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Glossary

A8 The eight central and eastern European countries (Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Slovakia and Slovenia) that joined the European Union in May 2004

ABC1 Social class grouping including the socio-demographic classifications of upper middle class (A), middle class (B) and lower middle class (C1)

ASPIRE Asylum Seekers Pursuing Integration, Refuge and Empowerment

BNP British National Party

BRAP Birmingham Race Action Partnership

C2DE Social class grouping including the socio-demographic classifications of skilled working class (C2), working class (D) and underclass (E)

CAB Citizens advice bureau

CEHR Commission for Equality and Human Rights

CFMEB Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain

CIH Chartered Institute of Housing

DCLG Department for Communities and Local Government

DTI Department for Trade and Industry

ESOL English for speakers of other languages

EU European Union

GLA Greater London Authority

HMO Households of multiple occupancy

ICAR Information Centre about Asylum and Refugees

IDeA Improvement and Development Agency

LSP Local strategic partnership

MORI Market and Opinion Research International

NASS National Asylum Support Service

NeSS Neighbourhood Statistics Service

NINo National Insurance number

ONS Office for National Statistics

PIP Personal integration plan

PCT Primary care trust

REC Racial equality council

RES Race equality scheme

RCO Refugee community organisation

RIL Refugee integration loan

RRA Race Relations Act (1976 and as amended)

SCI The CRE’s Safe Communities Initiative, which was operational from 2003 to 2006

SRIF Scottish Refugee Integration Forum

SUNRISE Strategic Upgrade of National Refugee Integration Services

WRS Worker registration scheme
Executive summary

The scale and nature of recent immigration has changed the map of diversity in Britain. Areas where immigrants have traditionally settled have become more diverse than ever, while areas that had previously not known much immigration have received relatively large numbers of newcomers.

The increasing diversity of backgrounds and experiences among Britain’s population has raised urgent questions about how best to encourage integration, and has made clear the importance of using reliable information about people’s needs as a basis for developing effective policies. The Commission for Racial Equality’s (CRE) tripartite approach to integration, focusing on equality of opportunity, universal participation and interaction between people from different ethnic and racial groups, provides a framework for taking up these challenges.

This research looks at the reception and integration of new migrant communities across ten locations in the UK, paying particular attention to the tensions arising from their arrival and settlement, key lessons from the response of public authorities, and how they use their responsibility under the race equality duty in this response.

The findings of this report point to a number of worrying trends influencing both the reception of new migrants across different parts of the UK and the capacity of local authorities to promote integration amid increasing diversity. Misperceptions and misinformation lie at the heart of how new migrants are received, with the media playing a key role in filling what is often a vacuum of accurate information on the dynamics of social change at the local level. These misperceptions are largely forged along the fault lines of race, ethnicity and religion, with white migrants in England reporting a broadly more positive reception than non-white migrants. The reception of new migrants is also influenced by local labour markets, local housing pressures, local and regional demographics, and political leadership on migration.

While strong dynamics of race, religion and ethnicity influence the reception of new migrants, local and public authorities do not fully understand the relevance of race relations to the integration of new migrant communities. In other words, refugees, asylum seekers and white migrants are not considered by many public authorities to fall within the remit of ‘race relations’. This is largely because of a widely-held view among public authorities that ‘race relations’ involves established white communities and established ethnic minority communities, but not new European immigrants. The findings of our research show that this simplistic ‘black and white’ perspective on race relations is out of step with the UK’s new diversity and the tensions arising from it that tend to divide communities in increasingly complex ways.

The capacity of public authorities to integrate new migrants is further limited by the diversity and pace of new migration. Public authorities are not well-informed about the scale and nature of new migration flows which limits their response to one which is largely reactive and driven by frontline pressures.

Despite these challenges, the findings of this report highlight three positive lessons for advancing integration policy. The first is that there exists a wide discrepancy between the actual impacts of new migrant communities, as reported by local authorities and public authorities in England and Scotland, and their perceived impacts, as reported by local communities and the media. This discrepancy reveals that the current focus on the ‘burden’ of new migrants in national and media discourse is misplaced and misjudged.
More importantly, this focus is overshadowing a more productive discussion that could be taking place among policymakers on how better to support and improve local capacity to integrate new migrants.

The second is that good practice on integrating new migrants is being forged in some localities and does offer wider lessons for securing better integration for new migrant communities. In particular, these good practices were found to be important and necessary first steps in promoting the greater interaction and participation of new migrants by advancing proactive measures to help newcomers settle into a local community. The good practice evidenced in this report is used to set out a basic framework of guidance on what works well and why. This guidance is not definitive as the influence of local factors makes it impossible to prescribe a ‘one size fits all’ approach to the integration of newcomers. However, three key characteristics underpinned all the evidence of good practice that emerged during the course of this research and so constitute the basis of the guidance outlined in this report:

- strategic partnerships between public authorities and other agencies;
- effective communication with local communities; and
- proactive measures to improve the local evidence base on new migrants in order to better inform integration policy.

The third is that Scotland seems to possess several characteristics that facilitate the reception and integration of new migrants that differ to those observed in England: a different scale of migration; a stronger sense of national identity; strong political leadership on migration; and more balanced media coverage. Many of these are ‘natural’ advantages determined by socio-demographic factors, but some are not - most notably the political leadership of the Scottish Executive in promoting a positive message on migration. However, these advantages are not a license for complacency and there are indications that a positive reception is not a uniform trend across all parts of Scotland. As such, the Scottish Executive should consider these strengths as a useful foundation upon which to formulate an integration strategy for new migrant communities - one that builds on Scotland’s relatively strong predisposition to receive newcomers and reflects the growing diversity of Scotland’s new migrant population.

Based on these findings, this report makes a number of recommendations:

- Successful integration of new migrants needs to be part of a broader process of integration for all in society, focusing on interaction, participation and equality.
- Central government needs to reassess current funding formulae for local authorities to assist those areas experiencing genuine pressures as a result of rapid population change.
- Central government need to provide clear and consistent political leadership on migration. Drawing on the example given by the Scottish Executive, they need to provide strong statements on the positive socio-economic benefits of migration as a foundation from which to improve the reception and advance the integration of new migrants.
- The Scottish Executive should formulate an integration strategy for new migrants, in the same proactive way that it has addressed refugee integration, to build on its successes to date and reflect Scotland’s growing diversity.
• Public authorities need to fulfil their obligations under the Race Relations Act (RRA). This includes assessing how their policies affect race relations in order to maximise opportunities for interaction and participation. To this end, public authorities should familiarise themselves with the CRE’s Promoting Good Race Relations: A guide for public authorities (CRE 2005) and the good practice outlined in it.

• The CRE should issue specific guidance on the relevance to new migrant communities of promoting good race relations, in order to clarify public sector responsibilities to these groups.

• Public authorities need to become more transparent in their decision-making procedures, particularly in relation to housing and grants, in order to eliminate misperceptions of preferential treatment for some communities.

• Public authorities and local agencies should proactively work to better inform local communities about the impacts of new migrants and work more closely with the local media to dispel myths and ensure more balanced coverage.

• Public authorities should work closely with employers, trades unions and others to plan for services better; improve the evidence base at a local level; share best practice and resources; and establish who is best placed to support and facilitate integration.

• Central government and local authorities should work together to improve the evidence base and data on new migrant communities. Reliance on Census data alone is inadequate to capture rapid population change.

• The national press and broadcast media should follow clause 1 (accuracy) of the Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice and adhere to the National Union of Journalists Code of Conduct.

The report draws two key conclusions for the integration of new migrant communities.

First, the statutory duty under the RRA to promote good race relations (referred to as the race equality duty) is a potentially useful tool for public authorities to secure better integration of new migrants. Useful and thorough guidance issued by the CRE on promoting good race relations already exists but this guidance is not consulted because new migrants are not commonly considered ‘racial groups’ among public authorities. In order for public authorities to realise fully the benefits of proactively meeting the race equality duty it will be necessary for the CRE to provide a stronger articulation and understanding of ‘good race relations’ as one which encompasses new migrant communities, both white and non-white, and in doing so captures the increasing diversity among the UK’s ‘minority’ population. The good practice on integrating new migrants that we highlight in this report offers some practical guidance to complement this broader understanding of ‘good race relations’.

Second, while valuable guidance from the CRE and central support from government is critical for supporting the conditions within which public authorities can best meet the challenges of increasing diversity, the current pace and nature of migration increasingly renders the successful integration of new migrants a local project. As such, the report concludes that the focus of policymakers should be on how to build and harness local capacity to integrate new migrant communities.
1. Introduction

As early as 2003, the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) was calling for a critical reappraisal of the policy of multiculturalism, and promoting instead the values of integration. At the heart of this challenge to multiculturalism was the widespread feeling that multicultural policy had privileged the ‘multi’ over a common culture and had led to a situation where many led ‘parallel lives’ (see, for example, Phillips 2005). The CRE has since developed an integration agenda, which aims to achieve an integrated society in Britain through the provision of three core concepts: participation, equality and interaction.

Indeed, the challenge of integration has never been higher on the government’s agenda. The UK model of multiculturalism has been challenged in recent years, most notably by the 2001 disturbances in many northern towns, the growing diversity of the UK’s population and the London bombings of 7 July 2005. These have all raised doubts about the health of community relations in the UK. Despite a relatively good record of eliminating racial discrimination and promoting good race relations, UK policymakers are realising that old assumptions and familiar policy interventions may no longer be appropriate. This has been coupled with widespread public anxiety about immigration, growing diversity and the rise of extremism in some communities.

One reason for this is the scale and nature of recent immigration. The arrival of economic migrants, asylum seekers, international students, and, most recently, workers from the new member states of the European Union (EU), has resulted in a rapidly changing map of diversity across the UK (Kyambi 2005). While areas where immigrants have traditionally settled have become more diverse than ever, other areas that have hitherto not been used to immigration have also received relatively large numbers of newcomers. These more diverse populations have brought about new integration challenges and a growing awareness that race and community relations are increasingly forged and broken along fault lines other than that of colour alone.

This new diversity raises a number of important questions about integration and race relations that have not yet been answered effectively. What are the impacts of this increased immigration and changing diversity on integration? What does increased diversity mean for the integration of newcomers? What conflicts have arisen and how are they being resolved? How are public authorities responding? What measures will be most effective in facilitating integration?

Answering some of the questions relating to new communities and increasing diversity is made all the more difficult by the lack of a suitable evidence base (Castles et al 2001). While there is no shortage of literature on immigration and diversity in the UK, there is very little research that looks at the reception and integration of recent immigrants or captures the nuances of diversity amongst new migrant communities. Indeed, a recent progress report on the Government strategy to improve race equality and community cohesion (DCLG 2006a) identified the following areas as characterised by a significant knowledge gap:

- the experiences and outcomes of specific ethnic groups within the white population, particularly for white migrants from eastern Europe; and,
- evidence on what works in improving community cohesion at a local level.

This report aims to fill these knowledge gaps and contribute to policymaking on integration by looking at the reception and integration of new migrant communities in the
UK, paying particular attention to the tensions arising from their arrival and settlement. The report presents the results of original primary research conducted with new migrant communities, ethnic minority communities and settled white communities in six locations in England and Scotland. It draws on quantitative statistics and interviews with ‘stakeholders’ - representatives from local authorities, and the public and voluntary sectors - in these and a further four locations.

The report also looks at what role race relations legislation, particularly the race equality duty (a set of obligations under the RRA, which public authorities have to comply with), can play in preventing and resolving conflicts that arise from the arrival of new migrants. This is also an important but relatively under-researched area of enquiry. It is not yet clear how far the recent changes to race relations legislation are being implemented by public authorities to account for the needs of new migrant communities. Neither is it clear how the duty to promote good race relations (part of the race equality duty) is manifesting itself in areas that have attracted more and more diverse newcomers. This is particularly important, because the 2006 Equality Act provides the Commission on Equality and Human Rights with a duty to promote good relations between all groups in society that share a ‘common attribute’, and not just between racial groups (Section 10 of The Equality Act).

The structure of this report

Chapter 2 of this report provides an outline of the methodology used (briefs on all ten of the research locations can be found in Appendix A).

Chapter 3 presents the findings on the reception of new migrants, focusing on the attitudes towards migration of members of UK communities, and chapter 4 assesses the role of public authorities in the integration of new migrants. Chapter 5 considers the role of local factors in determining the reception and integration of new migrant communities and chapter 6 goes on to assess the role of the race equality duty, particularly the duty to promote good race relations.

The final chapter sets out a framework of guidance on integrating new migrants and draws out a set of key lessons that will directly inform the work of policymakers, practitioners and public service providers.
2. Methodology

Locations

The research undertaken for this report was based around ten locations throughout England and Scotland, representing a variety of rural and urban areas, as well as a mix of cities, districts and boroughs. The aim was to provide a picture of how new migrants have been received in a variety of different locations and communities. Through desk-based research into local area information (press reports and population statistics), our focus narrowed to ten locations. As well as providing a broad regional spread over England and Scotland, the ten locations were picked on the following basis:

- **Demography:**
  - The ten locations needed to include both rural and urban locations, both experiencing the influx of new migrants.
  - All the areas had experienced rapid population change, so we could establish the influence of population change on prospects for integration and reception.

- **Diversity:**
  - The ten locations needed to provide a comparison between areas with a number of highly diverse minority communities (both settled and new) and those experiencing very little diversity. The aim of this was to help us establish how previous experience of local diversity might shape the prospects for the reception and integration of new migrant groups, and if the reception of new migrants might differ between established white and established ethnic minority groups.
  - The type of previous migration was also looked into, including the history of asylum seekers, refugees or short-term economic migrants.

- **Socio-economic:**
  - We aimed to look at areas with different labour market conditions, including employment rates, to test what influence they had on integration and reception outcomes.

The study involved desk-based research, quantitative analysis, stakeholder interviews and focus groups in six primary locations that provided the best mix of these demographic, diversity and socio-economic factors:

- Barking and Dagenham (London borough);
- Birmingham (English city);
- Crewe (English city);
- Edinburgh (Scottish city);
- Perth (Scottish rural area); and
- South Holland (English rural area).
Desk-based research, quantitative analysis and limited stakeholder interviews were conducted in a further four secondary locations chosen to supplement the findings from the primary locations:

- Berwick-upon-Tweed (English rural area);
- Luton (English city);
- Slough (English city in greater London area); and
- Sunderland (English city).

Figure 1: Map of the ten case study areas located across England and Scotland

Quantitative research

Quantitative data in this report comes from three main sources: Census 2001; the Worker Registration Scheme (WRS); and National Insurance Numbers data (NINo). Further details of these sources can be found in Appendix C.

Qualitative research

Qualitative research for this project involved both focus groups and interviews with ‘stakeholders’, representatives from local authorities, and the public and voluntary sectors.
1. **Focus groups**
A total of 17 focus groups were organised in the six primary locations, using a professional and accredited recruitment agency to recruit the research participants. Each focus group consisted of six to eight individuals, both men and women and aged between 25 and 50, and lasted for approximately an hour. Participants were paid a small amount as an incentive to attend. Focus groups were divided primarily according to location and ethnicity. There were eight groups with participants from settled white communities, four with participants from ethnic minority communities, four with participants who were new eastern European migrants and one with participants who were highly skilled migrant workers of mixed nationalities. The eight white groups were also differentiated by ‘social grade’, a demographic classification system commonly used in social science research in the UK. Three of the white groups were ‘middle class’ (ABC1 according to the classification system) and five were ‘working class’ (C2DE according to the classification system). Migrant groups were broadly classed as being either settled (having been in the UK for more than ten years) or newly arrived (having arrived in the last ten years as either asylum seekers or as migrants from eastern Europe).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ethnicity/migrant group</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Settled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Settled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>C2DE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Settled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>C2DE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>Eastern European</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>ABC1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>C2DE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Highly skilled migrants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>C2DE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Eastern European</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>ABC1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>Eastern European</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>Eastern European</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>ABC1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>C2DE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **‘Stakeholder’ interviews**
A total of 50 in-depth interviews were conducted with stakeholders from each of the ten locations. Stakeholders included at least one representative from the local authority in each location, and representatives from the public and voluntary sectors. One employer was interviewed, in the Lothians region of Scotland. A full list of interviewees is provided in Appendix B. The interviews were intended to help us gauge the way public services were responding to the arrival of new migrant communities and to what extent the race equality duty was adhered to as part of this response.

