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Abstract

Much of the public policy discourse about immigration in the UK has drawn on the experiences of post-war immigrants from the former British colonies. The volume and composition of immigration flows has changed significantly in recent years with substantial increases in the number of immigrants, particularly from countries without links to the UK, and as a result of the large scale immigration from the EU Accession countries in Central and Eastern Europe. Immigration remains a contested issue with public and political debates focusing on the nature and impact of immigration and its perceived negative effects on employment, public services and social cohesion. In spite of the growing number of studies examining the experiences of new immigrants in local neighbourhoods and labour markets there is a lack of comprehensive evidence about how these experiences differ across immigrant groups and the role of place in shaping the experiences and outcomes of new immigration.

This research draws on a variety of data from the census, national surveys, administrative sources and qualitative interviews to explore the settlement patterns, labour market outcomes and neighbourhood experiences of new immigrants. The findings show that new immigrants are more likely to locate in ethnically diverse and socially deprived neighbourhoods upon arrival although there is variation in the factors determining immigrant settlement by world area of origin in line with differences in migration motives and entitlements in the UK.

The findings from the qualitative interviews highlight the range of motivations and constraints that shape immigrant settlement patterns and how these change over time with secondary migration and family formation. Analysis of the labour market position of immigrants defined by country of origin and ethnicity shows the persistence of ethnic penalties in the labour market. Immigrants from ethnic minority groups both from established and new immigrant groups are found to be more disadvantaged in the labour market than white immigrants and the White British.

The neighbourhood context, specifically neighbourhood deprivation and ethnic diversity, is associated with poorer employment outcomes, with the relationship between area deprivation and employment shown to depend on ethnicity. The qualitative evidence highlights the role of social networks and a range of other factors in facilitating and hindering the socio-economic integration of new immigrants. The findings, particularly in relation to immigrant social networks, access to welfare, settlement intentions and housing aspirations, challenge common perceptions about new immigrants living in deprived areas in the UK. The research evidence contributes to a better understanding of the settlement patterns and experiences of new immigration and has implications for national and local policies.
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1. Introduction

Much of the public policy discourse about immigration and multiculturalism in the UK has drawn on the experiences of post-war immigrants who arrived from the Commonwealth countries in large numbers between the 1950s and 1980s. From the late 1990s onwards the UK started experiencing an increase in immigration from countries without prior historical and colonial links to the UK. The new immigrant population is far more heterogeneous than before in terms of a plethora of migrant socio-economic characteristics including countries of origin and this would be expected to influence immigrant settlement patterns and experiences. The changes in the nature of immigration raise new questions about the factors that lie behind the settlement and experiences of new immigrants and the implications of these settlement patterns and experiences for local areas.

Immigrant location choice and settlement is an under-researched area in the UK reflecting to some extent issues regarding the availability and quality of local data on immigration. Upon arrival to the destination country, immigrants would be expected to locate in large cities where previous immigrants have settled, where there is a large pool of jobs from which they can benefit, and initially move to deprived areas to take advantage of the availability of affordable housing.

The existing evidence on the determinants of the location choices of immigrants, drawn largely from US studies, suggests that the presence of immigrants in an area is the strongest predictor of immigrant location choice although this effect varies for different migrant groups by country of origin and immigration status (for example, Bartel, 1989; Zavodny, 1999; Zorlu and Mulder, 2008). The variegated migration routes and motives of new immigrants, who for example, enter the UK as workers, students, asylum seekers and refugees, family migrants and undocumented migrants (Vertovec, 2007) are expected to give rise to diversified settlement patterns. Understanding the factors that attract new immigrants to particular localities is important because it can determine where immigrants are likely to have the largest economic and social impact and so assist the planning of services in these areas.
Over the last decade, there has been renewed academic and policy interest on the nature and consequences of immigration that has informed debates about issues of integration and social cohesion. Evidence informing these debates so far has been rather piecemeal focusing either on the experiences of immigrants from established ethnic minorities or the experiences of some new immigrant groups, for example, labour migrants or asylum seekers. There has been little attention on how settlement experiences vary across different immigrant groups from established and new immigrant communities.

