institute for Community Cohesion, 2007b; Cook et al., 2008). However, concerns about ‘community tensions’ must be tempered with an acknowledgement that many individuals seek to welcome and help newcomers, attested to by the numerous reports found in this review that aim to inform and improve understandings. The recognition that tensions can arise from misunderstandings strongly supports the need for ‘mythbusting’ and information sharing initiatives. It is striking that calling for these basic mechanisms of preparing neighbourhoods for new arrivals remains a notable theme in work on recent EU migrants, given the prominence of such calls in coping with antipathy towards asylum seekers since dispersal began in 1999. New European migration has exposed individuals and services unfamiliar with international migrants to issues faced by new arrivals and more could be done to share established practice (GOYH, 2006).
4.8 **Integration**

### Key issues
Isolation and limited opportunities for mixing with ‘local’ people and the importance of information resources. Feelings of comfort affect decisions on long-term settlement.

### Research gaps
The role of libraries and churches as key social sites is often overlooked and require dedicated study on their role in issues of integration or cohesion.

#### 4.8.1 Integration and cohesion in policy
Integration and cohesion are both contested terms that do not have straightforward definitions, but it is beyond the scope of this review to discuss these terms at length. They are both terms that have become significant currencies in literature relating to migrants and which presently guide policy making. Integration is a term that has largely been used by the British Government to refer to the processes of settlement for refugees (see Section 3.8). Cohesion is a term that has come into widespread use following the emergence of the terms ‘social cohesion’ and ‘community cohesion’ in the government discourse on the widely publicised riots in northern towns in 2001 that were considered to have race-based characteristics. The cohesion agenda has tended to be led by a perceived need to prevent religious extremism, but there are signs that it is opening up and could provide a useful source of funding and a strategic force to benefit community relations for all groups, including new migrants (e.g. Trescom, 2003). It is ironic that even in Bradford, a city that formed one of the sources of current community cohesion policy and rhetoric, mechanisms to accommodate new European migrants were not anticipated (Bradford Central and Eastern European Working Group, 2006). Rather, systems of support, information sharing and addressing tensions are being developed post hoc. North Yorkshire Strategic Partnership advise that developments should be consulted on as widely as possible to involve the people they are targeted at and ensure they are reflective of a range of different ‘community’ perspectives (NYSP, 2008).

#### 4.8.2 Opportunities for mixing and informational needs
Several studies point towards the isolation and consequent lack of integration for migrant workers caused by long hours at work which restrict possibilities for meeting local people (Adamson et al., 2008; MacKenzie and Forde, 2008). Friendships and networks formed in the workplace are particularly important. As with refugees, ability to speak English and living arrangements (with family, or in multiple occupancy housing) affect experiences of integration (MacKenzie and Forde, 2008). Language is a prominent marker of difference and possibly the most important issue for new migrants: ‘the language barrier ‘pervades all aspects of life for a migrant with a low level of English competence’ (Experian, 2007: 4). Gaining and improving English language skills make a huge difference to migrants’ capacity to settle in the UK, navigate UK systems, source good quality information, find and keep work, secure better working and living conditions, facilitate positive experiences of living in the UK and understand rights and responsibilities (Experian, 2007; Spencer et al., 2007; MacKenzie and Forde, 2008). It follows that a lack of sufficient English skills is noted as a key contributing factor in perpetuating forms of exploitation that include signing contracts for poor, overpriced housing, agreeing to employment that waives or ignores working regulations, and being subjected to racist abuse or discrimination due to speaking another language (Adamson et al., 2008).
Long shifts, or night shifts severely hamper the possibilities for migrant workers to socialise, or to access services that could be a source of information and support (Cook et al., 2008). Because migrant workers are not available during the day attention should be paid to the specific needs of migrant workers. Existing asylum seeker and refugee structures may not to be sufficient or have the remit to address the issues of other types of new migrants (Adamson et al., 2008; MacKenzie and Forde, 2008). However, similarly to refugees (see Section 3.8.1), informal networks may be the most important and effective resource in assisting migrants to settle (Experian, 2007: 48). This also carries risks, as reliance on other migrants who speak better English for information can mean that information obtained is not accurate (Experian, 2007: 5). A8 migrants from countries other than Poland may find it more difficult to find information and access services as, where initiatives have been taken to provide translated materials, these often do not include other A8 languages, such as Slovak (Grayson and Horton, 2007). A consortium of Citizens Advice Bureaux (CABx) in North Yorkshire and a CAB in Sheffield report a substantially increased level of enquiries over the past few years, mainly but not solely from A8 migrants, each of which usually involves considerably greater time than a typical enquiry. This has led to increasing pressures, particularly on rural CABx (personal communication, 6 October 2008). Most seek advice about employment, housing and tax credits or other benefits (NYSP, 2008). In response to the informational needs and apparent exploitation of new migrants, local multi-agency and community-based networks and projects are emerging in towns and neighbourhoods across Yorkshire and Humber (for examples, see Bradford Central and Eastern European Working Group, 2006; Leeds City Council, 2007; The Churches Regional Commission for Yorkshire and the Humber, 2007; Yorkshire Rural Community Council, 2008). Typically, these networks develop welcome or information packs (for example, see box Selby Together), seek to improve local mapping data on new migrants, and work to improve cultural understandings (both for new migrants of UK norms, and for local residents and frontline workers of new migrants).