---

1 The exception to this were two focus groups in South Holland, where, due to the difficulty in reaching Eastern European migrants through an accredited recruiter, personal contacts, snowballing and the help of a community researcher were used to recruit participants.
Interviewees held a variety of positions within the hierarchy of their organisations, from chief executives and directors to managers and frontline staff, to help us capture a broad spectrum of evidence from across public authorities. However, all interviewees were given a guarantee of anonymity, so their quotes in this study are referenced only by the location of the interviewee, where available, and the interviewee’s role at the time of the interview. Individual job titles and specific roles have been omitted.

Definitions

‘New migrants’ are defined in this report as: asylum seekers; refugees; migrants from the eight central and eastern European countries that joined the EU in 2004; and other migrant groups who have arrived in the UK within the last ten years. Migrants who have been here for longer periods are described as settled or established.

Although asylum seekers, refugees and economic migrants are not racial groups under the Race Relations Act (RRA), individuals within these groups can be legitimately considered within discussions of race in this study on the basis of their colour, race, nationality, and ethnic or national origin – criteria which fully protects all individuals from racial discrimination under the RRA.

When reference is made to the duty or race equality duty, this refers to the general duty that applies to all public authorities under the Race Relations Act 1976 (RRA) to promote race equality. This part of the act requires them: to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination; to promote equality of opportunity between persons of different racial groups; and to promote good relations between persons of different racial groups.

While there are many different forms of conflict, it is defined in this report as conflict between and within racial groups. This report defines ‘racial groups’ in accordance with the RRA: those groups of people who are defined by their colour, race, nationality or ethnic or national origin. Conflict itself can be understood as both positive and negative. Positive conflict is channelled through debates which help build trust and solutions (Kremer & Schermbrucker 2006). However, this report focuses predominantly on negative conflict, which includes instances of ‘physical and psychological violence, which hurt or humiliate and so generate antagonism, harden disputes and/or damage trust and relationships’ (ODPM 2004). This definition is broad enough to accommodate racist views, attitudes and harassment, all of which - whether real or perceived, expressed publicly or privately - are classified in this report as forms of psychological violence which contribute to and reinforce negative conflicts between and within racial groups.

This report uses the term ‘integration’ to describe the process through which new migrants are received by established communities and have opportunities to participate as full and equal members of the society. However, as the term ‘community cohesion’ is closely linked to ‘integration’ in policymaking discourse (LGA 2004, 7), occasional references to ‘community cohesion’ are also mentioned in the report. These two terms are frequently used to describe similar policy aims, but ‘integration’, as it is largely used in this report, best encompasses the two-way process that is needed to ensure successful integration - a process which places the responsibility for integration on all members of society, from all ethnic groups. This definition is also consistent with the CRE’s understanding of integration - one which is underpinned by participation, equality and interaction.
3. The reception of new migrants

This chapter presents our research findings on the different types of conflict provoked by the arrival of new migrant groups in the six primary research locations. The discussion of our findings draws primarily from our qualitative work with local communities and stakeholders. Our findings highlight a complex picture of the reception of new migrants.

Summary of key findings

- There are no reported widespread conflicts or patterns of violence between established and new migrant communities.
- Contrary to many opinion polls, migration does not feature as a significant concern among established communities.
- The role of race, ethnicity and religion influences how migrants are received, with white eastern European migrants reporting a more positive reception than non-white migrants.
- Hostilities and tensions centre largely on misperceptions about new migrant communities, with a wide gap between evidence and perceived reality. The role of the media emerges as a key influence in fuelling misperceptions.
- Any underlying tension or hostility toward new migrant communities centres around jobs and wages; welfare entitlements and housing; impacts in public services; and cultural threats.
- The greatest hostilities stem from perceived economic injustice and are most prevalent among economically vulnerable groups, white and ethnic minority alike.

The findings of this study uncovered no evidence of widespread conflict or patterns of organised violence between new immigrant communities and the rest of the local population in any of the ten research locations. Local authorities, service providers and the local communities we met during the course of this study reported relatively low levels of violent conflict and hostility between new migrant and settled communities. Equally as significant, and contrary to many recent opinion polls, migration did not feature as a pressing concern for any of the communities we engaged during the course of this study. This is consistent with recent CRE/Ipsos MORI research (2007) that found that immigration was seen as an important issue for the nation, but not a priority issue for people personally. Instead, local issues such as transport and crime cropped up when focus group participants were asked what they thought were some of the negative aspects of their community or how they thought their community had changed for the worse.

However, our findings also show that the reception of new migrant communities is largely influenced by misperceptions about migrants’ entitlements to welfare and housing; misperceptions about their impact on jobs, wages and public services; and a perceived cultural threat posed by migrants in the English case study locations. These perceptions are fuelled by untruths and misinformation, with the media playing an influential role. The reception of new migrants is also heavily influenced by the dynamics of race, ethnicity and religion in the English locations.
The extent of conflict between communities

In their analysis of community conflict, Lemos and Crane (2004) highlighted the fact that community conflict often arises when a new division, such as the arrival of new migrants, is overlaid on an already disadvantaged community.

However, the types of violent and aggressive conflict that were uncovered during the course of this study were overwhelmingly perceived to be one-off incidents between individuals from different communities that were often fuelled by alcohol and anti-social behaviour, and not always related to the migrant’s ethnic origin. The sporadic and ‘one-off’ nature of these incidents were reported by all the communities - both migrant and local, across urban and rural communities alike.

Despite the low-level nature of the conflict reported, the frequency of incidents varied between communities. Of all research participants, eastern European migrants had the least experience of violent or racist abuse, whereas ethnic minorities and non-white migrants reported a higher frequency of racist incidents and abuse in the English and Scottish locations.

‘There are 300 people at my company. Sometimes there’s a problem with communication but of those that don’t accept Polish people, it’s perhaps 1% maybe.’

(Eastern European male migrant worker, South Holland)

In contrast, a higher frequency of violence and abuse was reported among ethnic minority groups and non-white migrants, perpetrated by individuals from both white and other ethnic minority groups. A significant minority of ethnic minority research participants reported a higher frequency of incidents of name-calling, spitting, damage to property and racially motivated violence against them than Eastern European migrants. This would suggest that the dynamics of race and colour negatively influence the sort of reception that non-white migrants receive. This was no less apparent in Scotland, where non-white (highly skilled) migrants also reported a higher frequency of racist incidents that white migrants.

‘My kids were in the garden speaking in our language and our neighbour shouted to us “in England, we speak English”.’

(Nigerian female, Birmingham)

Although racist abuse was reported more among non-white migrants and ethnic minorities, it was not characterised by a clear-cut ‘black and white’ divide, but extended to relations between different ethnic minority communities. Somali participants reported the highest number of racist abuse of all participants, perpetrated by non-white groups as much as it was by white groups. Their experience emerged as one compounded by a mix of their colour, nationality and (perceived) migration status as asylum seekers. The Somali participants were quick to identify the main cause of such abuse as that of negative public perceptions and stereotypes of asylum seekers, which had ‘labelled’ the whole community. This is consistent with strong evidence highlighting negative public attitudes towards asylum seekers (Lewis 2005; Coe et al 2004; Finney & Peach 2005). The findings of our work strongly indicate that negative public attitudes to asylum cut across ethnic minority communities.
It’s a very cosmopolitan area but there are lots of clashes with white people but also with black people. They say, “go back to your own country.”

(Somali male, Birmingham)

A small amount of reported violence within the Somali and eastern European communities was characteristic of those mirroring international conflicts or domestic crime patterns in the country of origin. These were found to be infrequent and involving only a minority of individuals from the respective communities.

Reported incidents of violent conflict and hostility between new migrant and settled communities were infrequent and lacked common characteristics. This was backed up by relatively low levels of racial incidents reported by police and local authorities in the six areas of primary research. Although these figures do not include unreported incidents of racial violence, they remain one important indicator of violent conflict among local communities, and one which concurs with the qualitative findings of this study.

**Types of hostility and tension characterising the reception of new migrants**

**Hostile attitudes to new migrants: jobs and wages**

A significant number of research participants had hostile attitudes towards migrants that were closely linked to perceived economic threats - specifically job displacement and wage deflation at the low skilled end of the labour market. These attitudes were overwhelmingly concentrated among the C2DE groups who felt more vulnerable to economic competition. This hostility was largely directed towards eastern European migrants in all locations, but was often extended to other migrant communities in more diverse areas, although participants in these areas often referred to different migrant groups under the generic term of ‘immigrant’ when talking about jobs and wages.

‘There should be more attention on finding jobs for British people.’

(White female, C2DE, Barking and Dagenham)

Although these attitudes were found across both rural and urban locations, they were particularly acute in those areas with higher unemployment levels. This is consistent with other analysis on attitudes to immigration which link anti-immigrant sentiment to economic deprivation and the fear of further financial decline. Such analyses have found that negative attitudes are more pronounced among those who are most directly affected by the competition of migrant workers (Dustmann & Preston 2003; Fetzer 2000; Lewis 2005).

This is a worrying trend given that most of the evidence shows that this level of concern about jobs and wages is not justified. Most analyses of the empirical effects of immigration on labour markets in the UK have demonstrated that the impact of immigration on wages and employment prospects is minimal, although there may be some short-term effects (Glover et al 2001; Portes & French 2005; Gilpin et al 2006). Some of these effects might include wage deflation and a degree of job displacement, but this is far from certain and more research needs to be done in this area.

There were notably more positive attitudes found in the Scottish locations for this study. White communities, including those from the skilled and unskilled working classes, were far more assertive about the positive economic contributions that migrants make to the local economies in filling jobs that many local people did not want to take:
'They’re not coming for the weather. There are lots of jobs that have to be done. It’s good for the economy: they are earning money, they are spending money.'
(White male, C2DE, Edinburgh).

‘Wages have been down for years. The difference for me is that a Polish girl will get up at half five to clean a room whereas I wouldn’t.’
(White female, ABC1, Perth).

The fact that there were more positive responses from Scottish participants than English participants is likely to be to because there have been far fewer migrants to Scotland.

‘There are more migrant communities in London. If there were more numbers in Edinburgh, there would be more tensions. If there were dense numbers in Edinburgh, there would be more tensions.’
(White female, C2DE, Edinburgh).

However, stakeholders noted that the smaller scale of migration in Scotland was only likely to be part of the explanation for the more positive reception of migrants that we uncovered in this study.

‘The picture in Scotland regarding attitudes can be put down to a different scale of number and the fact that we have a different political climate, better media coverage and the Fresh Talent scheme². Also, the BNP has had virtually no success here.’
(Representative, CRE Scotland).

These findings are consistent with other research findings and polls showing Scotland to be more positive in attitudes to asylum seekers and other migrant groups (CRE/Ipsos MORI 2007, Lewis 2006; MORI/Oxfam 2004). Chapter 5 presents a fuller discussion of why we found regional differences between Scotland and England in the way new migrants were received.

**Hostile attitudes to new migrants: welfare entitlements, social housing and community support**

Much of the hostility towards new migrants stemmed from the perception that new migrant communities were given preferential treatment over established communities. This underpinned strong feelings of economic injustice, and in some cases overlaid existing tensions between ethnic minority communities who were already in competition for community grants and resources. Such negative sentiments were disproportionately aimed at asylum seekers and were predominantly felt by ethnic minority and C2DE groups.

‘They think it’s great, they love it, they get off a lorry and are given everything... money, a house, payouts.’
(White male, C2DE, Barking and Dagenham)

‘If we find that migrant workers are picking up council housing or rented accommodation, then I can see resentment building there. It would appear that the migrant worker community is getting better treatment because they’re getting council housing and yet they would have to go through exactly the same process as the indigenous population.’
(Local authority official, Birmingham)

² The Scottish Executive’s ‘Fresh Talent’ initiative aims to redress demographic trends by attracting hard-working and motivated people to live, study and work in Scotland. It has been accompanied by the ‘One Scotland’ campaign, designed to tackle racism.
Hostile views about the perceived levels of access migrants had to welfare entitlements, social housing and other benefits were expressed by both white and ethnic minority respondents. ‘Other benefits’ that migrants were perceived as having access to from the state included free mobile phones, free food, and special business support to open shops.

Our research found that misperceptions about the resources available to migrants disproportionately affected asylum seekers and resulted in the negative stereotyping of large sections of communities. The negative stereotypes about asylum seekers stemmed largely from a lack of awareness, among nearly all of the research participants, of the government restrictions on asylum seekers taking up work. Consequently, asylum seekers were perceived to be the most disinclined to take up work. Even though some of the Somali research participants were not asylum seekers, they all felt as if they were perceived as such, and that this was the root cause of the hostility they had experienced.

‘They’re [asylum seekers] not prepared to work. Once they’re given the papers, they don’t want to work. They want the social security.’

(Nigerian female, Birmingham)

‘It’s hard to find anything positive to say about the Somali community.’

(White male, C2DE, Birmingham)

Hostility towards new migrants frequently stemmed from a strong sense of procedural unfairness, and was prevalent among the most economically vulnerable groups. Findings indicate that established ethnic minority groups are no less likely to express concerns related to unfair treatment than their white counterparts, even thought it might be expected that ethnic minority groups with some experience of what it is like to be an immigrant might be more inclined to hold pro-immigrant attitudes. Fetzer (2000) argues that contradictory results among this group are likely to be because ethnic minority participants are more likely to be economically marginalised themselves. Our research seems to concur with this theory. Many stakeholders expressed concern that feelings of economic injustice among ethnic minority participants toward new migrant communities were being overlaid onto, and aggravating, existing tensions between ethnic minority communities over competition for community grants and resources.

‘I’m worried about the attitude of longer established ethnic minorities. They say, ‘why should we be doing things for these people when no one did it for us?’’

(Scottish Executive official)

**Hostile attitudes to new migrants: impacts on public services and housing markets**

Considerable concern about the perceived impacts of new migrants on public services centred predominantly on health provision and schools. Often, the strain which had characterised many public services for years prior to the arrival of new migrant communities was blamed on the arrival of these migrants, and these problems were widely predicted to get worse should more arrive in the UK. These concerns were the strongest among those participants from the upper and lower middle classes and were noticeably acute in rural areas.

‘We need another doctor’s surgery and NHS dentist. With more coming to work, there would be a strain on services and this would create resentment from the home-grown population.’

(White male, ABC1, South Holland)
In rural areas, it was widely felt that the relatively limited public service infrastructure would have to expand, with more migrants coming in. In particular, research participants in these areas were concerned about the language needs of migrant workers’ children in local schools, and how this would have an adverse affect on the resources and the number of school places for their own children. This was confirmed by many stakeholder interviews in the rural communities, which highlighted the concern of many local parents around the availability of school places and the displacement of teaching resources to provide language support for the children of migrant workers.

“They have a problem with attainment and adding in children with English as a second language is a problem. Also Catholic schools are very good and lots of local non Catholics want to send their children there but could soon find that there is a shortage of places because Poles want to send their children there.”

(Local councillor, Crewe)

It emerged that concerns were more acute in rural areas because they were smaller communities than urban areas, both spatially and in terms of population size. Hence, social change and its perceived impacts on public service provision were likely to be more apparent.

These attitudes were also more prevalent among research participants from the ABC1 groups, suggesting that concern about public services is also likely to be shaped by income and higher tax contributions to public services than those from lower income groups. Fetzer (2000) and Dustmann and Preston (2003) argue that those who worry most about the use of publicly funded public services are usually the ones who are contributing the most through taxation.

More negative views emerged over the perceived impacts of new migrants on local housing markets and the private rental sector. These were expressed across all social groups and centred on the affordability and availability of housing and rented property, which were widely believed to be reducing as new migrants move into the area.

“They are all on good money because of the hours they are working. Two of them like that can get a semi for £140,000. House prices have increased over the years. The area is no longer the cheapest in the country. Young people cannot get into the housing market because they are not getting salaries that match the cost of housing.”

(White female, ABC1, South Holland)

Much of the views around the housing markets overlapped with more embedded frustrations around rising house prices and the availability of affordable housing.

**Hostile attitudes to new migrants: cultural difference and integration**

The vast majority of white participants in the English locations felt that English culture was under threat from non-white communities. Cultural threats were seen to come from all groups, but were strongly associated with non-white migrant and established ethnic minority communities, as well as Muslim communities. Non-white and Muslim communities were seen as being more culturally different than eastern European migrants, and were consequently seen as more difficult to integrate.

Public policies and policymakers were perceived as being caught up in a politically correct culture that had permitted other cultures and religions to ‘flourish’ at the expense of English culture. Integration was seen as the responsibility of the migrant/minority community and widely interpreted as assimilation. It is interesting to note, however, that none of the aforementioned perceptions were evident among Scottish research
participants, possibly indicating a stronger sense of national identity or reflecting the relatively affluent characteristics of our two Scottish locations. However, this does not afford room for complacency, as the highly-skilled, Scottish non-white migrants reported a higher frequency of racist abuse than those of their highly-skilled, white migrant counterparts (See chapter 3).