Most studies to date have also paid little attention about how the experiences of immigration differ across different places. Place matters because different places provide access to different packages of resources, services, and facilities offering safety, security, and a sense of belonging to some (Robinson, 2010, p.2460) while acting as mediators of social exclusion to others (Spicer, 2008). The local impact of immigration will depend on a variety of local area factors associated with the characteristics of the immigrant population, the established communities in local areas as well as social, cultural, and historical factors such as experience of immigration in the past, and levels of area deprivation (Robinson and Reeve, 2006; Robinson, 2010).

New immigration also has implications for integration since it presents new challenges to policymakers looking to reduce or remove the socio-economic differences between immigrants and established communities that may prevent a successfully integrated society (Saggar et al., 2012). New immigrants may be disadvantaged in the labour market upon arrival to the UK as they may have low educational attainment or qualifications that are not recognised by employers and face language barriers (Berthoud, 2000a) or as a result of employment restrictions associated with their immigration status (Phillimore and Goodson, 2006). Cultural expectations and practices—for instance in terms of marriage and childcare responsibilities—and employer discrimination may also explain immigrant disadvantage in the labour market (Dale 2002; Heath and Cheung, 2006).

Studies have generally shown that ethnic minority immigrant groups other than white are particularly disadvantaged in the labour market with significantly lower labour force participation, employment and earnings prospects compared to white immigrant groups and the White British (Clark and Drinkwater, 2000; Wheatley Price, 2001; Haque et al., 2002; Dustmann and Fabbri, 2003; Dustmann and Fabbri, 2005). These differences have been partially explained by underlying investments in human capital such as
education, job specific skills and other individual characteristics. The ethnic penalty is the disadvantage that remains after controlling for these characteristics as a result of other factors such as employer discrimination (Heath and Cheung, 2006). In the majority of these studies, the role of neighbourhood socio-economic context—such as the presence of immigrants and ethnic minorities or local deprivation levels—is largely ignored despite evidence suggesting that these may also be important in determining economic prospects (Buck, 2001; Clark and Drinkwater, 1998; Simpson et al., 2006; Wang, 2008; Wang, 2009). The few studies that have examined the role of place in shaping labour market experiences suggest that living in areas with concentrations of ethnic minorities and deprived areas can influence employment outcomes, for instance, by enabling or hindering the transmission of information about employment opportunities. In policy terms, it is important to develop an understanding of the factors that lie behind the different employment outcomes of new immigrants and the ways policy interventions may have an impact in changing these outcomes.

Another area of significant policy interest has been the impact of immigration on social cohesion. Following the 2001 riots in northern cities in England there was increasing policy focus on community cohesion and the role of immigrants and ethnic minorities in addressing issues of self-segregation and integration, echoing wider concerns about the threat of increased diversity to unity and solidarity (Cheong et al., 2007; Finney and Simpson, 2009). Robert Putnam’s thesis that ‘diversity fosters out-group distrust and in-group solidarity’ (Putnam, 2007; p.142) informed much of the debates on the effects of immigration on cohesion. The community cohesion agenda which became New Labour’s approach to social policy, welfare reform and race relations (Worley, 2005) resonated with concerns about ‘the ways ethnic minorities develop and associate with their wider social world: in other words the extent of cohesion or differentiation’ (Zetter et al., 2006, p.9).

Social networks and the ‘associated norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness’ defined as social capital by Putnam and his ideas about bonding (within-group ties) and bridging capital (between-group ties) heavily influenced the community cohesion agenda. Immigration was largely seen as a threat to the social fabric and prosperity in Britain with bridging social capital perceived as a positive resource whilst bonding social capital among immigrants and the minority ethnic community seen as less desirable (Cheong et al., 2007; p.30). Despite the increasing focus on bonding and bridging social capital within migrant
communities questions remain about how these are defined and differentiated and ‘the ways in which migrants access, maintain and construct different networks’ (Ryan, 2011; p.707).

Social networks provide different types of support, including emotional, informational and tangible support (Schaefer et al., 1981) that may be provided by different people in different ways at different times (Ryan et al., 2008). Disadvantaged immigrants, for instance, may turn to co-ethnic networks for emotional support to help to offset depression, stress and anxieties stemming from poverty and the pressures of managing daily lives (Spicer, 2008) while economic migrants may turn to co-ethnic networks to utilise informational support to improve their economic situation. Similarly, high-skilled migrants would be expected to draw support from colleagues or organizations and less on family and friends than unskilled workers (Vertovec, 2002). The lack of evidence about the nature of immigrant social networks, specifically how and why migrants access existing networks and establish new ties (Zetter et al., 2006; Ryan et al, 2008) hinders our understanding about the ways immigration is impacting upon local areas and social cohesion.