Selby Together: welcoming new workers

Selby is a town in North Yorkshire that had not experienced significant levels of migration before the arrival of workers from new European member countries since 2004. To begin to map the population the Senior Chaplain Reverend John Davis conducted a survey in 2005. The survey estimated there were around 1000 migrant workers in the Selby District, mostly Polish who had been in Selby 6 to 12 months. The research found migrants lacked basic information about life in the UK, partly due to a lack of English language skills.

Selby Together emerged as a result of this research. It is a group of public and private sector organisations that aim to help new workers settle and feel welcomed. Selby Together worked to put together a ‘Welcome Pack’ available in Polish and English. It includes information on:

- council services in the Selby area, such as refuse collection, recycling and leisure services
- health, entitlements and details of doctors and dentists
- fire safety, drug and alcohol advice, and domestic violence
- how to register to vote and open a bank account
- housing and tenancy issues
- education and ESOL classes
- health and safety at work

The pack is produced loose-leaf to reduce production costs, to allow updates to be circulated every six months and to enable local information to be added. It is distributed through the town and parish councils, workplaces, libraries, educational establishments, healthcare centres, training centres and on request. The pack has helped to bring service providers together to provide a more integrated service. See also Davis, 2005; Institute for Community Cohesion, 2007: 14; and Fitzgerald, 2008. Appendix 2 has details of other examples of welcome information across the region.

For more information contact Selby Together, c/o SCADIM, Community House, Portholme Road, Selby, YO8 4QQ, 01757 241050, office@scadim.org.uk.
4.8.3 Churches and libraries: social sites
The church is recognised as a central site of socialising and networking (Davis, 2005; Commission for Rural Communities, undated), and therefore a potential dissemination resource for trade unions (Fitzgerald, 2008) and other agencies seeking to share information and support EU accession migrants. This is especially the case for Polish migrants—there are 48 Polish churches in England and Wales, and others that provide a regular mass in Polish (Audit Commission, 2007). Churches, including those in rural areas have experienced a sudden increase in attendance at services (see The Churches Regional Commission for Yorkshire and the Humber, 2007; and de Verny, undated). Libraries can be an important site for spending leisure time (East Riding of Yorkshire Council, 2006; Adamson et al., 2008) and, with the police force, may be the public service new migrants have most contact with. This is largely due to their free internet facilities, reflecting the importance of virtual communications in the lives of migrants whose social networks may span across countries.