Of those participants that did acknowledge the positive aspects of cultural diversity, all had had greater personal contact with migrants.

Fears were based on the perceived loss of English culture as well as feelings that other cultural values were being imposed upon English communities.

“We are turning into a different country. We’ll be the minority.’
(White female, C2DE, Barking and Dagenham)

These attitudes were stronger in rural communities which were commonly perceived to be less able to ‘absorb’ cultural diversity than areas which had more experience with immigration. Research participants in the rural locations were also less likely to differentiate between different migrant groups.

Again, the role of race, religion and ethnicity emerged as influential in determining reception to migrant communities, with cultural difference being closely associated with non-white communities and Muslim communities. All participants felt that white migrants had far fewer cultural differences than non-white or non-Christian communities, and it was therefore easier for them to integrate. Many interviewees also expressed the view that eastern European migrants had an easier integration experience because they were white.

“Well, if it’s Pakistan, it’s a totally different ball game because if you’re Pakistani, you’re Muslim and that controls every part of what you do. But if you’re Polish, then you can be a non-believer or Christian.’
(White male, ABC1, Crewe)

‘I think that because they are white, it makes a difference. Others stand out far more than the Polish who only stand out when they speak Polish.’
(Deputy Head, Crewe)

However, other research shows there are still negative sentiments directed towards eastern European migrants, at least partly driven feelings of procedural unfairness so our findings should not lead to a lower priority being given to integrating eastern European migrants.

Our research uncovered considerable resentment among white participants towards a politically correct climate in the UK which was perceived to be encouraging the celebration of other cultures at the expense of English culture. As a result, participants felt that they could no longer celebrate English culture for fear of being branded ‘racist’. The Government were seen as being to blame for this. Most participants also felt that more economic resources, public spaces and buildings were made available to enable communities to celebrate and share their culture and traditions, to the detriment of English culture.

‘People say you can’t celebrate Christmas and Easter, but they can celebrate their stuff. They’d never celebrate St George; they think it’s racist.’
(White female, C2DE, Barking and Dagenham)
Despite this, there was no clear sense of what constituted ‘English culture’. Participants mentioned Christianity, Christian festivals, the English language and the St. George's flag, but also acknowledged that few of these characteristics actually characterised their lives.

White groups engaged in this study saw integration as the responsibility of the migrant or minority community and did not recognise that they themselves might have a role in facilitating this process. As a result, successful integration was interpreted as the assimilation of migrants into a ‘British’ way of life. Some of the strongest views on assimilation were directed towards Muslim communities, and were prominent even among rural communities that had had very limited experience of a Muslim community. These views on assimilation were notably absent from Scottish research participants and instead, many characterised Scotland’s reception to migrants as ‘welcoming’ in contrast to what they knew of the English reception to migrants.

‘You have to comply with the community, whichever community you move to. You have to be part of that community. You would have to try and fit in ... abide by the rules. You do your thing, but don’t expect us to build your mosque. You do your own thing and we’ll do our own thing.’

(White male, ABC1, Crewe)

‘During Ramadan, we gave them time off. They should leave their religion behind. I don’t agree with it.’

(White female, C2DE, Crewe)

The most positive views about other cultures and prospects for integration were from white participants who mixed regularly with migrants and people from ethnic minorities through their workplace, local schools, neighbours or through family history (Fetzer 2000). This is in line with some of the proponents of contact theory who suggest that true acquaintance as opposed to casual contact decreases prejudice (Fetzer 2000; Valentine and McDonald 2004). Other research has found that people who have had meaningful, more personal contact with migrants and ethnic minority groups tend to have positive attitudes towards them (Lewis 2005). A recent study in South Holland on migrant labour also found that the majority of local people who knew migrant workers (52.5 per cent of those surveyed) had a positive attitude towards them and understood the reasons why they had come to the area (Zaronaitė 2006).

**Hostile attitudes to new migrants: racism**

Our findings found that only a small minority of the views expressed among all participants were racist. The majority of racist views were apparent among the white participants, across both rural and urban communities alike. Some participants feared that migrants would erode their sense of community and these were based either on views of ‘pure’ ethnic communities or negative stereotypes of certain types of communities.
4. Public authorities and the integration of new migrants

This chapter looks at what public authorities can do to help integrate new migrants, drawing out examples of good practice and highlighting wherever possible why this practice proved successful.

Our research found that new migrant groups present some new challenges for public authorities that differed from the needs of better established ethnic minority groups, but were not seen to be insurmountable. There were no notable differences in the scale and nature of the challenges posed between England and Scotland. However, notable differences did emerge between rural and urban areas in England and Scotland. The response of public authorities to the integration of new migrant communities was mixed, particularly in rural areas unaccustomed to diversity, but innovative practice was apparent in some areas. The research identified five main characteristics underpinning the impacts of new migrant communities and the subsequent responses made by public authorities.

Summary of key findings

- New migrant groups present new challenges for some public services that are different from the needs of more established ethnic minority groups. These new challenges centre more around language interpretation and improving the accessibility of services.

- Pressures on service provision are particularly acute among public authorities in rural areas, which have little experience of accommodating diversity, and where pressures on resources are sometimes created because funding formulae used by government departments are out of step with recent population changes.

- While some pressures exist, this does not reflect the pressures often reported in national and media discourse, or those reported by public authorities and service providers.

- Efforts to integrate new migrants are often reactive and have emerged in response to frontline pressures.

- Despite this, where effective responses have emerged, they have often been innovative, and characterised by partnership working; effective communication with local communities (for instance, ‘myth-busting’), and efforts to improve the local evidence base on new migrants as a basis for further policy action to improve the integration of new migrants into the local community.

Impacts of new migrants and the response of public authorities

New migrants present new challenges for some public services

It is unsurprising as new migrants present different challenges for public services from the needs of more established ethnic minority groups, because they have a different profile to that of the established communities. In addition, there are varying levels of need within new migrant groups. For example, people seeking asylum and refuge in the UK present a very different set of needs to service providers than highly-mobile, eastern European migrant workers. And unsurprisingly, the highly skilled migrants engaged in this research
had found integration far less problematic because of higher levels of mobility, skills and, in Scotland, a political climate geared towards attracting highly skilled migrants (the Fresh Talent initiative).

Despite being highly diverse, new migrants often present common challenges for public services that centre on language interpretation and information provision. Rural areas, although used to migrant labour, have been unprepared for greater numbers of migrants arriving at short notice with needs such as translation and extensive information provision. In both our rural and urban case studies, citizens advice bureaux (CABs) and some schools reported insufficient capacity or resources to deal with an increased demand for special services such as translation and English language tuition. A recent report by West Lothian Council reported that the extra time given to migrant workers in the local area due to language difficulties was putting pressure on service provision to local customers (West Lothian Council 2006). While there is already considerable capacity within some local authorities to deliver English language support (particularly those with diverse populations, like Edinburgh), the level of provision in other local authorities is less comprehensive. For instance, the Tayside report noted that 46% of migrant workers who could potentially have benefited from English language support appear not to have had any form of support (Scottish Economic Research 2006).

However, it is important to note that nearly all of the public authorities in rural areas did not report this problem as being one of newcomers per se, but more one of a lack of experience in accommodating diversity within service provision. For example, all public authorities acknowledged the need for migrant workers to fill skill and labour shortages in the local economy, and shared a common conviction that different needs had to be met within service delivery, but stated that they often lacked the experience and knowledge to accommodate this diversity within their structures and processes, because their local population had never really experienced cultural diversity before. In many cases, this had an effect on their ability to access additional funding that could ease current pressures.

‘[Migration] is not a major problem for us. But it’s got specific problems. The only problem for us is that it’s never happened. I mean if I was sitting in London talking to you it would just be the latest wave of, wouldn’t it? But for here, this is quite amazing.’

(Teacher, South Holland)

Our research also indicated that current funding formulae used by government departments may, in some cases, be out of step with current population movements and migration realities on the ground.

Box 1: Meeting new migrants’ needs within current funding formulae

The Lincolnshire Ethnic Minority Achievement Service has a mandate to support schools with pupils for whom English is not a first language. Its 2005/06 Standard Fund budget for Lincolnshire is approximately £165,000, which is the same as five years ago in real terms, despite the increase in the numbers of pupils with English as an additional language. This is because the formula used to calculate funding depends solely on numbers and educational outcomes of ethnic minority pupils, and most migrants in Lincolnshire would be classed as ‘White Europeans’, the same ethnic group as native British pupils.

Although the DfES Standards Fund budget is supplemented by core funds from Lincolnshire County Council and some money from a children’s fund, the latter is the only funding that has increased significantly in recent years.
Ensuring that funding formulae are in line with large population movements and migration realities in both rural and urban areas is important for a number of reasons. First, it ensures that public authorities have sufficient capacity and resources to meet the needs of migrant workforces – often highly mobile communities that support and contribute to local economies and industries. For example, many Citizens Advice Bureaux have a history of meeting the needs of migrant workers in rural areas but have faced limits on this role in recent years as the numbers have increased (CAB 2005).

Second, it is important for the integration of migrants within the wider community itself. As chapter 3 outlined, much hostility among established communities springs from the perception that public services are being stretched to breaking point by new migrants. While many of these views were out of proportion to the actual impacts we uncovered, there were some public authorities that reported how pressures on their services were causing disproportionate amounts of resentment among established communities. Many parents, for example, felt that children were being disadvantaged because of the language support needed for children of migrant workers. More worryingly, the opportunity to promote integration and tolerance was being lost as children often brought their parents’ negative views into the classroom. While many staff were committed to challenging such views, resource issues made it difficult to address these satisfactorily.

“We’re seeing children coming in to our classes who may or may not have problems and we’re seeing the attitude of our kids being moulded by the attitude of their parents. We’re getting the “they are taking our jobs. They are taking our houses”.

(School teacher, South Holland)

However, extra funding from central Government and the Scottish Executive should not be seen as the only solution to such pressures. While it may ease short-term pressures, building local capacity to handle increasingly mobile populations should look at longer-term, more sustainable solutions such as ensuring better and more flexible ESOL provision across the UK. Some of these pressures could also be eased by local agencies using resources more efficiently or working more in partnership with each other to improve service delivery. Work by the Audit Commission on service use and provision in London with regard to asylum seekers and refugees found that while rising numbers had increased pressures on some services in the capital, some boroughs made better use of resources than others and recommended that local, regional and national agencies should work together to improve the quality of services for these groups (Audit Commission 2000).

Current pressures do not reflect the magnitude of those reported in national and media discourse

One of the most notable differences between individuals’ responses and the responses of those working for public authorities, was in the way they felt about the impact of new migrants on public services. People working in public authorities reported some challenges, but nothing that was insurmountable. However, the research participants felt new migrants were placing a significant strain on public services, and that migrants were ‘swamping’ the UK, as reflected in reporting by the national media. The actual impact is often difficult to measure in quantitative terms, because authorities such as strategic health authorities and primary care trusts in England do not collect specific data on the number of occasions when services are provided to migrants or to any other groups. However, our qualitative work for this study covered a significant sample of opinion from a number of different public authorities, which revealed a wide discrepancy between the impact as reported by the national media, and actual local impacts on public services. Work by Arai (2005) on media reports of the impact of new migration on public services found a similar mismatch between reported impacts and actual or evidenced impacts.
‘There’s not significant cries for help or panic about the presence of Polish people.’

(Lothian and Borders police representative)

The public authority representatives we spoke to also talked about using the arrival of new migrants as an opportunity to increase cultural diversity awareness among the wider community. For example, a local school in Lincolnshire initiated a ‘Polish day’, during which Polish pupils could share stories of their life in Poland and aspects of their culture with other pupils. In other cases, public authorities worked to influence broader regional policy on migration to improve integration outcomes for migrants. The South Holland CAB, for example, succeeded in securing a place on the steering group of the Migrant Worker Project being undertaken by South Holland District Council and the regional development agency. This offered the CAB the opportunity to influence local and regional outcomes by reminding policymakers that facilitating the integration of migrant workers needs to be taken into consideration when promoting regional economic development.

The public authority representatives spoke much more in terms of the opportunities afforded by new migration, rather than the problems, particularly about eastern European migrant workers, who they thought were hardworking and a support to the local economy. Where problems were identified with regard to new migrant groups, they were articulated in terms of specific challenges and not burdens. Even when faced with communities with often high levels of basic needs and limited opportunities to participate in wider society, such as asylum seekers and refugees, public authorities pointed to the need for more flexibility in service provision, more resources or a better understanding of a community’s needs, but never spoke in terms of an impending crisis or an infrastructure stretched to breaking point by newcomers.

Box 2: Press headlines on the impacts of new migrants

‘Claim Scots suffer as more Poles need services’

The Scotsman, 26 October 2006

‘East European children at UK schools double in year’

The Telegraph, 17 September 2006

‘Four out of five migrants ‘take more from economy than they put back’

Daily Mail, 29 August 2006

‘Poles claiming UK benefit for children they left back home’

Daily Mail, 13 August 2006

‘Fury as migrant anglers ‘eat the fish’”

Telegraph, 8 August 2006

‘Secret report warns of migration meltdown in Britain’

Daily Mail, 29 July 2006

‘Asylum chaos in Britain’

The Sun, 19 June 2005

‘Asylum? We’ll get you a home in an hour’

The Sun, 2 June 2003

Many research participants, particularly in the smaller, rural locations, said that they learnt about eastern European migrant communities through seeing them in the local area. However, the local and regional press, as well as broadcast media, were also cited as an important and trusted source of information, particularly in Scotland. Recent work has highlighted the negativity of press coverage around recent migration (D’Onofrio & Munk...
2004; Arai 2005), and a poll suggested that the British public are more likely to say that recent migrants have had a negative impact on the country than some of their European counterparts (Financial Times/Harris Poll 2006). While some participants voiced scepticism about the reliability of the tabloid press, the vast majority repeated information they had read in the tabloid press. For example, at the time of conducting the focus groups, press coverage of Romanian and Bulgarian accession into the EU was prevalent, and this was reflected in the responses of many research participants, who expressed strong fears that ‘things would get much worse’ when Romania and Bulgaria joined the EU. This is consistent with other IPPR research on the influence of the media influence over public attitudes to asylum (Lewis 2005).

‘I watched last night a documentary on BBC1 that Bulgarians and Romanians are coming here for benefits.’

(Bangladeshi female, Barking and Dagenham)

‘You read things in the press about too many immigrants. We’re obviously making mistakes and not doing it properly.’

(White male, C2DE, Edinburgh)

There is a great deal of debate around the direct influence of the media on public attitudes. This is partly because people tend to choose a newspaper that reflects their views (Greenslade 2005; McLaren & Johnson 2004). Some work has highlighted how the media influences public attitudes in a number of different ways (Valentine & McDonald 2004), and other work has found that the media uses provocative and confusing terminology and presents inaccurate or misleading information (Buchanan et al 2003; D’Onofrio & Munk 2004; Arai 2005). Our research shows that the media impacts upon people’s views largely through the dissemination of inaccurate information and myths. This often wields a more direct influence in local areas, where there is a vacuum of information about new migrants and where little or no effort is made in the media to communicate accurate information about new migrants to the established communities.

**The main driver of integration efforts has been frontline pressures, but innovative practice is emerging**

In terms of service delivery, efforts to integrate migrants have been reactive - that is, they have often emerged in response to some of the immediate frontline pressures that have faced many public services - but have very rarely been the result of a proactive and planned strategy to meeting the needs of a new migrant group. The most prominent of these were pressures relating to language interpretation and ensuring services were accessible to new migrant communities. Some of these pressures were particularly acute in rural areas, which had had little prior experience of diversity.

These pressures are not unusual across many public authorities (CAB 2005), and many local authorities reported that, prior to 2004 EU accession, they had not expected the numbers of migrants to be as high as they were, and so they were unable to prepare for the nature and scale of migrants’ needs.

It is, however, encouraging to note that some public authorities have formulated innovative responses to facilitate the integration of new migrants. Together, it was evident that these were important first steps for securing greater interaction and participation within and between local communities, both settled and migrant.
These responses varied in nature, but common characteristics underpinning them all provide some indication of what worked well. These common features were:

1. strategic partnership working - planning and coordinating services;
2. effective communication with local communities;
3. efforts to improve the local evidence base on new migrants as a basis for further policy action on integrating new migrants.

Further details on these features are described in the rest of this chapter.