New Labour’s community cohesion policy was criticised for failing to address the persistence of inequalities among ethnic minorities and for not dealing with the underlying causes of discrimination and disadvantage that underlie the residential segregation of ethnic groups and their attachment to deprived areas (Zetter et al., 2006; Cheong et al., 2007; Phillips, 2007; Phillips and Harrison, 2010). Community cohesion as a policy objective, lost favour with the Coalition Government elected in 2010. However, some of the key ideas underpinning New Labour’s community cohesion agenda, for example, active citizenship, individual responsibilities and social capital, are at the heart of the Coalition Government’s flagship policy, ‘the Big Society’. The Big Society aims to transfer power from government to local communities, replacing state provision with volunteerism. The unprecedented large scale cuts in public expenditure that have accompanied the Big Society agenda have put into question the effectiveness of current policy in addressing the needs of disadvantaged groups (Ratcliffe, 2012). One of the groups likely to be affected by the cuts in public funding available in local areas is new immigrants living in the most disadvantaged areas. In this context, understanding the settlement experiences of new immigrants, their employment prospects and the way they interact and form relations with established groups are pertinent in understanding the consequences of new immigration for integration and cohesion.
1.1 Research objectives

The research aims to examine dimensions of new immigration including immigrant settlement patterns, labour market and neighbourhood experiences and the relative importance of place characteristics in determining these patterns and experiences. The neighbourhood experiences of new immigrants are explored with an emphasis on the processes that determine how and why immigrants form their social networks and the types of support they draw from them. The main objectives of the research are as follows:

1. Explore the settlement patterns of different immigrant groups and identify the relative importance of place characteristics in immigrant settlement.
2. Examine the labour market outcomes of new immigrants relative to other immigrant groups and White British people and how they depend on place characteristics including deprivation levels and ethnic concentration.
3. Examine the neighbourhood experiences of immigrants living in deprived areas and the role of social networks and the neighbourhood environment in shaping these experiences.
4. Examine the implications of the settlement patterns and the experiences of new immigrants for national and local policies.

Specifically, the research will seek to answer the following questions:

RQ1. What are the area determinants of the settlement patterns of new immigrants?
RQ2. Which immigrant groups are more likely to settle in ethnically diverse and deprived areas?
RQ3. Are new immigrants more disadvantaged in the labour market than immigrants from established ethnic minority groups?
RQ4. Are new immigrants more disadvantaged in the labour market if they live in deprived or ethnically diverse areas?
RQ5. What is the nature of migrants’ social networks and what support do they draw from them?
RQ6. How do the experiences of new immigrants living in deprived areas depend on the neighbourhood environment?
1.2 Research design

In 2008 a research proposal for a CASE (Collaborative Awards in Science and Engineering) PHD studentship on immigration, urban renewal and community cohesion with New East Manchester (NEM) Urban Regeneration Company as the CASE partner was accepted by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). The main objectives of the research in the initial proposal were to examine the settlement experiences of new immigrants in areas undergoing regeneration, their economic circumstances and their impact on social cohesion. Initial discussions with NEM officers highlighted the need for new evidence on the experiences of new immigration in East Manchester to help answer the following questions: Who are the new immigrants? Why did they settle in East Manchester and what are their long-term settlement intentions? What are their employment circumstances? What is their impact on community cohesion?

In light of the limited small area data on new immigrants and discussions with the CASE partner it was proposed that the research drew on different sources of information and both quantitative and qualitative data. The use of qualitative data also emerged from the need to understand the local experiences of new immigration, for example, the mechanisms underlying settlement patterns, and experiences in the labour market and in the neighbourhood.

The research is based on a mixed methods research design which combines quantitative and qualitative data into a single study. The mixed methods approach is one that tends to base knowledge on pragmatic grounds (Cresswell, 2003). Pragmatism guided the research process in that the choices of research approaches were determined by the research objectives. Quantitative and qualitative methods were used to address different research questions with different data complementing each other (Woolley, 2009) in order to provide a comprehensive account of the nature and experiences of new immigration. Quantitative data were used for questions RQ1-RQ4 and qualitative data for questions RQ5-RQ7. The data were collected simultaneously and the information from the quantitative and qualitative data analysis was integrated in the interpretation of the overall results (Cresswell, 2003). While the results from the
quantitative and qualitative analyses are presented in separate chapters the significance of the results to the overall study are discussed in the final chapter. In the final chapter, the discussion centres upon the implications of the experiences of new immigration for integration and cohesion and for policy.