4.8.4 Possibilities of settlement and ‘future intentions’
WRS applications data indicates that almost half of EU migrants expect to stay less than 3 months, but this data is not seen as a very reliable measure, as a migrant’s situation may change (Experian, 2007). Those in skilled positions may be more likely to stay longer than those in unskilled positions (MRUK, 2005b). Over time this could alter the characteristics of the A8 migrant population, reducing the availability of young workers prepared to work for low wages with potentially negative economic impacts (NYSP, 2008). Data from WRS clearly shows patterns of seasonal migration—more migrants register between July and September (Adamson et al., 2008). Agricultural harvests and planting may partly influence higher migration in the summer months (IPPR, 2008). Some workers may work for a short period before returning, while others are seasonal workers who travel to and from the UK (Matthews, 2006a). This ‘short-termism’ can cause labour shortages for employers reliant on migrant workers (NYSP, 2008). Short visits may also cause difficulties for migrants as entitlement to benefits, healthcare and other services are complicated if migrants are not normally resident for a period of six months or more. Although the primary motivation for recent EU accession migration is economic, other factors play an important part including a desire to learn English, develop careers, join family or friends, and to broaden horizons (Experian, 2007; Spencer et al., 2007; Cook et al., 2008; IPPR, 2008). The arrival of Roma people seeking to escape discrimination and persecution in EU accession countries (Cook et al., 2008: 9) demonstrates that forced migration is subsumed under general migration at times of lower restrictions. A decision to stay longer involves a complex weighing up of factors (Spencer et al., 2007) including career progression, integration and economic conditions in the migrants’ home countries.

As discussed, negative experiences of life in the UK encourage people to move and exploitation or discrimination could encourage people to leave. Understanding more about the intentions of migrants, their likelihood to stay long term and whether they will remain in Yorkshire and Humber having arrived here is a vital area of future investigation which will assist with planning. When considering approaches to the reception of EU accession migrants, it is worth noting the likely future growth of the EU to include more new members (Bradford Central and Eastern European Working Group, 2006) such as FYR Macedonia, Croatia and Turkey that presently have relatively weak economies in comparison to EU states. Although migration to the UK may be diverted as restrictions in other western European countries are relaxed, further EU expansion may repeat a pattern of large in-migration (SQW Consulting, 2008). The practice established now may well provide useful learning for potential migrations from future new member states.
5. Research: gaps and recommendations

This concluding section provides details of ongoing research, identifies research gaps emerging from the review and gives a summary of key recommendations from research.

5.1 Ongoing research

The previous two sections have summarised the findings from regional research published since 1999, and other sources on policy and service delivery. Before going on to look at the research gaps that have emerged from this analysis, it is useful to note ongoing research we were made aware of.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation are funding a three year project to look at housing needs and aspirations of the settled white British community, settled ethnic minority communities and newly arrived A8 migrants in Bradford. This is being undertaken by the Department of Geography at the University of Leeds. Women’s Health Matters in Leeds have started work on research entitled ‘Mothers in Exile-listening to asylum seekers’ experiences in maternity’. Professor Peter Campion, University of Hull, is leading a study into the extent of and provision for health needs of asylum seekers and refugees in Hull. Professor Gary Craig, University of Hull, is leading a study funded by Oxfam UK into the position of vulnerable migrant workers and the work of labour suppliers. He is also collaborating with the Centre for Cities and the University of Bristol in a study of the effects of migrant workers on local labour markets.

An Economic and Social Research Council funded research project at the University of Leeds Geography department is establishing a new migrant databank, which is expected to improve available data on both international and internal migration. It combines alternative sources of international migration data (including, NINo, WRS, Total International Migration and other data) providing trends and patterns at national, regional and local authority level. As repeatedly noted in many reports, there is no single source of statistics that provide a comprehensive measure of the new migrant population, and this project aims to address this deficiency.

A number of PhD students are conducting migration research in this region, including research on young refugees (Ala Sirriyeh, University of Leeds), on trafficking and women’s agency (Maria de Angelis, University of Hull), on undocumented migrants (Jessica Hughes, University of Hull), asylum seekers’ experiences of detention (Bob Mouncer, University of Hull), and on the role of religion in transitions for young refugees (Bereket Loul, Leeds Metropolitan University).

5.2 Research gaps

In addition to the gaps identified in specific areas that have been highlighted in each sub-section, some wider research gaps emerged from the review.

Concerns about the quality and availability of data and statistics are raised in almost all of the literature. It is vital that evidence based research on how migrants affect housing, health, education and emergency services is developed and communicated to address anxieties and concerns based on often unfounded perceptions that appear to have an overt influence on research agendas.
Little is known about how long migrants stay in Yorkshire and Humber, their transitions in employment, housing and family formation, or what influences them to move within the region, to other areas in the UK, or to return to their country of origin.