1. **Strategic partnership working - planning and coordinating services**
   
   Our research found that where public authorities had effectively worked together to facilitate the integration of new migrants, this had yielded several benefits. Not only had it pooled organisations’ different strengths and resources, but it had avoided duplication of programmes and had harnessed efforts to tackle the pressing needs of migrants.

   This type of working highlights the wider potential for using local strategic partnerships (LSPs) to facilitate local integration. LSPs can provide the foundation on which to build such effective partnership relationships, and have been identified as important for improving community cohesion more generally (DCLG 2006b). Where LSPs had been harnessed to this end by public authorities we spoke to in this survey, they had enabled ‘frontline’ organisations, which were familiar with migrant workers’ needs, to raise the profile of their work, get involved in local planning and decision-making, and share information with other organisations. In some cases, the nature of relationships between organisations changed in the process of partnership working, from being largely functional in nature to being one where partners were regarded as key to delivering better services and a respected source of information and advice. However, it was clear from our research that this potential had yet to be realised in many areas.

   **Box 3: Working in partnership to facilitate the local integration of migrants**
   
   In July 2005, Lincolnshire Police, South Holland CAB and Jobcentre plus prepared a ‘myth-busting’ leaflet on migrant workers. The leaflet aimed to secure the better integration of migrant workers in the local area. The nature of the partnership lent status and authority to the production and dissemination of the leaflets, and reassured migrant workers of local attempts to challenge prejudice toward their community.

   LSPs also offer the opportunity for public authorities to engage more with employers of migrant workers. This is helpful for several reasons. First, employers and recruitment agencies often play an important role in managing flows of migrants into a region (Pillai 2006; Stenning 2006). Working more with employers and recruiters can not only improve the local evidence base on migrant flows and patterns, but can also help local agencies better plan for service provision for migrants. Second, working with agency-led activities and employers can encourage the sharing and identification of best practice, and the development of standards and benchmarks for the employment of migrant workers. Employers of migrant workers are often already doing good work in integrating migrant workers, and sharing this would benefit other local agencies working in the area (Cooke & Spencer 2006). Many of the local authority representatives already recognised this.
It is an understanding that only the employers can give. It would be helpful if business would be open about how they plan to deal with new migrants.’

(Local authority official)

Through LSPs, local agencies can better position themselves to learn from any local examples of good practice, to be better informed about the scale and nature of migration flows to the area, and to identify who is best placed to facilitate integration outcomes in both the workplace and wider society. In these ways, LSPs could be effectively used to help build local capacity in dealing with rapid migration flows.

2. Effective communication with local communities

Communicating and engaging effectively with local communities also proved important to facilitating the integration of new migrants. Local activities to this end took different forms across our case studies, but were all characterised by proactive attempts to either dispel myths and misperceptions among the local community, or to inform the migrant community about available services and life in the UK.

For example, Lincolnshire Police produced a leaflet for migrant workers, available in seven different languages, to inform them about the law and improve their safety and awareness (Box 4). This accessible leaflet included basic information and illustrations on UK laws on drugs, alcohol, anti-social behaviour, weapons and road safety. Lothian and Borders Police have produced a similar leaflet to inform migrant workers and overseas visitors of local safety information and important contacts.
In addition to information and guidance leaflets, myth-busting literature can also be another way of communicating accurate information to the established communities in order to dispel myths, prevent potential tensions arising and keep local people well informed through the dissemination of accurate facts and information about the impacts of migrant workers, their rights and their entitlements. A study of four local authorities in 2002-2003 found that myth-busting activities and effective communication with local residents were central to local cohesion (DCLG 2006b). As our research found, misperceptions often lie at the heart of conflicts surrounding the arrival of new migrants into an area, and myth-busting initiatives can help to challenge these negative attitudes and misperceptions. The myth-busting leaflet produced by South Holland CAB, Lincolnshire Police and Jobcentre Plus (see point 2), provided answers to some of the widely-held myths and questions often asked among established communities (Box 5). These include why they have come to the area, their impacts on local employment, their rights to housing, benefits and healthcare, and their obligations with regard to matter such as council tax and driving licenses. The leaflet was modelled on a similar leaflet produced by Boston CAB in 2004, and a total of 10,000 copies were printed for local distribution. Other work has also suggested that such activity has also been found to be useful in combating myths about asylum seekers and refugees (Perry 2005; D’Onofrio & Munk 2004). However, it should be noted that in order to be successful, myth-busting efforts should appear to be unbiased and informatively address the legitimate concerns of local people (D’Onofrio & Munk, 2004). Forthcoming research from the ippr also highlights how important it is
to undertake myth-busting activities carefully and with a thorough consideration of the intended audience (Newman & Lewis 2007).

Box 5: Myth-busting leaflet by South Holland Citizens Advice Bureau

Some public authorities and employers are also providing ‘welcome packs’ for new migrants, as a good way of combining both basic information and guidance on local services and how to access them. Perth and Kinross Council is currently preparing a welcome pack, to provide information for all new migrants coming and prepare them for life in the local area. Many welcome packs also contain useful contact details for a range of voluntary and statutory organisations with responsibility for the services that migrants may require.

Public authorities and agencies can communicate with their local communities in many other ways. The CRE’s guide Promoting Good Race Relations: A guide for public authorities (CRE 2005) states that public authorities need to involve the communities they serve as part of their duty to promote good race relations. For example, public authorities should clearly explain their rationale for grant allocation between different racial groups to avoid misunderstandings and mutual resentment around perceived priority being awarded to some groups over others. Another important method of communication is through liaison with the local media. The chief executive of a local authority in a rural area reported that regular briefings with the media had encouraged the local papers to print more positive and accurate local stories about migration, including personal stories told by migrant workers themselves. Wider
evidence on asylum seekers suggests that personal stories of this kind are one of the most powerful ways of changing negative attitudes towards migrant workers (Newman & Lewis forthcoming).

Good communication with local communities is also central to the prevention of community conflicts, as the CRE’s SCI initiative learned through their work in facilitating dialogue (CRE 2006).

3. **Efforts to improve the local and regional evidence base**

Many local authorities and regional agencies took steps to improve the regional evidence base on migration in order to inform policymaking. Several studies have examined the regional and local impacts of new migrant communities (McKay & Winkelmann-Gleed 2005; Pillai 2006; Comedia 2005; University of the Highlands and Islands 2005 and forthcoming; Solutions 2005; Scottish Borders Council 2005; Scottish Economic Research 2006; Lothian Labour Market Unit 2006).

Building a local or regional evidence base on the impact of migration makes sense for several reasons. First, it is clear that UK regional dynamics are distinct and varied (Adams et al 2003), and second, the socio-economic profiles of migrants also vary across regions (Kyambi 2005). Improving the evidence base is also useful for informing local and regional policymaking on migration and planning for service provision.

The South Holland District Council, with funding from the East Midlands Development Agency, has established a project to assess the public service needs of South Lincolnshire in light of the increased dependence on migrant casual labour. The project seeks to strengthen business development in South Lincolnshire through the integration of migrant workers into local society. An important part of this was a report published in 2006 which examined the impacts of migrant labour, including a survey of local people, migrants and employers (Zaronaitė 2006).

**Box 6: Building a local evidence base to better inform policy and practice**

ASPIRE (Asylum Seekers Pursuing Integration, Refuge and Empowerment) is a Development Partnership covering Birmingham and Solihull, which aims to develop innovative solutions for supporting asylum seekers and organisations working with them, while they await a decision from the Home Office. The aim of ‘round two’ of the development partnership in the Birmingham and Solihull area was to draw the link between the Equal\(^3\) and community cohesion, taking an evidence-based approach. Evidence was therefore sought to inform community structures by undertaking research on refugees and asylum seekers in the local area. The research resulted in several projects being developed: ASPIRE, to support asylum seekers using Equal funding; European Social Fund Co-financing to develop information, advice and guidance and ESOL; and Trellis to develop an Employability Forum for refugees.

---

\(^3\) Equal is the European Social Fund initiative to test and promote new means of combating discrimination and inequality in the labour market.
5. The role of local factors

The previous chapter identified three common factors that underpinned successful local efforts to integrate new migrant communities: partnership working, communicating with local communities, and improving the evidence base. However, it is unlikely that this will apply in a uniform way to all local areas, or be uniformly appropriate in all areas. It is therefore necessary to account for the role and influence of local factors. This chapter outlines four local factors that emerged as important in determining the reception of new migrant communities in our ten case study locations. The findings point to the importance of locality in determining integration outcomes, and the need to better support local capacity to deal with the current pace of population movement and increased diversity.

**Local, regional and national demographics**

**Previous experience of immigration and ethnic diversity**

In English locations with little previous experience of immigration and diversity, there were greater fears around cultural threats among the established communities, and these were directed towards non-white communities and Muslim communities. Our findings also indicated that rural areas with little previous experience of immigration and diversity were finding it hard to adapt services to meet the needs of new migrant communities.

The same was not true in the Scottish locations, where previous experience of diversity did not appear to affect either the reception or integration of new migrants. The reasons why these trends do not hold for Scotland are discussed in the next section, ‘Country Differences: England and Scotland’.

Fear and hostility towards perceived cultural threats were stronger in rural areas that had little or no previous experience of migration or diversity (with the exception of Perth).

‘It feels like they don’t really want the change and don’t really want the change around them.’

(REC representative, Lincolnshire)

Other research shows that a lower proportion of ethnic minorities in a local population is strongly correlated with negative attitudes to immigration. A survey in 2003, for example, identified some key regional differences in attitudes (MORI 2003): 75 per cent of people in London agreed that it is a good thing that Britain is a multicultural society, compared with just 39 per cent in the North East. Other evidence on London, where communities are very mixed at ward level, has reported relatively low levels of prejudice (Stonewall 2003).

The strongest cultural threats in rural communities were associated with non-white migrants and Muslims (discussed in greater length in part 3), who made up a tiny proportion of the existing local population. The fact that such perceptions were based on relatively little personal experience of these communities would strongly suggest that the media plays an important role in informing local opinion about non-white and Muslim communities in rural areas with little experience of such diversity.

Service provision for migrant communities in rural areas had yet to be mainstreamed; in many cases current services had adapted to frontline pressures by providing add-on services. Training on diversity and racial equality were identified as essential.
‘We just weren’t used to it. We have had very little to do with immigration problems. We’ve had a stiff learning curve and had to train into things that we have never dealt with before and that meant we had more work than we had before.’

(CAB representative, South Holland)

In many respects, pressure on rural services can be expected, as more diverse groups of migrants take up available work in rural areas and present a broader spectrum of needs than that previously known to service providers. However, this will become harder to ignore as new migrant groups continue to diversify both geographically and demographically. Consideration must therefore be given as to how best to support those rural areas facing particular pressures of increasing diversity.

Country Differences: England and Scotland

Our research found a markedly more positive reception to new migrants in the Scottish locations than in the English locations. However, there is little room for complacency, as the Scottish experience of migration is not uniformly positive, and our findings are influenced by the choice of the Scottish case studies in which we carried out much of the original qualitative research. The reasons we found in our research for this more positive attitude as described below.

First, England and Scotland have a very different history of migration. It is only very recently that Scotland has experienced net immigration rather than emigration (from the early 1990s until 2002, inflows and outflows were approximately equal, and since then there have been small net in-migration gains of around 9,000 in 2002-03, 26,000 in 2003-04 and 19,000 in 2004-05) (National Statistics 2006) compared to a net gain of 185,000 for England in 2005 (National Statistics 2006; ONS 2006). However, Scotland has one of the fastest growing foreign-born populations in the UK (Kyambi 2005).

However, there have also been local differences in the history of migration in Scotland; our findings may therefore have been very different if we had chosen other sites within Scotland. For example, the vast majority of asylum seekers are to be found in Glasgow, whereas eastern European migrants are more likely to be located in rural areas and the highlands of Scotland. Other research has found the dispersal of asylum seekers to Glasgow played an important part in negatively influencing people’s attitudes to asylum (Lewis, 2006).

Second, the political leadership and language from the Scottish Executive on migration issues is positive, particularly with regard to economic migrants, and this has influenced the way in which people understand the need for, and benefits of, migration into Scotland. The Scottish Executive’s ‘Fresh Talent’ initiative, which aims to redress demographic trends by attracting hard-working and motivated people to live, study and work in Scotland, has been accompanied by the ‘One Scotland’ campaign, designed to tackle racism. Our research findings indicate that these efforts have helped people understand the positive benefits of migration. The Scottish Executive cites an aging population, a declining labour force and the desire to encourage cultural and ethnic diversity as catalysts for the creation of positive response to integration.

‘There are many jobs in Edinburgh. Foreigners are taking jobs that people don’t want to take.’

(White female, C2DE, Edinburgh)
‘They are most welcome. There is a chronic under-staff in hospital, and especially trades’ people. A bit of competition wouldn’t do any harm at all.’

(White male, ABC1, Perth)

This positive response from Scotland’s central government has changed the political context of official and public debate significantly. Diversity and migration are understood as a natural, inevitable and beneficial resource. Although largely based on economics and demographics, this provides a much better foundation from which to advance integration policy than the English national political discourse.

Third, there is a received wisdom that Scotland tends to be more welcoming to newcomers because of a strong sense of national identity, which many do not believe is under threat from migration. Our research found some evidence to support this view, as many research participants spoke of a ‘Scottish mentality’ that is more welcoming than other parts of the UK. Many eastern European research participants, who had had experience of other parts of the UK, also reported that Scots were more welcoming than other Britons. Of those that had not experienced other parts of the UK, many said that they had come to Scotland because informal networks of friends and peers already living in Scotland had told them that it was a friendly place.

Fourth, it is likely that the Scottish media has influenced the more positive reception that new migrant communities reported in this study. Much of the Scottish media tend to report more positive stories about new migrants communities and their contribution to the economy. More recent coverage of asylum seekers and refugees in the Scottish media has also been more positive following criticism of the Scottish tabloid press for exacerbating tensions in the run-up to the murder of an asylum seeker in Sighthill (Lewis 2005). Many Scottish participants cited the national and local media as an important source of information about new migrants. This is in line with polling evidence showing that 93% of Scots said that they formed their understanding of asylum issues through media sources (MORI/Oxfam 2004).

However, the story of the Scottish media is not uniformly positive and more recently there have been a few reports on the negative impacts eastern European migrants have on public services (see Box 7). The MORI/Oxfam research also found that few papers provided much context for the asylum stories that they covered and were overly reliant on spokespeople from one political party or right-wing think tanks (MORI/Oxfam 2004).
Box 7: A selection of recent press headlines in the Scottish press on new migrants

‘Asylum seekers left destitute’  
*Sunday Herald, 6 November 2006*

‘Migrants flout drink drive laws’  
*The Daily Record, 6 November 2006*

‘Fair hearing on asylum. A robust, compassionate policy is required’  
*The Herald, 27 October 2006*

‘Claim Scots suffer as more Poles need services’  
*The Scotsman, 26 October 2006*

‘Call for more GPs as practices “hit by east European influx”’  
*The Scotsman, 8 September 2006*

‘Benefits of immigration: Scotland wins in all ways from influx of new blood’  
*The Herald, 23 August 2006*

‘Where are the hordes of grasping migrants?’  
*The Herald, 18 August 2006*

‘Migrants from eastern Europe flooding into Scotland to fill skills shortage’  
*The Herald, 1 March 2006*

‘European migrants fill Scots vacancies’  
*Evening Times, 1 March 2006*

‘Highland hospitality courtesy of eastern Europeans; Rural tourism now depends on increasing numbers of migrants from Slovakia and Poland’  
*Sunday Herald, 14 November 2004*

**Housing**

**Local housing pressures**

Our research found a strong relationship between the affordability and availability of local housing and the extent of concern among research participants over the impact (real and perceived) of new migrants on housing markets.

Table 2 uses three indicators of the availability and affordability of local housing in our case study locations: difficulty of access to owner occupation; demand and supply of social housing; and percentage of owner occupied households. These indicators are sources from the Scottish Executive Housing Statistics (2001) and the Neighbourhood Statistics Service dataset.
Table 2: Relationship between local housing pressures and attitudes to new migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Difficulty of access to owner-occupation indicator, 2004* Household score</th>
<th>Social rented housing: percentage on the LA register % Households</th>
<th>Owner occupied: Owns with a mortgage or loan % Households</th>
<th>Housing pressures negatively associated with arrival of new migrant communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>NO - overall, research participants mentioned housing pressure as a broader local problem that was not strongly associated with the arrival of new migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>NO - housing pressures were not an overall concern and research participants made no association with local housing pressures and new migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>YES - housing pressures were mentioned by all research participants. Those from the established communities thought new migrants had exacerbated existing housing pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>YES - housing pressures featured as one of the top concerns of all research participants. Both white and ethnic minority groups thought new migrants were responsible for local shortages of both affordable and available housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>NO - Housing pressures were mentioned as broader problems to do with the housing markets and were in no way associated with new migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>NO - Housing pressures were mentioned as broader problems to do with the housing markets and were in no way associated with new migrants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Housing statistics for Scotland are not currently measured according to the indicators of ‘difficulty of access to owner-occupation’ and of ‘demand and supply of social housing’.