1.2.1 Quantitative data

In the early stages of the research a review of available data sources that contain information on immigration was undertaken to determine the characteristics of new immigration in the UK. The data template in Appendix 1 shows the range of sources of information on immigration and the limitations associated with using each of these sources.

The national data sources on immigration examined in the study include:

- Long-Term International Migration estimates
- Home Office Asylum and Immigration Statistics
- Department for Work and Pensions National Insurance Number Registrations
- Workers Registration Scheme
- Labour Force Survey
- Census of Population

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) produces Long-Term International Migration (LTIM) estimates from the International Passenger Survey (IPS) and a combination of other data sources providing the most accurate estimates at the national level of immigration and emigration. The IPS is based on an annual sample of 280,000 interviews of passengers passing through main UK ports and airports. One of the main limitations of LTIM estimates is that they are based on migrations that take place over a period of at least a year. This is particularly problematic in terms of obtaining estimates of new immigrant groups that have been associated with temporary or seasonal migration such as migrants from Central and Eastern Europe. The small sample size of the IPS survey (less than 10% of interviewees are classified as migrants) means that estimates

1 This was compiled by reviewing documentation of accompanying data as provided by data providers and through existing reviews, for example, Boden and Rees (2010) and Green et al. (2008).
2 Such as the Labour Force Survey (LFS), Home Office data on asylum seekers and dependents, the Irish Quarterly National Household Survey and the National Health Service Central Register.
of the volume and characteristics of immigrants at the local area level are particularly unreliable.

The review highlighted the limitations of using different data sources together since they define migrants in different ways, for example by country of birth or nationality, and since they allocate migrants into local areas in different ways, for example by place of residence or workplace (see Appendix 1). Overall, the main limitations of official estimates of international migration are that they are least robust at the local area level\(^3\), they cover limited information about the characteristics of migrants and they fail to capture many immigrants that do not appear on national or local registers and databases.

The decennial Census is the most complete and accurate source of information on immigration in the UK but it quickly becomes outdated\(^4\) while surveys are generally unreliable for producing estimates for local areas because the survey samples tend to be small. In recent years, there has been an interest in the use of administrative sources to measure immigration and as an alternative approach to the Census of population (ONS, 2009).

Apart from the Census there are three main sources of information on immigrants at a lower geography than the local authority although these are also subject to some of the limitations mentioned above. The Patient Register can be used to measure both inflows and outflows in local areas based on GP registrations and re-registrations and can be used to distinguish migrants coming from abroad. The Patient Register is considered to be one of the most reliable sources of information on international migration at the local level as it captures both children and adults (Green et al., 2008). The School Census provides a source of information on children in maintained schools in England and Wales. Immigrants can be defined as those who enter the school system for the first time outside compulsory starting age and using information on ethnicity and first language. The number of National Insurance Number (NINo) registrations provides a measure of in-migration for adult overseas nationals according to their place of residence. NINos capture mainly economic migrants including economically active students, since they exclude those not

\(^3\) There have been attempts to improve local area migration estimates in recent years which include the New Migrant Databank (NMD) developed by the University of Leeds and the Migration Statistics Improvement Programme (MSIP) led by ONS. These estimates however correspond to relatively large local areas such as regions and districts.

\(^4\) The 2001 Census did not capture key components of new immigration, for example immigration from Central and Eastern Europe since it predated the EU Accession while the 2011 Census was released in the months prior to the completion of the thesis.
eligible to work such as undocumented immigrants and asylum seekers who have not been granted refugee status.

To examine the settlement patterns of different immigrant groups (objective 1), NINos were used which unlike Flag 4 GP registrations, collect information on nationality. Migrants were defined by the data provider according to nationality by broad world area of origin, the only migrant level characteristic available with small area (ward) NINos. The tobit regression method which takes into account the censored aspect of the data is used to examine the relative importance of ward level and district level characteristics in the settlement patterns of new immigrants. The data and methods for this analysis are described fully in chapter 3.