In relation to the previous point, the question of the impact of migrants on services is controversial and the evidence at present is not conclusive. The literature repeatedly refers to ‘increases’ in numbers attending services, yet qualitative studies have exposed that many migrants do not understand available support and are often not eligible, suggesting that support systems are not meeting potential need. Both of these issues require more attention: how public services might develop mechanisms to respond to the rapidly shifting migration environment; and the exclusion of migrants from sources of support that could avert continuing cycles of deprivation for new migrants.

In addition, little attention has been given to the wider benefits of migration. ‘Impacts’ tend to be simplified into an economic cost (to public services) benefit (to the economy) analysis.

Lack of country of origin data severely limits the possibilities for understanding the distribution and needs of migrants and their uptake of public and voluntary service provision. Ethnicity monitoring has very limited use for understanding new migration as people are subsumed under categories of ethnicity such as ‘white other’ or ‘black African’.

Much research is gender blind; there is a need to understand the specific experiences and needs of men and women.

There is very little with a migrant perspective. Most is secondary, anecdotal or focusing on policies. What do migrants think about accessing services?

5.3 Recommendations from the research

This final section summarises the many and varied recommendations from the literature, informed by information supplied by individuals who sent in information or took part in discussions with the authors.

New migrants are a broad, heterogeneous group, and more attention must be given to understanding the specific needs of the many groups that make up the migrant population. Engaging in a meaningful way with new migrants could develop these understandings, as well as providing the opportunity for decision-making bodies to consult with the people that policies are aimed at prior to implementation.

5.3.1 Regional
Promote the rights and recognise the needs of new migrants within existing relevant policy provisions.

Asylum seeker, refugee and new migrant populations should be recognised within existing local government and voluntary structures and within policies addressing deprivation, cohesion, diversity and race discrimination. Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) can perform a key role by using their cohesion remit to ensure representation from new migrant representatives and by funding grassroots and community organisations to facilitate their participation in local governance. Repeated recommendations for LSPs to take up the needs of asylum seekers, refugees and migrants suggest that to date there has been
little success in identifying effective mechanisms to achieve this. We therefore see progress with LSPs as a priority.

5.3.2 Housing

**Local authorities should use their public health functions to manage housing conditions and should publicise lists of approved or accredited private sector landlords more widely.**

Addressing fire safety issues resulting from overcrowding is a priority. Fire and rescue services should be encouraged to produce information in appropriate languages and to promote fire safety, for example, through churches and other migrant meeting places. Councils should make their application process transparent, and should be proactive in providing accurate information and correcting misinformation.

5.3.3 Health

**Undertake migrant health mapping for Yorkshire and Humber to identify migrant health needs and to act as a base for promoting migrant health needs across NHS organisations to guide the provision of services.**

Such a mapping exercise would help to highlight the particular needs of certain groups, for example, recognising the specific needs of Roma, and could engage new migrants as outreach workers to ascertain migrant health needs and facilitate engagement with health services. There is a need for promotional campaigns to encourage registration with General Practitioners. This work would be assisted by all NHS organisations having a migrant lead as attention to migrant issues is not consistent across PCTs in the region and some health trusts in the region have yet to establish effective race equality policies.

5.3.4 Children and young people

**Education authorities should investigate the possibilities of using Ethnic Minorities Achievement funding to support work being done in schools to help migrant children and teach them English.**

5.3.5 Adult education

**The educational sector should be supported by central government and employers of migrants to provide English classes to adult migrants.**

Better provision from education and training agencies for all new migrants is needed to recognise their skills, often in short supply locally, but not being used effectively, and to avert long term barriers to the integration of migrants.

5.3.6 Employment

**A dedicated strategy is needed to address reports of exploitation in the labour market and to map and utilise the skills of new migrants.**

Tackling exploitation can include: local authorities fostering a closer relationship with the Gangmasters Licensing Authority; widening the remit of the GLA and Health and Safety Executive; promoting examples of good employers; Trade Unions supporting migrant workers to acquire proper employment rights (deploying representatives of the same nationality as workers may help); and research and investigations into the form and scale of exploitation. Establishing good work practices is undermined by illegal workers. The government should regularise irregular migrants, which would boost tax revenues and undermine illegal employers and should provide a time-limited, revocable licence to work to refused asylum seekers until return to their country of origin can take place.