(Sources: DCLG, Neighbourhood statistics service (NeSS) dataset, 2004, 2005; Scottish Executive housing statistics from Census 2001)

---

* Households Score Jan 06. This is an indicator score, which gives a measure of access to affordable housing based on house prices and income/earnings. This indicator is a modelled estimate of the proportion of households unable to afford to enter owner-occupation on the basis of their income for 2002.

* Households Count Apr00-Mar01. Percentage of total households on the LA register of applications for social rented housing as at 1 April for each year of data.

* Households Percentage Apr01. All households counted in the area at the time of the 2001 Census, which were owned with a mortgage or loan.
In our case study areas, where housing availability and affordability were low, there was a stronger tendency to associate housing pressures with the arrival of new migrant communities. For instance, in both Barking and Dagenham and Birmingham, where there is a relatively lower percentage of owner occupied households (36 per cent and 33 per cent respectively) and a relatively higher proportion of households unable to enter owner occupation on the basis of their income (83 per cent and 75 per cent respectively), our research found housing to be a key concern among research participants and one that was explicitly linked to the arrival of new migrant communities. In other areas, housing either did not emerge as an important concern among research participants or was perceived to be a product of housing market pressures rather than the influx of migrants. Although two of the three indicators are not available for the Scottish case studies, the qualitative work highlighted these locations as somewhat exceptional because the research participants made no connection whatsoever between local housing pressures and the arrival of new migrants.

In those areas experiencing housing pressures, there was a conflation between an influx of new migrants and broader housing problems of availability and affordability which predated their arrival. Concern over the availability of housing was often simplistically linked to the arrival of new migrant communities, often based on misinformation. Social housing, for example, is only available to A8 migrants in England after they have been working for 12 months, but it was mistakenly thought to be a priority awarded to migrants over people who had been waiting longer for social housing.

‘The problem is that they feel a bit under siege themselves because they don’t have housing ... and then you add to that people from different communities and myths start to circulate.’

(REC representative, Lincolnshire)

Of course, while the arrival of new migrants into an area may affect local housing demand, it is important to note that no conclusive studies have been carried out on this issue and the evidence base is currently very small. Much of the work that has been carried out does not look at migrants’ use of housing, but at the barriers to their access (Arai 2005). The paucity of work on eastern European migrant groups and their use of housing is particularly notable (Phillips 2006).

Despite this, it is worth noting that asylum claimants housed by National Asylum Support Services do not take away social housing that would otherwise be available to UK nationals, or slow down their access. They are instead housed under quite separate arrangements, funded by the Home Office. Work permit holders and their dependents do not have access to social housing and A8 migrants in England have to be in continuous employment for more than 12 months and have satisfied the Habitual Residency Test before they are entitled to housing and homelessness assistance. Migrant inflows into an area, and any subsequent pressures on demand, should also be weighed against flows of people out of an area and to other parts of the UK (internal migration), which can often cancel out inflows.

These points, along with the lack of broader evidence on migrants’ use of public services, strongly indicate that broader housing pressures are often blamed on the arrival of new migrant communities without legitimate or substantiated evidence.

Disproportionately more concerns over housing emerged in Barking and Dagenham than in any of the other locations. This is likely to be a residual effect from the 2006 local elections, when the BNP campaign in Barking and Dagenham focused its campaign on local
concern over housing and changing demographics, falsely claiming that the council had a secret scheme to give African families £50,000 to buy local houses.

In all of the six primary locations, there were some pressures around the availability and affordability of housing, and this had already been prioritised as an issue to be addressed within a few local authorities. However, pressures around the availability and affordability of housing that emerged during the course of our qualitative work and which were specifically linked to new migrant communities were only prominent in Barking and Dagenham and Birmingham, suggesting that there is a relationship between the strength of local housing pressures and the tendency to attribute these pressures to the arrival of new migrants into the area.

Housing pressures in relation to new migrants did not emerge as a significant issue for concern in the Scottish locations. This could be considered somewhat surprising for two reasons. First, A8 nationals do not face the same restrictions as they would in England, but instead have the same housing rights and homelessness assistance as nationals from other EU states. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that this would provoke more resentment towards new migrants than in England, where restrictions apply. As it stands, the Code of Guidance on homelessness (Scottish Executive, 2006) has been inconsistently applied by Scottish local authorities. Some have abided by the code while others, including Glasgow City Council and Edinburgh City Council, have not. The reticence of some local authorities to apply the code is based on a concern that their homeless services would be unable to withstand large numbers of A8 nationals seeking assistance without recourse to public funds. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note the lack of influence this appears to have over the Scottish reception of new migrants when compared to the English context (see Appendix D for a fuller summary of A8 entitlements in the UK).

Second, there are a range of housing challenges at the local level in Edinburgh and Perth. The wider Edinburgh housing market is characterised by housing supply shortages in affordable housing (Scottish Executive 2004), and Perth and Kinross Council had to embark upon a new drive to tackle the severe shortage of affordable housing in Perthshire in September 2006. Despite these local housing issues, and the fact that housing was widely acknowledged to be an issue among participants in Perth and Edinburgh, none of the participants linked housing issues to influx of new migrants.

The fact that the Scottish participants did not blame housing problems on new migrants could be explained by the different magnitude of those problems in Scotland. While many housing issues are present across the UK, those in Scotland tend not to be of the same magnitude (Scottish Executive 2004). While the Barker Review found that house prices in the UK had risen on average by 2.0 per cent per annum in real terms over the last 30 years, the rate of increase in Scotland was considerably lower, at 1.5 per cent. Price changes in Scotland have also been less volatile, and the economy has not suffered the same reduction in economic activity associated with sharp adjustments in house prices (Barker 2004; Scottish Executive 2004). It is likely to be a combination of factors in the Scottish context, including the demographic factors described earlier in this chapter, which account for why housing does not feature as a significant factor in Scotland and why participants from the two Scottish locations did not link housing pressures with the influx of new migrants.

7 See www.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/tayside_and_central/5370276.stm
**Households of multiple occupation (HMOs)**

Our qualitative work with established communities and stakeholders highlighted some local concerns about the social effects of houses of multiple occupation (HMOs) upon integration prospects. Most migrants only have short-term plans to stay and so take up rented accommodation, often sharing with several other migrant workers. In South Holland for example, it is estimated that 59 per cent of migrant workers lived in HMOs, with nearly 14 per cent sharing their accommodation with 7-10 others (Zaronaitė 2006).

A number of council representatives and research participants reported a growing number of complaints about HMOs regarding the level of noise at unsociable hours as a result of migrants coming or leaving home to go to work (often shift work at unsociable hours). Other common complaints were around migrant workers not being familiar with procedures for refuse collection (leading to the accumulation of refuse) and an increase in street parking.

However, it is unlikely that HMOs will cause long-term challenges to integration. Since April 2006, the licensing of houses of HMOs, with three or more storeys and at least five occupants in more than one household, has been mandatory. It is also possible for local authorities to apply additional HMO licensing requirements where they consider that a significant proportion of the HMOs of a particular type are being managed in such a way as to create problems for either the occupiers or members of the public.

**Local labour markets and skill levels**

It can be expected that labour market conditions play an important role in influencing the reception of new migrants into a region. In recent years, the UK has had a buoyant economy and a tight labour market, yet there is little evidence of how local economies and job markets influence attitudes towards new migrant communities in particular areas.

From the analysis of our findings, it is possible to see a strong relationship between those areas with strong labour markets and/or local economies heavily dependent on migrant labour, and a recognition of the contribution that migrants make to the local economy. We found six locations where there was a high awareness of the contribution that migrants were making to the local economy, and four of these had strong labour markets, as characterised by high employment, low unemployment and a strong labour demand. Our analysis is summarised in table 3.
### Table 3: Summary of labour market profile and attitudes towards migrant contribution to the local economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage employed*/unemployed†</th>
<th>NVQ4‡ and above (Jan 05-Dec 05) %§</th>
<th>Earnings, gross weekly pay (£)**</th>
<th>Labour demand job density††</th>
<th>Wide recognition of migrant contribution to the local economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>70/10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>NO - both the ethnic minority and the white participants felt economically marginalised by new migrants and eastern Europeans in low skilled work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>71/9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>NO - white and ethnic minority participants felt economically threatened by migrants taking low skilled, low paid work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe and Nantwich</td>
<td>78/4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>YES - although the C2DE group felt threatened by eastern Europeans taking low paid and low skilled work, they widely acknowledged the fact that the local economy needed migrant labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edinburgh</td>
<td>77/5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>YES - one of only two locations where the C2DE group did not feel economically vulnerable regarding jobs and wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perthshire and Kinross</td>
<td>80/3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>YES - the white ABC1 group did not feel economically vulnerable and acknowledged the positive economic contribution that migrants made to local economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>81/4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>YES - with exception to the C2DE group, there was wide recognition of migrant contribution to local economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>75/5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>75/7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>80/5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>412.5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>77/5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>405.3</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>77/5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>78/5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk)

* proportion of working age population that are unemployed (16-59/64)

† proportion of those aged 16 and over who are economically active

‡ e.g. HND, Degree and Higher Degree level qualifications or equivalent

§ % is a proportion of total working age population (16-59/64)

** The figures show the median earnings in pounds for employees living in the area who are on adult rates of pay and whose pay was not affected by absence. Figures for earnings come from the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE). The ASHE is based on a one per cent sample of employees, information on whose earnings and hours is obtained from employers. The survey does not cover the self-employed. In 2004, information related to the pay period which included 21 April. The earnings information collected relates to gross pay before tax, national insurance or other deductions, and excludes payments in kind. It is restricted to earnings relating to the survey pay period and so excludes payments of arrears from another period made during the survey period; any payments due as a result of a pay settlement but not yet paid at the time of the survey will also be excluded.

†† The numbers of jobs per resident of working age (16-59/64); based on the mid-2001 population estimates. A job density of 1.0 would mean that there is one job for every resident of working age. The total number of jobs is a workplace-based measure and comprises employees, self-employed, government-supported trainees and HM Forces.
In the four areas with the tightest labour markets, where unemployment is very low, participants were more likely to acknowledge the economic contribution of new migrants to the local economy because of their own relatively stable position in the local economy. Employers in many of the low skilled sectors, who require a flexible work force that is able to work longer hours, have found this type of work less attractive and desirable to the local workforce who, in a tight labour market, have more options for work with regular hours and benefits (Dench et al 2006).

In Birmingham and Barking and Dagenham, however, this trend is reversed. Birmingham and Barking and Dagenham are both characterised by particularly high unemployment rates (9 per cent and 10 per cent respectively) and lower employment rates than the regional averages. Alongside these factors, the majority of research participants from these areas felt economically marginalised and threatened by migrants who were perceived to be an extra source of competition in the local labour market.

The findings also indicate that when an area has both a tight labour market and higher than average skill levels (Perth and Kinross, Edinburgh), the attitudes to migrants’ role in the local economy are the most positive, even among the C2DE groups. Without exception, all focus group participants in the Scottish locations recognised the positive contribution to local economies from migrant labour. Of course, other factors could also be at play (as described earlier in this chapter). Nonetheless, the comparative overview provided in table 3 indicates the strong relationship between a tight labour market/highly skilled local workforce and a positive reception towards the role of migrants in the local economy.

A strong recognition of the economic contribution of new migrants in rural areas such as Perth, Crewe and South Holland is also likely to be determined by the particular sectors in the area, which are dependent on migrant labour to fill key labour and skill shortages. Agriculture and food processing have a long history of utilising migrant labour to fill labour shortages, and so the local community are fully aware of the benefits this can bring to rural economies. Although the scale of recent migration is much larger than previous influxes, previous history and experience of migrant labour is likely to have raised awareness of the necessity of migrant labour in key sectors upon which many local economies depend.

Negative sentiments around jobs and wages would seem to be concentrated among the skilled and unskilled groups, and far more so in relatively weaker labour markets. In light of this, these groups would need particular targeting in efforts to address misperceptions and prejudice.

**Political leadership at the local level**

Our research findings highlight the importance of political leadership in both prioritising race relations within an organisation and in influencing local attitudes towards new migrants.

The lack of council leadership on issues of race relations was frequently identified as a barrier to advancing work on the integration of new migrant communities. Many stakeholders felt that their peers or their senior staff either did not want to be seen to take leadership on migration issues because they saw it as too ‘political’, or because they did not see it as a priority. In both cases, this had the same effect, which was to prevent the mainstreaming of race relations throughout the organisation. It also meant that race relations was awarded less of a priority.

‘The council are all over the shop with this ... there are very mixed feelings.’

(Councillor)
The situation now is much more uncomfortable to work in because the current political leaders are uncomfortable with it. In particular my boss is very uncomfortable with the idea that he could be seen as supporting any activity which involves providing services for asylum seekers. In terms of political leadership, I don’t think we’re anywhere near it, really ... and among senior officers too.’

(Local authority official)

Perhaps more worrying was the fact that when political leadership was evident, it was often not the sort of leadership that promoted good race relations. Several local authority representatives reported the behaviour and attitudes of individual councillors to be in direct conflict with the duty to promote good race relations. While it can be argued that councillors need to address the genuine concerns of their constituents, it was not always clear through some councillors’ language whether this was being done in the most informed or responsible way.

‘I think there need to be more controls ... because it’s just getting too many now. We’re doing lots for the migrants but I’m not sure we’re doing enough for the indigenous population. We should not be letting people in willy nilly.’

(Councillor)

In some cases, councillors were pursuing their own political interests with regard to a specific community at the expense of any obligations they had within these communities to promote good race relations and wider community cohesion.

‘We have Asian councillors who won’t talk to officers who are of African-Caribbean descent and they refuse to support funding for projects which are submitted by African-Caribbeans. We have white councillors who are racist. We have Asian councillors who are racist. They don’t really make much attempt to hide it. What’s worse is that they talk to the local communities in very inflammatory language. It does nothing to ease the existing racial tensions.’

(Local authority official)

‘For some people, you’re doing community relations if you’re getting something for a BME community and actually understanding the issues about competition between ethnic minority communities is something that people try and ignore.’

(Local authority official)

The Standards Board for England promotes a Code of Conduct for local authorities and councils, which states that councillors should promote equality by not discriminating unlawfully against any person and treat people with respect (Standards Board for England 2006). In the light of our findings, it would seem that this code of conduct should be more forcefully enforced by local authorities in areas where community tensions are apparent.

Political leadership and the politics of migration provide an important backdrop against which many people’s attitudes are formed (McLaren & Johnson 2004). The Local Government Association and Improvement and Development Agency have produced a guide for local authority leaders and chief executives (LGA 2006). This guidance details key themes and approaches to cohesion as well as providing a casebook of examples on how leaders and chief executives have directly contributed to their authorities’ work in promoting community cohesion. Putting such guidance into practice will be critical to improving the integration and reception of new migrants and ensuring that local leadership provides the sort of political and discursive backdrop that is consistent with an agenda to improve race relations.
6. The role of the race equality duty

This chapter presents our findings on the role of the race equality duty in the reception and integration of new migrant communities.

In 2001, the Race Relations Act (RRA) was amended to give around 43,000 public authorities a statutory general duty to promote race equality, under section 71(1). The aim was to help them to provide fair and accessible services, and to improve equal opportunities in employment. The race equality duty requires public authorities to pay ‘due regard’ to the need to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity and good race relations. To help public authorities meet the general duty, most of them have been given specific duties to:

• prepare and publish a race equality scheme, which states how they will meet the duty in the areas of policy and service delivery; and
• monitor specified employment procedures and practices, by racial group, and make this data public in an annual report.

The term ‘race equality duty’ covers both the general duty and any specific duty. Further details on the duty and its implementation can be found in Appendix E.

By drawing on 50 in-depth interviews with local authority representatives and other ‘stakeholders’ (see chapter 2) in our ten research locations, this chapter presents a picture of how the race equality duty is currently used by public authorities to prevent and resolve community tension.