The Labour Force Survey (LFS) is a national survey of around 60,000 households drawn from five waves conducted at quarterly intervals. The analysis of the labour market outcomes of new immigrants (Objective 2) draws on the most restricted version of the special licence LFS which contains additional variables including ward of residence. The analysis was carried out at the ONS Virtual Microdata Laboratory in London and through the Secure Data Service (SDS). The main limitation of the LFS is that the size of the foreign born people in a given year in the sample is very small to conduct any meaningful analysis. By pooling together different quarters and years (2004-2009) of the LFS it was possible to generate a large sample of recent immigrants. To examine the effect of place characteristics as well as individual characteristics on the employment disadvantage of immigrants, multilevel modelling methods were used to determine the risk of immigrants being workless. New immigrants were defined by combining information on country of birth, ethnicity and length of residence included in the dataset. Chapter 4 provides further details on the data and methods used in this analysis.

**1.2.2 Qualitative data and study localities**

The qualitative data were gathered using semi-structured interviews in two study localities in Manchester—Gorton and Cheetham. The two neighbourhoods were selected to be similarly deprived but to have different ethnic composition and

---

5 The LFS also consists of people who have lived in the UK for at least 6 months and therefore is likely to exclude the most recent or temporary migrants.
migration histories. In order to improve understanding about the local experiences of immigration in the study localities and for the purposes of selecting respondents, the areas were defined in terms of ward boundaries and were selected based on their socio-economic characteristics using data from the Census, indices of deprivation, community cohesion indicators and other local area data from local surveys and administrative sources. The interrogation of local data was important during the initial stages of the research since the 2001 Census data did not accurately capture the characteristics of immigration in the case study areas. The limitations of available secondary data meant that qualitative evidence was needed to supplement quantitative evidence and as ‘a reality check’ to provide additional qualitative evidence on patterns indicated by the different quantitative data sources (Thunhurst et al., 2007).

The fieldwork was conducted in two stages. In the first stage, interviews were conducted with 12 key informants from local groups and organisations operating in the two neighbourhoods to help with the profiling of neighbourhoods and provide insights about the nature of new immigration and the local impacts of migration (see Appendix 3). In the second stage, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 27 immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe (Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia) and Francophone African countries (Cameroon, the Republic of Congo, and Congo DRC). The study participants were identified through snowball sampling and comprised of 16 females and 11 males of which, 9 participants were in their twenties, 15 in their thirties and 4 participants above the age of 40. The interviews examined the experiences of immigrants around five main themes: migration; work and skills; neighbourhood and housing; social interactions and relationships; belonging, future plans and aspirations. The data and methods used in the qualitative study are explained in detail in chapter 5.

1.3 Key concepts

The thesis explores the settlement patterns, employment outcomes and neighbourhood experiences of new immigrants drawing on the concepts of place, deprivation and social networks.
1.3.1 Place

Place comprises three interrelated elements, location, locale and a sense of place (Agnew, 1987). Locale denotes the physical setting for social relations, location the geographical area encompassing social interactions and sense of place the ‘local structure of feeling’ (Gustafson, 2001). Place has different meanings for different people and operates at different spatial scales, for example, the neighbourhood, city, region, and country. Galster (2001; p.2112) defines the neighbourhood as ‘the bundle of spatially based attributes associated with clusters of residences, sometimes in conjunction with other land uses. Neighbourhoods according to Galster (2001) have spatially based characteristics including buildings and infrastructure, demography and class status, tax/public service package, the environment, proximity to employment and facilities, political networks, social interaction and sense of identification.

Neighbourhoods are generally very difficult to define as they do not have fixed boundaries and any attempt to define them needs to take into account the different functions they serve. Three levels of neighbourhood are used in this study as defined by Kearns and Parkinson (2001). The home area discussed mainly in the context of the qualitative analysis has psycho-social purposes such as socialization and fostering feelings of attachment and belonging. The locality is the locale for residential activities in which the local housing market and shops and services operate and denotes social status and position. Urban district or region provides the wider landscape for social and economic opportunities. For the purposes of the quantitative analysis electoral wards are used as an approximation for ‘neighbourhoods’, though these are areas that are very heterogeneous with sizes ranging from 100 to 30,000 residents. Local Authority districts are used as approximations of the wider areas of socio-economic opportunity within which the local neighbourhoods sit.