To address employment for refugees and migrants at a skill level appropriate to their education and experience, employers should be supported to actively recognise refugees and migrants in diversity policies.

### 5.3.7 Safety

**Continued information and awareness work by councils, media and support agencies is needed to challenge negative stereotypes that may foster tensions.**

There is an urgent need to address misconceptions about migrants and refugees getting preferential access to social housing, as this can lead to tensions and damages neighbourhood relations. Front-line workers are members of the public and also prone to adopting stereotypes; information work needs to take place within organisations, as well as being directed out. Local media outlets have a vital role to play in encouraging community cohesion and in reducing incidents of harassment and abuse towards new migrants by promoting positive images.

There are immediate problems with fire safety and environmental health that require information resources to be made available in all A8 languages. Although there is a trend away from reliance on translated materials, there is a need for start-up information. The good examples set by Barnsley and Leeds Councils and the Humber Improvement Partnership (see Appendix 3) in providing accessible, translated information on rights, entitlements, support and other information should be followed by all local authorities.

There is ample scope for **improvements to asylum determination, support and the treatment of refused asylum seekers** which is more cost effective than reducing legal aid and reliance on detention and enforced removal.

### 5.3.8 Integration and cohesion

**Migrant representatives and community organisations should be adequately funded to organise social and cultural events and provide a representative role.**

Some statutory bodies (especially the police) have called for better links with migrant representatives to improve relationships and understandings of their needs. For this to be viable, resources need to be made available to develop representation and access points into decision-making structures.

### 5.3.9 For research commissioners and researchers

**Researchers and commissioners should take responsibility not to perpetuate ill-founded perceptions about migrants and language misuse.**

Clarity of reference terms is especially important in the field of migration, which is prone to conflation and confusion. Research should carefully present the groups being studied, be precise about how people are referred to, and should consider the possible wider impacts of their research on the people (migrants and practitioners) being studied (SRA, 2003; Salford Housing and Urban Studies Unit, 2004; RSC, undated). Care should be taken with terms like ‘new migrant’ or ‘economic migrant’ that have broad meanings, often used without definition. Consideration should be given to providing clear, plain English research summaries and well-presented findings to aid dissemination, for research to influence improved policy and understandings of migrants.
A2: the A2 countries are Bulgaria and Romania which joined the EU in 2006 and are subject to different restrictions to A8 nationals.

A8: the A8 countries are Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia, which joined the European Union in May 2004.

A10: ten countries joined the European Union in 2004 - the ‘A8’ countries plus Malta and Cyprus.

Accession: the act of legally becoming part of the European Union.

Asylum seeker: someone who has made a claim for asylum, and is awaiting determination of their case.

Asylum support: the UKBA support system for dispersed asylum seekers, formerly known as NASS (National Asylum Support System).

cf (confer): compare (with another text).

Dependant: a child who accompanies an adult migrant when they arrive in the UK.

Destitution: describes the situation of asylum seekers not in receipt of state support (for a variety of reasons) and with no right to work.

Dispersal: the system to provide accommodation to asylum seekers in towns and cities around the UK, introduced in the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999.

EU accession migrant: a migrant from either the A8 or A2 countries.

Family joiner: a person who has come to the UK to join a member of their family already here, and given a right to live in the UK.

Gateway: the government programme to resettle agreed numbers of refugees from UNHCR refugee camps to the UK. People who came under UNHCR-mediated settlement programmes were formerly known as ‘quota’ refugees.

International migrant: a non-UK national who comes to live in the UK. Migrants include asylum seekers, refugees, EU and non EU migrants.

Irregular migrant: (sometimes known as ‘undocumented’ or ‘illegal’ migrant). Someone who does not have a valid immigration status, either because they entered clandestinely without permission, or because they entered in another visa category and have stayed after their visa entitlement expired.