Our research was carried out in three stages.

i. We undertook a broad assessment of eight race equality schemes from the ten local authorities in the case study locations. An assessment of a race equality scheme is a sound starting point for any in-depth analysis of how the race equality duty is valued and used within a local authority. Findings of these assessments are presented in tables 1 to 8 of Appendix F and the subsequent discussion.

ii. The findings of the interviews with local authority representatives and other stakeholders were then analysed. Our findings from these, as well as from our first set of analyses, showed that the duty to promote good race relations was not always clearly recognised in the race equality scheme. Findings from this second stage of analysis highlight exactly where the gaps were in public authorities’ understanding of the duty to promote good race relations, with a particular focus, wherever possible, on where these gaps in understanding specifically related to new migrant communities.

iii. The findings of the interviews with local authority representatives and other stakeholders were then analysed to identify the barriers preventing public authorities from fulfilling their specific duties under the race equality duty. Again, our analysis draws out, wherever possible, any particular barriers that specifically related to new migrant communities.

Discussion in this chapter focuses predominantly on the part of the duty which requires public authorities to have ‘due regard’ to the need to promote good race relations. This part of the race equality duty has the most relevance and potential as an instrument for preventing discrimination and improving race relations, and was flagged up as a particularly neglected strand of the race equality duty in both the Schneider-Ross report
for England (2003), and in our analysis of eight race equality schemes (Appendix F, table F.1).

### Summary of key findings

- Many of the public authorities in our ten case study locations were aware of and active on two parts of the race equality duty - eliminating unlawful discrimination and promoting equality of opportunity - but were not fully aware of or active on the other part - promoting good race relations.
- A survey of eight local authority race equality schemes found patchy coverage of the duty to promote good race relations (under the race equality duty).
- The gaps in public authorities’ understanding of good race relations lay primarily in: its definition and outcomes; how to achieve it; and how it is relevant to new migrant communities.
- Barriers to implementing the duty to promote good race relations were identified as: a lack of resources; a lack of leadership and political will; and a lack of information and data about new migrant communities.
- A failure to understand and implement the duty to promote good race relations in key areas of policy, such as housing and grant allocation, actively created and fuelled fresh tensions between communities.

Fulfilling the duty to promote good race relations is a proactive process. It is defined by the CRE as a duty to ‘challenge public misconceptions or preconceptions, and prejudices against people perceived as outsiders or foreigners’ and ‘ensure that all racial groups are aware of their rights and have access to, and information about, the services available to them’ (CRE, 2005).

Meeting this part of the race equality duty can therefore help to resolve community conflicts arising from the arrival of new migrants, because it involved challenging people’s misconceptions and prejudices, which as chapter 3 explored, are behind many of the tensions arising from the arrival of new migrants.

However, previously commissioned work by the CRE found that this part the race equality duty was also the most neglected by English public authorities (Schneider-Ross 2003). Our own work with local authority representatives found that, whilst there was a good deal of activity around the other two parts of the race equality duty, there was little activity being done with regards to this part.

Some local authorities were doing some work on ensuring that migrants had access and information to services available to them, but this was patchy and inconsistent across the eight locations. It was also always due to ‘bottom up’ pressure - in response to frontline pressures brought about by the arrival of a new community - rather than ‘top down’ planning or prioritising - a deliberate response to the need to meet the duty to promote good race relations.

We found very little activity in any of the local authorities on challenging misconceptions about and prejudices against new migrants.

---

8 Two locations did not have a Race Equality Scheme at the time of conducting this research
We also found a number of barriers preventing public authorities from fulfilling their specific duties under the race equality duty. These were both barriers resulting from public authorities not understanding how new migrants were relevant to the duty to promote good race relations, and other, more general barriers to promoting good race relations.

**Assessing race equality schemes**

We compared the eight race equality schemes from our case study locations against the seven main criteria drawn from the CRE’s assessment template (2005a) (listed in the tables in Appendix F), which is designed to help councils and boroughs meet their statutory duties under the race relations legislation. A comparison of this nature creates difficulties, as the schemes are not uniform in their structure and content. Several councils developed their race equality schemes using pre-existing equality frameworks and so were primarily concerned with adapting these mechanisms and ensuring that they were sufficient to meet the new duties. The schemes were also usually part of a wider framework of action plans and strategy documents which elaborated on different aspects of arrangements to implement systems to meet the requirements of the race equality duty. Some councils used generic equality schemes which addressed gender and disability alongside race equality, while others had separate schemes.

The brief analysis of the schemes (see Appendix F) did not assess the schemes in the manner of a compliance assessment. A brief investigation of the material contained in the schemes themselves did not allow for detailed analysis of the timescales set for reviews, the robustness of evaluation procedures or the delineation of responsibility. Instead, the analysis focused on whether the seven main criteria were raised in each scheme, and also whether the duty to promote good race relations was specifically mentioned.

Many authorities included some coverage of all seven criteria in their schemes, but the extent of the measures they put in place varied, and the extent to which the duty to promote good race relations formed an explicit part of the schemes was in far less evidence (see the descriptions of the measures in the tables in Appendix F). Although each scheme included a description of the general race equality duty, which included the duty to promote good race relations, this was often not worked into all the different aspects of the scheme. However, although explicit reference to the duty to promote good race relations was infrequent, some schemes did reference to issues like ‘community cohesion’ or were concerned to promote better ‘community engagement’ which are part of promoting ‘good race relations’.

While a useful starting point, analysis of a race equality scheme does not alone provide a picture of what is actually taking place on the ground. As one stakeholder put it, ‘one of the difficult things is that the specific duty to produce a race equality scheme has become an end in itself’ (Scottish Executive official). The rest of this chapter tries to look at how the schemes are being implemented on the ground through analysis of the interviews we conducted with local authority representatives and other stakeholders.

**Relevance of good race relations to new migrant communities**

From the interviews with local authority representatives and other stakeholders, it was evident that public authorities were not clear as to how the duty to promote good race

---

9 Our analysis was based on the race equality schemes that were available in the public domain at the time that this research was being conducted.
relations could be relevant to new migrant communities. This stemmed from two main issues:

- the fact that the majority of local authority representatives understood ‘race’ or ‘racial groups’ as synonymous with ‘colour’ and with non-migrant communities (i.e. established ethnic minorities); and

- the fact that the majority local authority representatives failed to see the relevance of good race relations in areas with low ethnic minority and migrant communities.

‘Race relations’ was widely perceived to be an issue of ‘colour’, accounting for relations between white and non-white communities, but not relations between white ethnic groups, such as the English and eastern Europeans. This was something that was particularly apparent in communities that had had previously very limited experience of migration and had very small ethnic minority groups.

‘There’s nothing in any of the guidance to categorise migrant workers. The categories that we use are recommended by census. Race equality doesn’t cover migrant workers.’

(Local authority official)

Although not defined as ‘racial groups’ under the RRA, migrants can claim racial discrimination on the grounds of their nationality and ethnicity. Despite this, the majority of local authority representatives did not consider migrants to be a ‘racial group’, and this affected their perceived obligations under the race equality duty towards these groups.

This finding points to a need for clearer guidance as to how the race equality duty is relevant to new migrant communities. Almost all other obligations under the duty flow from public authorities first identifying which communities they have to consider. If the criteria for this is being done largely on the basis of ‘colour’, without due consideration for nationality or ethnicity, then many new migrants are automatically excluded from attempts to eliminate unlawful discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and promote good race relations.

A significant minority of interviewees from public authorities also found it hard to see the relevance of the duty to promote good race relations because of the size of the ethnic minority and migrant communities.

‘Our responsibilities are to the rest of the community rather than to the 2%. This is the driver rather than any statutory obligation.’

(Local authority official)

Such a finding appears consistent with previous work that has been done on race equality, which found that many public authorities were responding in a way that was proportionate to the size of the minority population, rather than proportionate to the level of need among the minority population (Audit Commission 2004). This work concluded: ‘It is only by understanding the issues and views of the local community, including black and ethnic minority groups, that the appropriate response can be determined’ (Audit Commission 2004, 25). Our findings would seem to indicate that many public authorities have yet to understand fully the criteria for determining how they should proceed on promoting good race relations, and race equality more broadly.

Definitions of good race relations
A strong finding that emerged from our engagement with public authorities was a lack of understanding surrounding the definition of ‘good race relations’.

‘It’s too vague ... I’m not sure many people round here know what good race relations is supposed to look like. And how do we do it?’

(Local authority official, Luton)

Local authority representatives expressed a degree of frustration about what ‘good race relations’ were supposed to look like in terms of outcomes and this had several implications for their work in this area.

First, they were largely unable to provide indicators or markers of good race relations. Given the perceived lack of clarity around the term, most found it easier to define good race relations in terms of what it was not. Through this, what emerged was a popular understanding of good race relations based on a distinct lack of visible tensions and hostilities, such as riots, organised violence and hate crimes between members of different communities.

‘People don’t know what good race relations is, but they know what bad race relations is.’

(Scottish Executive official)

Tensions relating to race and religious belief may be highly visible, but less visible tensions and hostilities can also have a significant impact in a wide range of individuals and groups. With all but a few exceptions, there was little acknowledgment of this latter point among interviewees’ understanding of good race relations.

Second, they were unable to gauge whether some of their current activities and policies already underway could be defined as ‘good race relations’, particularly those aimed at building community cohesion.

‘There’s quite a lot of stuff going on the ground that isn’t in our race equality scheme or in some glossy brochure.’

(Local authority official)

The CRE provides a definition of good race relations with the caveat that each organisation needs to develop a more detailed understanding, based on its particular circumstances. While the logic of this approach makes sense in so far as it allows for the dynamics of different locations, the overwhelming response from the public authority representatives we spoke to during the course of this study found that this approach did not go far enough, and more examples of best practice would be of the greater use in relation to new migrant communities.

Understanding the role of good race relations in service delivery

Through the interviews carried out with representatives from public authorities, a number of difficulties were identified in relation to good race relations and service delivery. These were issues relevant to both rural and urban areas, but appeared to be more acute in those places that had little previous experience of migration and diversity.

The first was an issue raised in previous work done on the race equality duty: getting around the ‘tick box’ approach. This problem stemmed from a lack of understanding around how to translate the ‘tick box’ approach into outcomes.
‘The police were quite good, but there were action plans there that they hadn’t actually actioned. It’s a bit like when I go to schools ... It’s things like, “how do you put this into action?”’

(REC representative, Lincolnshire)

It was also unclear to what extent race equality impact assessments (REIAs) were being carried out. The RRA gives listed public authorities a specific duty to carry these out, to assess the impact a proposed policy is likely to have on promoting racial equality, and to consult those who are likely to be affected by the policy, before it is formally introduced. Many local authority representatives we interviewed reported that REIAs were ‘time consuming and resource intensive’ (Community development officer, Crewe District Council), and others reported confusion as to what was required.

‘I didn’t realise we had to [carry out race equality impact assessments]. I don’t think there’s a single person in the office who would know anything about it. I’m very fuzzy about impact assessments and what services the council does provide.’

(Local authority official)

Perhaps the most striking finding on the role of good race relations in service delivery was that it was almost completely disconnected to any practice taking place on the ground that might relate to good race relations. Some action was taking place on the ground, but not within or connected to any framework of good race relations. Much of this was because of the pace of population change on the ground which many local authority representatives reported as difficult to plan for.

‘My honest answer is that [the RED] hasn’t had any impact whatsoever. It is from the ground up that anything’s happening. What we’re dealing with is a community that is simply trying to cope with a group of people moving into the area.’

(Local authority official)

‘We are tending to act to what we find before us. We don’t get out the scheme and say “this is happening, what the schemes suggests we should be doing is ...”. There is some sort of feeling that schemes can be good for tick boxes, to pass inspections, achieve legal duties, but we have to do what is needed in the circumstances. I wouldn’t say that our scheme is driving our behaviour. I would say that it is the circumstances driving our behaviour.’

(Local authority official)

‘It’s purely and simply the actual pace with which you have to move on the ground to ensure that you are actually meeting the needs of these people, and meeting the needs of the indigenous population so that we do have peaceful coexistence.’

(Coordinator, educational forum, South Holland)

A significant minority of the public authority interviewees reported that racial equality was not valued in some organisations, which in turn made their job more difficult and frustrating. In a minority of cases, it was evident that leaders and staff of some organisations were themselves promoting antagonistic opinions in direct conflict with their obligations to promote good race relations.

A more serious problem emerged as a result of slow progress in getting racial equality mainstreamed within some public authorities. In some cases, a failure to have mainstreamed racial equality throughout an organisation meant that different parts of an organisation were often working towards different goals and to the detriment of good race
relations. Housing and grant allocation emerged as two important areas in which such activity was directly fuelling tensions between communities according to most stakeholders in one area. Grant allocation, which was seen as an important activity under the duty to promote equality of opportunity, was not being conducted with race relations in mind, or with a communications strategy in mind to help explain the grant decision and therefore diffuse any potential conflict that might arise as a result of allocating resources to one community over another.

Housing policy was another area where policymakers did not always consider the potential implications for race relations.

‘We need to look at some of the policies that put these people into areas where there are already stretched resources. And then you might get tensions between and within the communities. There seems to be a view that they’d connect because they’re all newly arrived communities - whether they arrived 30 years ago or today doesn’t seem to matter sometimes. The problem is that sometimes there is no connection whatsoever; there isn’t any relationship or cultural similarities or cultural identities for that matter. A lot of these communities are being put into areas where there are already huge issues.’

(Local authority official)

These findings are concerning, not least because housing has been identified as having important implications for community cohesion. In some recent work, it has been suggested that the government should adopt community cohesion as a key aim of its policy on asylum, and encourage housing associations to provide accommodation for asylum seekers in appropriate areas, and not only where properties would otherwise be difficult to let (CIH 2003; Phillips 2006). The CIH also proposes that advice be given to housing agencies on how to prepare host communities (CIH 1999, 2003).

Leadership and political will

Leadership and political will emerged as an important factor in how far public authorities felt they could prioritise and value race equality. This has been discussed more fully in chapter 5, but it is worth noting here that many local authority representatives reported that they could not address the issue of good race relations unless it was specifically prioritised in their particular area or department.
7. Conclusions and recommendations

This report has sought to collect fresh evidence on the reception and integration of new migrants across ten locations in England and Scotland. It represents a tentative exploration of how increased and diverse immigration has shaped and is shaping communities across the UK. The report’s findings offer both encouraging and discouraging reading for those wanting to promote the reception and integration of new migrants.

Overview of research findings

On the positive side, there is much cause to be reassured that the arrival of new migrants is not causing the havoc that many fear, or some sections of the press suggest:

- Despite widespread public and media attention about the negative impacts of recent immigration, reported incidents of violent conflict and hostility between new migrant and settled communities were infrequent and the impacts on public services were exaggerated. While some pressures on public services emerged as a result of new migrants, these were not of the same magnitude as those often reported in national political and media discourse.

- In addition to this, and in contrast to public opinion polling that suggests that race and immigration were the top issues of public concern, our primary research suggests that local concerns over such things as crime and safety, transport, and access to services were as important as, if not more important than, fears of immigrants undermining local communities. Migration into an area was never mentioned as a top concern of any participants in our focus groups.

- Good practice is being forged that offers wider lessons for securing better integration for new migrants. Our evidence found that good practice was underpinned by strategic partnership working; effective communication with local communities; and proactive, local measures to improve the evidence base.

- Our research also suggests that there was no straightforward relationship between the arrival of newcomers into areas not used to immigration and high levels of hostility toward migrants. While there were sometimes greater fears around perceived threats to culture in these areas, migrants were not necessarily less well-received there than in areas with a long history of immigration. However, previous experience of diversity did influence the ability of some public services to respond to the pace and nature of new flows of migrants.

- We also found that the invisible hand of the market was also helping with the reception of new migrants. There seemed to be a relationship between those areas with strong labour markets and/or local economies heavily dependent on migrant labour, and a recognition of the contribution that migrants made to the local economy.

On the other hand, the findings also suggest some cause for concern.

- There were high levels of hostility towards newcomers, strongly influenced by the dynamics of race, ethnicity and religion. A higher frequency of violence and abuse was reported among non-white migrants groups compared to eastern European migrants. It would seem that the Somali community was a particular target of
much hostility, perhaps because of an unfortunate combination of perceptions around race, asylum-seeking, welfare dependency and Islamophobia. The contrast between the experiences of some migrants, at least in terms of their own perceived reception if not actual reception, raises the worrying possibility that stereotypes about ‘good’ migrants (white economic migrants) and ‘bad’ migrants (non-white asylum seekers) endure.

- Many public authorities, including local authorities, did not consider new migrants as within the remit of ‘race relations’. A ‘black and white’ view of race relations persisted among many public authorities and was out of step with the growing diversity of the UK.

- Our research confirms clearly that misperception is at the heart of hostility and tension around the arrival of newcomers. The role of misinformation about migrant communities was often fuelled by a lack of accurate information as well as negative media coverage.

- While there is little to suggest that local public services were being overwhelmed by the arrival of new migrants, some public service providers were facing additional pressures because of the need to provide services to a larger and more diverse population than they were used to. Two long-term challenges seemed to be evident: the mainstreaming of service provision for migrant communities, and re-designing funding formulae to ensure that local authorities were adequately resourced to deal with changing populations.

- Finally, our research raised worries about the lack of effective local leadership in some areas. Many of our local authority representatives reported a low priority awarded to race relations among their leaders, and that the behaviour and attitudes of individual councillors were often in direct conflict with the duty to promote good race relations.

**Key lessons for improving the integration of new migrants**

From the findings of our research, it is possible to draw out some broader lessons for improving the integration of new migrant communities in the UK:

- **Political leadership on migration is vital** for creating the conditions in which migrants can be positively received. The strategy of the Scottish Executive has had an overwhelmingly positive effect on public discussion and understanding of migration, in terms of both its necessity and its benefits. This has filtered through to the Scottish media, which now appears significantly less hostile to immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers than in the English media. This provides tangible evidence for the need to change the official political discourse on immigration, as suggested by ICAR (2004) and others (Lewis 2005). At a local level, the leadership evident in many of the local initiatives that have been detailed in this report demonstrates how public authorities can make an immediate positive difference to integration and social cohesion by proactively changing their own discourse, defining the terms of the field and the atmosphere of engagement, and generating a climate conducive to combating racism and social exclusion.

- **Improving interaction and participation could build on common concerns across different communities about local issues.** Our research found that issues such as crime, anti-social behaviour and access to services were the most important
concerns for all communities, migrant and non-migrant alike. These common concerns could be fertile ground for initiatives aimed at bringing communities together and facilitating interaction between them. Other studies that have been carried out which have looked at relationships at community level (for example, D’Onofrio & Munk 2004) have emphasised the similarity of what people commonly want - such as a feeling of safety, being accepted, and having the opportunity to make friends. A common language and some knowledge of each other’s culture are also important in the two-way process of people getting to know each other. The issues are similar whether considered at the level of the individual person or family, at the level of a neighbourhood or estate, or across a whole city.

• **Integration of new migrants is essentially a local project** and one that is significantly shaped by local factors, such as labour markets and previous history of migration. Within local areas, good practice involves building partnerships, communicating effectively with local communities, and improving evidence of new migrant communities. Policymakers need to focus on how best to support and build local capacity to better integrate new migrants amid rapid population change.

• **It is important to define the responsibilities of the receiving communities.** The significant levels of misinformation, prejudice and misperceptions uncovered in our research highlight not only how central and local authorities should work to become more transparent in their decision-making procedures and public statements, but also how little attempt has been made to define the responsibilities of established populations in the two-way effort of integration. While citizenship policies have gone some way to develop a more inclusive sense of citizenship, it is still not clear what migrants are supposed to integrate into (ICAR 2004; Castles 2002; Refugee Council 2004). Receiving communities should not only be consulted about developments such as the settlement of refugees, and supplied with reliable and accurate information about the process, but also told more about where newcomers have arrived from, why they have come, the implications of their arrival, their needs and the benefits they bring to the community. These issues need to be a central part of strategies to facilitate both community cohesion and integration.

• **New migrants have different profiles from established ethnic minorities.** The challenge of integrating the former will centre around improving interaction and participation. There are a number of challenges facing those wanting to achieve this, which centre around policy obstacles and the socio-demographic profile of new migrants. The greatest policy obstacle is that current government policy is grounded in the belief ‘that integration can only begin in its fullest sense when an asylum seeker becomes a refugee’ (Home Office 2005, 3). This continues to ignore the very real and well-documented damage to later integration which the negative aspects of the asylum experience can cause; the success of the integration of refugees is intrinsically related to the quality and length of asylum determination procedure and the conditions of reception.

The socio-demographic profile of many new migrant groups also presents certain challenges for integration policy. On a practical level, it will be difficult to devise strategies for improving migrants’ wider participation and interaction with the wider community due to the nature of many of the employment opportunities for A8 migrants, which are typically low-skilled, with long hours and shift work. Many research participants reported that this was one of the main reasons they did not have much contact with eastern European migrant workers. New migrants are also more mobile than previous waves of migrants, often coming to the UK for only a
few months, or moving between locations in the UK, and this also raises important questions of how to facilitate greater participation and interaction among this community, and to what extent. However, the good practice detailed in this study indicates that a strategic partnership working, effective communication with local communities, and proactive measures to improve the evidence base are important and necessary first steps in facilitating the integration of new migrants.

**Key lessons in following the race equality duty**

On the basis of our findings, this report identifies two key lessons for how public authorities can meet their obligations under the race equality duty:

- **The duty to promote good race relations emerges as potentially the most relevant strand of the race equality duty in advancing the reception and integration of new migrants.** Our findings show that the greatest challenges to integrating new migrants (predominantly misperceptions and access to key services and information) are precisely those areas that constitute the core definition of ‘good race relations’: challenging misperceptions and ensuring that communities have access and information to services. This suggests that the CRE guidance tool *Promoting Good Race Relations: A guide for public authorities* (CRE 2005) would be an ideal tool for helping facilitate the integration of new migrants.

- **Fulfilling the potential of the race equality duty to facilitate reception and integration requires moving beyond a ‘black and white’ perspective of race relations.** Public authorities do not always see the relevance of race relations to new migrants’ communities, largely because of a simplistic view of race relations that is out of sync with the increasing diversity of the UK’s migrant population. The continuing dominance of the term ‘ethnic minority’ over ‘immigrant’ in much of race relations discourse has two important implications. The first is that non-white migrants (particularly refugees and asylum seekers) tend to disappear into the category of ‘ethnic minority’ in both popular and political discourse, despite often having a very different set of needs and experiencing a very different type of discrimination from settled ethnic minorities, and from each other. The second implication is that white migrants remain relatively under-researched and excluded from what is widely-understood as ‘race relations’ among public authorities.

The lack of an effective approach to promoting good race relations, which has been detailed in this report, does not augur well for the future. The changing nature of immigration and diversity is likely to mean new and perhaps continuously changing challenges for the reception and integration of newcomers. This is likely to mean that current models and approaches will have to support public authorities better in developing more flexible and strategic approaches to promoting good race relations.

Looking ahead, these changing conditions also have implications for how we conceive of equality. For example, it has been clear throughout this research that white migrants are
not considered a ‘racial’ group by many public authorities, thus hindering the effectiveness of the relevance of the race equality duty. This neglect of white migrants is in stark contrast to the widely-held misperceptions among established communities that migrants receive preferential treatment. In the long term, a broader approach to equality pursued under the 2006 Equality Act and by the CEHR may be better at meeting the needs of these groups if attempts to broaden the current understanding of ‘race relations’ prove challenging.

Finally, this report has raised important questions about how far equality legislation and, specifically the duty to promote good race relations, can go in addressing some of the more fundamental challenges to the reception and integration of new migrants. While the statutory duty to promote good race relations has immense potential in its current form, the key challenge going forward will be how to realise this potential amid the current pace and nature of migration flows.

Given the critical importance of public authorities in shaping the public agenda, in providing key integration services, correcting misperceptions and in promoting good race relations, we suggest the following recommendations for organisations covered by the race equality duty.

**Recommendations**

**The CRE should:**

- issue specific guidance on the relevance of good race relations to new migrant communities in order to clarify public sector responsibilities to these groups; and
- issue more advice and guidance on all aspects of the race equality duty for areas that have had little or no previous experience of ethnic diversity and/or immigration.

**Central government should:**

- formulate an overarching integration strategy for all new migrants and the established population focusing on interaction, participation and equality.
- reassess current funding formulae for local authorities to assist those areas experiencing genuine pressures as a result of rapid population change;
- draw on the Scottish example to provide clear and consistent political leadership on migration with strong statements on the positive socio-economic benefits of migration as a foundation from which to advance the integration, and improve the reception of new migrants; and
- work with local authorities to improve the evidence base and data on new migrant communities.

**The Scottish Executive should:**

- formulate an overarching integration strategy for all new migrants and the established population, in the same proactive way that it has addressed refugee integration and taking on board the importance of equality, interaction and participation in achieving that goal;
- reassess current funding formulae for local authorities to assist those areas experiencing genuine pressures as a result of rapid population change; and
- work with local authorities to improve the evidence base and data on new migrant communities.
Recommendations (continued)

Local authorities should:

• become more transparent in their decision-making procedures, particularly in relation to housing and grants, to minimise misperceptions around preferential treatment;

• fulfil their obligations under the RRA and assess how their policies impact upon race relations in order to maximise opportunities for interaction and participation;

• proactively work to inform local communities better about the impacts of new migrant communities, and work more closely with the local media to dispel myths and ensure more balanced coverage;

• work closely with employers, trade unions and others to plan services better, improve the local evidence base, share best practice and resources, and establish who is best placed to deliver key support to facilitate integration; and

The press and broadcast media should:

• follow clause 1 (accuracy) of the Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice (2006) and adhere to the National Union of Journalists Code of Conduct (2006), so that the risk of reporting misinformation about new migrants is minimised.
Appendix A. Location Profiles

This Appendix provides more detail of some relevant demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the six primary locations and four secondary locations.

Primary Locations

Table A.1 summarises some key information of the six primary locations:

Table 4: Indicators of employment and population mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>In employment */ unemployed</th>
<th>Ethnic Minority Population % of total in 2001</th>
<th>A8 total number of arrivals from May 2004-February 2006</th>
<th>Asylum Seekers / Refugees (2nd Qtr 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>70/10</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>71/9</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>5,684</td>
<td>1,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe and Nantwich</td>
<td>78/4</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edinburgh</td>
<td>77/5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6,016</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perthshire and Kinross</td>
<td>80/3</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3,239</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>81/4</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3,236</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Labour market statistics: [www.nomisweb.co.uk](http://www.nomisweb.co.uk). Numbers are for those aged 16 and over, % are for those of working age (16-59/64)
† numbers and % are for those aged 16 and over. % is a proportion of economically active
‡ ONS Census 2001

Barking and Dagenham

- Barking and Dagenham is an outer eastern London borough.
- Its population in 2001 was 163,944 (Census).
- It has an ethnic minority population of approximately 15%. The white ethnic population of Barking and Dagenham is 85%, ranking the authority 336th out of 376 in England and Wales in terms of the proportion of white population.
- The foreign-born population is as high as 25-30% in some wards (Census).
- The two largest foreign nationalities applying for NINos were from Nigeria and Pakistan (NINo).
- Has had several decades experience of migration, attracting new migrants and other Londoners partly because of good transport links to the city and the relatively cheaper house prices.
- Main industries attracting A8 migrant workers are distribution, hotels, and restaurants (WRS).
- In the 2006 local elections, the BNP attracted 17% of the vote, an increase of over 10 percentage points from the last local elections. There are now 12 BNP
councillors, making the BNP the second largest party in the borough. Hostility around immigration is often cited as a reason for increased support for the BNP in the borough.

Birmingham
- Birmingham is considered to be one of the largest English cities outside of London and is the largest local authority in the UK.
- Its population in 2001 was 977,087 (Census).
- Ethnic minorities represented approximately 30% of the population in 2001. The largest groups in 2001 were Pakistani (10.6%), Indian (5.7%), Caribbean (4.9%), Irish (3.2%) and Bangladeshi (2.1%). Two-thirds of the minority ethnic population were born in the UK (Census).
- The unemployment rate is approximately 9.1%. This is higher than the national average of 5.0%. Unemployment is higher (approximately 16%) amongst both the minority ethnic and foreign born population (LFS December 2005).
- Since 2004, there has been a notable increase in A8 migrants applying for NINos.
- In 2005/06, 5,684 A8 migrants registered to work in Birmingham. Main employment areas for A8 migrants are in the distribution, hotels and restaurants industry, manufacturing and transport and communication. (WRS)

Crewe
- The borough of Crewe and Nantwich is in the county of Cheshire, in North West England.
- Its population in 2001 was 111,007 (Census).
- Has had no experience of large-scale migration. Since 2002, it has experienced a significant increase in migrants from Poland and Portugal.
- The ethnic minority population is 2%. Largest minority ethnic communities are from the Caribbean, Bangladesh, Portugal and Poland. Less than 3% of the population were born outside of the UK.
- Main employment areas for migrants according to 2006 WRS figures are: manufacturing (55.85%), transport and communication (20.06%), and distribution, hotels and restaurants (11.4%). Low unemployment rate in 2001 at 1.2%.

Edinburgh
- The city of Edinburgh is the capital of Scotland and its second biggest city after Glasgow. Its 2001 population of 430,082 makes it the UK’s seventh most populated city.
- Foreign-born residents of Edinburgh comprise 5.08% of the local population, which is approximately double the Scottish average, which is 2.5%. (2001 census)
- There has been a long history of migration to Edinburgh from Commonwealth and other European nations. Since 2004, there has been a steep increase in Polish nationals in Edinburgh. (NINo 2005/06)
- Edinburgh’s has a tight labour market with 4.8% unemployment compared to the Scottish average of 5.4% and the UK average of 5.0%. (LFS 2005)
- Most popular employment areas for recently arrived migrants in 2005/06 were distribution, hotels and restaurants and manufacturing.

Perth and Kinross
- Perth and Kinross is a unitary authority situated in the east of Scotland, close to the North Sea. It is a predominantly agricultural area.
• Its population was 134,949 in the 2001 census. It has a very low population density (26 people per sq. km). Perthshire is significantly more populated (43,450) than Kinross-shire (4,681). (2001 General Register Office for Scotland)
• Perth and Kinross has a small minority ethnic population, according to the 2001 census. Only 2.27% of the population were born outside the UK. This is close to the average for Scotland which is 2.25%. 
• Perth and Kinross has traditionally attracted temporary migrant workers due to its agricultural and food processing industries. It has a strong economy with a low unemployment rate of 3.1%. (LFS 2005)
• National Insurance and Workers Registration figures show that the numbers of migrant workers have significantly increased since 2004. National Insurance numbers indicate that Polish nationals are at present the largest migrant group that have registered to work in the authority.
• Main employment areas for migrant workers are agriculture, distribution, hotels and restaurants and manufacturing.

**South Holland**

• The district of South Holland is located in southern Lincolnshire, in the east of England. It is predominantly rural with very low population density. (ONS 2001)
• Its population in 2001 was 76,522 (ONS 2001).
• Unemployment is low at 1.5% in 2005 (LFS Dec. 2005).
• It has a small minority ethnic population of 2.78%, according to the 2001 census. 3% of the population were born outside of the UK.
• South Holland has had very little experience of migration but this has changed in recent years. NINo data from 2002 to 2006 shows a large intake of Polish, Lithuanian and Portuguese workers in the area.
• Migrant workers in South Holland work have been concentrated in Manufacturing (53.4%), Agriculture and Fishing (20.1%) and Transport and communication (11.8%). Close to 60% of new migrant workers are males. (WRS 2006).

**Secondary Locations**

**Berwick-Upon-Tweed**

• Berwick-upon-Tweed is a small rural borough located in the north-east of England
• Its population in 2001 was 25,948.
• 1.75% of the borough was born outside of the UK and its minority ethnic population was estimated to have been about 0.5%. It is ranked the ‘whitest’ ethnic authority in England and Wales. (ONS 2001)
• It has experienced a recent wave of migration, mainly from Eastern Europe and Portugal.

**Luton**

• Luton is situated in east England. Until 1997, it was part of Bedfordshire, but is now an independent unitary authority.
• In 2001, the population was 184,371. (ONS 2001)
• It has a large established south Asian (18.3%) and Afro-Caribbean (6.3%) community.
• Since 2004, there has been an increase in A8 nationals arriving in Luton. According to WRS data of 2005/06 a total of 7116 migrants have arrived. The largest group came from Poland. (WRS data)
• Migrant workers are employed in the following areas: manufacturing; distribution, hotels and restaurants; transport and communication. (WRS data)
• Its unemployment rate is 7.5%, which is higher than the national average, which is at 5.0% (LFS Dec. 2005)

**Slough**

• Slough is a borough in Berkshire, in south-east England.
• Its population in 2001 was 119,067. It is ranked the 9th most ethnically diverse borough as well as the 9th fastest growing population between 1991 and 2001. (ONS 2001)
• Unemployment is low at 4.5% which is below the national average of 5% (Labour Force Survey, Dec. 2005). Multi-national companies from the manufacturing, retail and food processing industries, as well as companies servicing Heathrow airport have been the main employers in Slough’s local economy. These are mainly located on Slough Estates, an industrial zone.
• Since WW2, Slough has attracted migrant workers from diverse nationalities. Since 2002, main migrant worker groups have come from Poland, Pakistan, India and Zimbabwe. (NiNo 2002-2006)
• Slough Council has publicly challenged central government funding levels, claiming that the current population has significantly increased since the 2001 census due to the arrival of new migrants.