Migrant: someone who moves to another country to reside.

Migration: the movement of people between places.

Migrant worker: a non-UK national working in the UK.

NINo: National Insurance Number.

Non EU: from outside the European Union.

Refugee: someone granted a positive determination because they meet the criteria of the Geneva Conventions definition or other criteria, including Humanitarian Protection (HP), Discretionary
Leave (DL) and other forms of exceptional leave. Refugee status may be granted after an asylum application made in the UK or prior to arrival through a refugee settlement programme (‘Gateway’).

**Refused asylum seeker:** (or failed asylum seeker). Someone who has applied for asylum and been refused.

**Regularise:** give legal status to irregular migrants without documentation, including permission to work.

**Roma people:** are gypsies from mainland Europe who have a culture and ethnicity distinct from Irish and UK gypsy travellers.

**Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme:** the scheme gives permission to workers from Romania or Bulgaria to work in agriculture, with accommodation provided by the farmer or grower employing them, for up to six months.

**Student migrant:** a migrant who entered the UK with a student visa to study in a British institution.

**Trafficking:** the recruitment or transportation of people by threat or coercion in order to have control over another person for the purpose of exploitation (see www.ukhtc.org.uk).

**UKBA:** the United Kingdom Border Agency, formerly the Borders and Immigration Agency (BIA), and before that, the Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND), part of the Home Office.

**WRS:** the Workers’ Registration Scheme - all A8 nationals wishing to work in the UK must register with the Department of Work and Pensions.

**Yorkshire and the Humber:** (‘the region’, ‘this region’) is the Government Office region comprised of 21 local authorities in the four sub-regions of the Humber, North Yorkshire, South Yorkshire and West Yorkshire.
Appendix 2
Sources of information on policy and practice

Key sources for reports, practice guides and research on asylum seekers, refugees and migrants.

The information centre about asylum and refugees in the UK (ICAR)
www.icar.org.uk

Institute for Public Policy Research
www.ippr.org.uk

Improvement and Development Agency for Local Government
www.idea.gov.uk

Institute of Community Cohesion
www.cohesioninstitute.org.uk

The British Refugee Council
www.refugeecouncil.org.uk

What Works Database
www.yorkshirefutures.com

Yorkshire and Humber Regional Migration Partnership
www.refugeeaccess.info/yhrmp
(The website will change to www.migrationyorkshire.org.uk in early 2009)
Appendix 3   Information for migrants

For advice on asylum or refugee issues:
Refugee Council
Ground Floor
Hurley House
1 Dewsbury Road
Leeds LS11 5DQ
Tel: 0113 244 9404
Advice line: 0113 386 2210
www.refugeecouncil.org.uk

For advice on legal, money and other problems:
Citizens Advice Bureau
www.citizensadvice.org.uk

A directory of services for asylum seekers, refugees and migrants in the Yorkshire and Humber region is available, at the time of writing, at www.refugeeaccess.info

The Refugee Access website will close at the end of 2008 and the directory will be made available on a new website by the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Migration Partnership.

The following list gives information on resources we were made aware of.

Information for new arrivals
Barnsley www.barnsley.gov.uk/bguk/New_Arrivals
Leeds www.leeds.gov.uk/welcome
‘Welcome to’ Hull, Leeds, Rotherham, Sheffield, Wakefield guides for asylum seekers available from Paul Harvey, p.harvey@vas.org.uk

Mythbusting
Humber Improvement Partnership:
http://www.nelincs.gov.uk/community/migrantworkers.htm
Leave to remain. The frontline struggle of Hull’s refugees.
Don’t believe the hype! The truth about asylum seekers and refugees. Available at Hull Libraries.

Education
Supporting new arrivals in schools: http://www.emaonline.org.uk/
Higher education: A guide for refugees and asylum seekers in Yorkshire and Humber. Available from John Willott, j.willott@leedsmet.ac.uk

Housing
Housing rights information: www.housing-rights.info

Volunteering and Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) checks
Sheffield New Horizons, Voluntary Action Sheffield
http://www.vas.org.uk/volunteer-centre/refugee-asylum-project/index
The Yorkshire and Humber Regional Review, 18, 2: 5-7.
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