**Sunderland**

• Sunderland is a medium-sized city situated in the north-East of England. Its population is 280,807.
• Sunderland has little historical experience of migration, with 97.8% of the population born in the UK according to the 2005 annual population survey (0.4% of these are non-white UK born); the remaining 2.2% comprises of 1.1% white not UK born and 1.1% non-white not UK born.
• There has been a relatively low migration of A8 nationals since 2004.
• Most popular industries of Sunderland for A8 migrant workers are public administration, education and health (28.1%); distribution, hotels and restaurants (20.6%) and manufacturing (15.6%).


Appendix B: List of stakeholders interviewed

**Berwick-upon-Tweed**
Local authority official
Representative, Citizens Advice Bureau

**Birmingham**
5 local authority officials
Representative, police force
Representative, BRAP

**Barking and Dagenham**
Local authority official
Representative, PCT
Representative, Harmony House Charity
Head teacher, public school
Representative, Citizens Advice Bureau

**Crewe and Nantwich**
2 local councillors
2 local authority officials
Practice manager, health centre
Deputy head teacher, school
Chair of Polish Association

**Edinburgh**
Representative, Lothian and Borders Police
Representative of REC, Edinburgh and Lothians

**Luton**
2 local authority officials

**Perth and Kinross**
2 local authority officials
Representative, CAB

**Slough**
Local authority official
Representative, Police

**South Holland**
4 local authority officials
Representative, Citizens Advice Bureau
Migrants’ Pastor
ESOL provider
Representative, education provider
Representative, Lincolnshire REC
Teacher, school
Representative, local police
**Sunderland**
2 local authority officials

**Other**
2 Scottish Executive officials
Representative, CRE Scotland
Representative from legal team, CRE
Employer of highly skilled migrants
Appendix C: Quantitative data sources

1. **Census 2001.** Data from the 2001 census of the UK population is used to present some basic demographic characteristics of each research location, including the numbers of foreign-born people. However, it must be noted that this data is now five years old.

2. **Worker Registration Scheme** (WRS). Nationals from the eight central and eastern European states that joined the EU in 2004 (the ‘A8’ countries) are allowed to come and work in the UK provided that they register with the UK Government’s Worker Registration Scheme (WRS). Data from this scheme appears in a quarterly Accession Monitoring Report and shows the numbers of people who have registered, their nationalities, ages and regions and sectors of work in the UK. It is important to note that WRS data only shows the *inflow* of A8 nationals into the UK, as de-registration is not required upon leaving the UK. Additionally, registration is not required for A8 nationals working for periods of less than one month, or if resident in the UK for more than a year, or if in self-employment.

3. **National Insurance Numbers** (NINos). National Insurance Numbers are required by anyone wanting to work, be self-employed or claim benefits or tax credits in the UK, whether they are locals or immigrants. The Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) has responsibility for allocating NINos. Data on how many NINos are issued to foreign nationals can often be a good way of counting the number of migrants active in the labour market. However, the data series can be affected by time lags caused by bottlenecks and clearances in the processing of NINos, does not account for those migrants who work illegally, and only tells us where people applied for a NINo (not where they work now).
Appendix D: Summary of A8 entitlements in the UK

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigration category</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.U. A8 nationals</td>
<td>Nationals from these countries have the same rights to healthcare as nationals from other EEA states.</td>
<td>From 1 May 2004, A8 nationals have been free to come to the UK to live and work without a visa. All A8 migrants who have been in the UK for less than 12 months and who want to work are required to apply to the ‘Worker Registration Scheme’. Upon the completion of 12 months continuous employment, A8 nationals are afforded full rights of free movement and can get a residence permit confirming their right to live and work in the UK.</td>
<td>According to the Scottish Executive, nationals from these countries have the same rights to housing and homelessness assistance as nationals from other EEA states. This is different from the situation in England, where regulations have been enforced that disallow persons from A8 states from homelessness assistance unless they satisfy certain conditions. Note that the Scottish Executive position has been contested by some local authorities.</td>
<td>Nationals from these countries have the same rights to education as nationals from other EEA states.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: The Race Equality Duty

In 2001, the Race Relations Act was amended to give around 43,000 public authorities a statutory general duty to promote race equality, under section 71(1). The aim was to help them to provide fair and accessible services, and to improve equal opportunities in employment. The race equality duty requires public authorities to pay ‘due regard’ to the need to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity and good race relations. To help public authorities meet the general duty, most of them have been given specific duties to:

- prepare and publish a race equality scheme, which states how they will meet the duty in the areas of policy and service delivery; and
- monitor specified employment procedures and practices, by racial group, and make this data public in an annual report.

The term ‘race equality duty’ (RED) covers both the general duty and any specific duty.

The development of the RED was closely related to the lessons that emerged from the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry that reported in 1999. The MacPherson Report on the inquiry noted that: ‘if racism is to be eliminated from our society there must be a coordinated effort to prevent its growth. This needs to go well beyond the police services’. The report went on to say that ‘it is incumbent upon every institution to examine their policies and practices to guard against disadvantaging any section of our communities’. The recognition of institutional racism and the need to interrogate mainstream practices for potential discriminatory effects informs the thinking behind the RED.

The RED represents a radical change from simply avoiding unfair discrimination on racial grounds by instituting a requirement for the positive promotion of race equality. It changed the very nature of equalities legislation by requiring public sector organisations to switch from a reactive to a proactive approach to race equality.

The difficulties in implementing the duty centre around giving substance to the promotion of race equality beyond general exhortations to ‘treat people fairly’.

Early research into the progress on implementing the RED in England found strong indications of positive progress. After being in force for just 6 months around 70% of respondents felt that their work on the public duty had produced positive benefits, although implementation had been patchy. Nonetheless 84% of respondents had undertaken the first step of fully or partially assessing functions for relevance to the RED and between 83% and 99% had produced a race equality scheme or policy (Schneider-Ross 2003:5). Despite progress being identified across urban and rural areas with varying proportions of ethnic minority populations, the research was clear about the challenges remaining. Some sectors lagged behind in implementation and both the employment duty and the duty to promote good race relations tended to receive less attention. The report concluded: ‘getting Race Equality seen as a mainstream responsibility or activity, and therefore a priority, is still the main challenge’ (Schneider-Ross 2003: 7). In the effort to mainstream race equality the report highlighted the need for more guidance from the CRE noting that some elements of the duty could benefit from clarification and that there was a need for the approach to begin to move from creating a delivery infrastructure to a focus on delivering outcomes.

A later report by the Audit Commission (2004) also found that progress on implementing the RED in England had been patchy. Responses of authorities in England and Wales varied
from resistant to having achieved clear progress and priorities for action. The report notes that the introduction of a positive duty to promote race equality left authorities struggling to be specific about what race equality entailed in their local context. The challenge to set aspirational outcomes is matched by the difficulties of understanding and tackling institutional behaviours that get in the way of progress. Again, the research pointed to a need to focus on improving outcomes for ethnic minority communities. The report found that not defining tangible outcomes had led to a gap emerging between optimism and reality as progress on race equality was continually measured in terms of process rather than delivery. Confusion remains particularly apparent on the duty to promote good race relations. This aspect of the duty relates closely to conflict resolution, yet fears remain that increased engagement with ethnic minority communities may result in demands for increased services or a ‘white backlash’.

The CRE guide to promoting good race relations (CRE 2005) states that the duty should involve:

‘Challenging misconceptions or preconceptions, and prejudice against people perceived as outsiders or foreigners, as well as making sure that people from all racial groups are aware of their rights and have access to, and information about, the services available to them.’

The Guide lists five principles of good race relations:

- Equality: equal rights and opportunities for everyone in all areas of activity.
- Respect: acceptance of the individual right to identify with, maintain and develop one’s particular cultural heritage, and to explore other cultures.
- Security: a safe environment, free from racism for all.
- Unity: acceptance of belonging to wider community, and of shared values and responsibilities, rooted in common citizenship and humanity.
- Cooperation: interaction by individuals and groups to achieve common goals, resolve conflict and create community cohesion.

The CRE provides support in this area by providing guidance, funding local groups whose work contributes to good race relations and by monitoring and enforcing the race relations duty on public authorities. Between 2003 and 2006, SCI undertook proactive engagement in conflict prevention and resolution in five cities: Glasgow, Birmingham, Leicester, Wrexham and the Tower Hamlets.

The DCLG and the CEHR Project team at the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) are working on the CEHR good relations remit to ensure that it is joined up with the community and faith agendas. The team is responsible for building up an evidence base and evaluating initiatives on good relations and community cohesion for the incoming CEHR board to use in planning its work on good relations.
### Appendix F: ippr analysis of eight race equality schemes

#### Table 6: Summary of eight race equality schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough Council</th>
<th>Assessing functions and policies</th>
<th>Race Equality Impact assessment</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Publishing results</th>
<th>Public access to information &amp; services</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Review of RES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham BC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific mention of GRR?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham CC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific mention of GRR?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe and Nantwich BC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific mention of GRR?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton BC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific mention of GRR?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific mention of GRR?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough BC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific mention of GRR?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland DC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific mention of GRR?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland BC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific mention of GRR?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh CC*</td>
<td>Don’t have</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick upon Tweed BC**</td>
<td>Don’t have</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*REC not available in the public domain at the time of conducting this research and so excluded from further analysis

**REC under development at the time of conducting this research and so excluded from further analysis

---

10 Borough Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Is the criterion included?</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Is duty to promote GRR referred to in relation to this criterion?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Council completed an audit of the authority’s functions, using an initial assessment grid based on that recommended by the CRE in its Good Practice Guide.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham CC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Corporate Equality Scheme references the 2002 Race Equality Scheme as providing a framework for assessing functions</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe and Nantwich BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The appendix sets out relevant functions and their priority. The scheme states that in deciding on relevant functions the CRE Code of Practice requires that all three aspects of the RED be considered.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Councils corporate steering group identified and assessed all functions and policies using the CRE’s assessment grid to prioritise in order of relevance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Services were assessed in relation to function and policies in 2002 and reassessed in 2005. New policies should also be assessed. The race assessment guide is included in the appendix.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Provides a list of functions relevant to the RED and states council will continue to assess all functions and policies for relevance.</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland DC</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>A corporate assessment framework is to be implemented to allow for a consistent identification and prioritising of RED relevant functions and policies.</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland CC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Functions and policies in each department were listed and prioritised in relation to all three aspects of the RED</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Assessing and consulting on the likely impact of policies on promoting race equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Is the criterion included?</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Is duty to promote GRR referred to in relation to this criterion?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Detailed impact assessments planned starting with areas identified as high priority</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham CC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Impact/needs assessment are undertaken and strategies are developed to address any adverse impacts</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe and Nantwich BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To monitor services, recruitment and employment for adverse impacts using variety of data sources. Will make improvements were find negative impacts</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Best Value Reviews to be subjected to equality impact assessment. To assess for adverse impact using the framework provided in the Code of Practice and the Equality Standard for Local Government</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Monitoring arrangements are planned to allow for indicators of adverse impact. If any adverse impacts are detected policies will be changed.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Council as Equality Impact Assessment process. Plans to broaden this to include refugees, religious minorities and community cohesion. To try to lessen negative impacts and if impacts are justifiable to explain why have allowed impact.</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland DC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To monitor the impact of services on different racial groups using 2001 census categories</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland CC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Assesses impact of all functions and policies in relation to all three aspects of RED. Considers whether any reason to believe impacts are racially differentiated or any public concern that policies operate in discriminatory manner.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9: Monitoring policies for adverse impact on the promotion of race equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Is the criterion included?</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Is duty to promote GRR referred to in relation to this criterion?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham BC</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Corporate race co-ordination group oversees implementation &amp; monitors services using an internal audit. Employment monitoring not covered.</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham CC</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Developed race specific performance indicators. To monitor services to ensure race equity in planning and delivery. To contribute to city wide monitoring of racist incidents. Employment monitoring not mentioned.</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe and Nantwich BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Monitor service usage and take up by different groups using racist incident reporting, consultations, surveys and focus groups. Monitor workforce data including involvement in grievance and disciplinary procedures. To further develop monitoring systems</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Monitor service delivery using customer satisfaction surveys and complaints records. Service usage to be monitored to compile profiles of service use and needs for different racial groups. To build on current consultative frameworks to consult widely. Monitor employment applications using 2001 census categories</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross Council</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Monitoring systems are being developed for monitoring employment. To use 2001 census categories where possible. Guidance has been developed for the accurate reporting of racist incidents. No mention of monitoring need/service usage. Assess existing policies regarding concern that they are damaging good race relations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough Borough Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Monitoring ethnic profile of service users and employees. To introduce religious group monitoring following consultation. Introduced guidance on monitoring racist incidents in schools. Committed to developing accurate management information systems</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland DC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Monitor impact of service on different racial groups via consultation with users, monitoring complaints, focus and interest groups and workforce monitoring. Use 2001 census categories in monitoring</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland CC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To develop service monitoring including usage, satisfaction and complaints. To research local needs and consult on proposed changes. Workplace monitoring by racial group must cover promotion, training, grievance and disciplinary procedures.</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Is the criterion included?</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Is duty to promote GRR referred to in relation to this criterion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham BC</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>To publish accessible summary report on race equality scheme with full document available on request</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham CC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Publish outputs, impact on outcomes, and our targets annually</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe and Nantwich BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Best Value Performance Plan published annually and will include results of monitoring and assessments. Where new policies are being developed consultations will be published on website</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To publish the results of consultations on website, Lutonline and annually in Best Value Performance Plan. Can request information in alternative formats</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Monitoring and consultation results published in newsletter. Other formats/languages available on request. Residents alerted to this in main minority languages on all publications.</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough Borough Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Make available results of customer surveys, consultation exercises and any equality impact assessments. To use range of media</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland DC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Publish consultation and monitoring results in Best Value Performance Plan. Also in press releases and council website</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland CC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Annual review to include results of consultation and monitoring. Available in different formats and languages and online</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Is the criterion included?</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Is duty to promote GRR referred to in relation to this criterion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To ensure equal access on the basis of need. Information available in translation. Efforts underway to engage better with different communities.</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham CC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Acknowledge need to ensure public access to services and information and the need to target some groups that face specific barriers to access such as newly arrived communities.</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe and Nantwich BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Making arrangements to increase the accessibility of information and establish community awareness of services. Will review to improve access</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton BC</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Publish consultations only</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Publish information service in translation following guidance from Scottish Executive. Participating in research to identify barriers to access for various groups including migrants</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough Borough Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Council has expanded range of translated material available and is consulting on accessibility</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland DC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Where necessary will provide translated information/interpreters. Consultation underway to investigate how to improve access</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland CC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Information available in different languages and interpreting service offered. Consulting on how to improve accessibility. Purpose of promoting GRR mentioned.</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Is the criterion included?</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Is duty to promote GRR referred to in relation to this criterion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General and specific training</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham CC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Training provided around cultural awareness, Awareness of equality issues and general duty</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe and Nantwich BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Annual training plan includes equality issues.</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Comprehensive Training Plan includes both general and specific training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross Council</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Equalities Training Strategy developed and further training to be developed.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough Borough Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General and role specific training</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland DC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General training and plans to review training content and develop further training</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland CC</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Specific training programme for those with responsibilities related to the RED including managers and front line staff</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Is the criterion included?</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Is duty to promote GRR referred to in relation to this criterion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Annual service reviews and future review of race equality scheme</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham CC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consultation planned to review the scheme and of reporting and monitoring</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe and Nantwich BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ongoing reviews of service delivery and race equality scheme to be reviewed every three years</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luton BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Comprehensive review within three years</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Annual reviews of service. Race Equality Scheme to be reviewed every three years</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough Borough Council</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Policies and procedures reviewed regularly</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland DC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ongoing review of services annual assistant chief executive review. Three year review of entire scheme</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland CC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Best Value Review of services and three yearly review of scheme</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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