1.3.2 Deprivation

The study uses the concept of deprivation in the context of individuals and the neighbourhoods based on Peter Townsend’s (1979) definition of poverty concerned with the lack of material and non-material resources. Peter Townsend viewed poverty as a multi-dimensional concept defined in terms of relative deprivation.
Individuals, families and groups in the population can be said to be in poverty when they lack the resources to obtain the types of diet, participate in the activities, and have the living conditions and amenities which are customary, or at least widely encouraged or approved, in the societies to which they belong. Their resources are so seriously below those commanded by the average individual or family that they are, in effect, excluded from ordinary patterns, customs and activities (Townsend, 1979; p.31).

The concept of individual deprivation can be related to the concept of neighbourhood deprivation defined as the geographical concentration of deprived people and the effects arising from the concentration of deprived people (Noble et al., 2006; p.160). The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), a relative measure of deprivation at Lower layer Super Output Area (LSOA) level, has been used to measure neighbourhood deprivation. The Index is derived from indicators covering seven dimensions of deprivation: income, employment, health, education, barriers to housing and services, crime, and the living environment.

1.3.3 Social networks

Social networks as represented by friends, relatives and acquaintances provide information and support in all stages of the migration process, and are therefore integral to a better understanding of patterns of migration, settlement and employment (Ryan et al., 2008). Social networks are not just connections between people—they also connect people with organisations (McCabe et al., 2013).

Social networks provide different types of support including emotional, informational and tangible support (Schaefer et al., 1981) influencing the experiences of immigrants in the receiving country, and their social and economic integration into society. Social networks are not spatially bounded or static, and can extend outside neighbourhoods, regions, and nations (Ryan, 2007; Vertovec 2007). Despite this, proximity is seen as important for the development of social relationships and for some groups, particularly disadvantaged groups the neighbourhood might be critical for all generalised social relationships (Bridge, 2002; p.12). Transnational networks which link migrants with friends and family in their
home country have been shown to be an important source of information and support for migrants (Ryan et al., 2008).

Social networks can also constitute a source of social capital in so far as social networks are part of a wider set of relationships and norms that allow people to pursue their own goals, they constitute a resource that can make a difference in people’s lives and serve to bind society together (Field, 2008). Following Ryan et al. (2008) rather than focusing on the ambiguous concept of social capital this study examines the nature of immigrant social networks, the factors that facilitate and hinder access to social networks and the support immigrants draw from their social networks both within and outside their local neighbourhoods.

1.4 Thesis structure

Chapter 2 reviews recent trends in immigration, discussing developments in immigration policy and presents the literature review on the nature and consequences of new immigration. The literature review highlights the importance of migrant characteristics and place characteristics particularly the presence of ethnic networks and neighbourhood deprivation in determining immigrant settlement patterns, labour market outcomes and the local consequences of immigration. The discussion on the consequences of new immigration focuses upon the links between immigration and i) integration ii) community cohesion and iii) neighbourhood renewal; and discusses the factors expected to influence the experiences of new immigration and the implications for policy.

Chapter 3 explores the settlement patterns of recent immigrants in England, using aggregated Department for Work and Pensions National Insurance Number (NINo) registrations. The results based on tobit regression models show that higher neighbourhood co-ethnic density and ethnic diversity levels, and higher deprivation levels, are associated with increased immigrant settlement. The relative importance of housing and employment conditions are shown to vary for different immigrant groups in line with differences in migration motives and entitlements in the UK.

Chapter 4 examines whether immigrants from ‘established’ and ‘new’ immigrant groups are disadvantaged in the labour market by facing a higher incidence of worklessness than
the White British, using data from the Labour Force Survey. The logistic multilevel modelling results suggest that the labour market disadvantage of non-white immigrants in England is persistent and widespread, with immigrants from ethnic minority groups both from established and new immigrant groups found to be disadvantaged in the labour market compared to white immigrants and the White British. The results also suggest that contextual factors influence the incidence of worklessness among new immigrants with those living in the most deprived areas and areas with high concentrations of ethnic minorities generally facing a higher risk of worklessness.

Chapters 5 and 6 present the findings from the qualitative interviews which focus on the neighbourhood experiences of new immigrants living in two deprived neighbourhoods in Manchester. The qualitative interviews provided evidence about the plurality of experiences of new immigrants and the range of factors shaping these experiences. The main findings are presented in relation to experiences of employment, housing, the neighbourhood environment and social networks. They highlight the motivations and constraints that shape immigrant settlement patterns and how these change over time with secondary migration and family formation. The interviews demonstrate the different ways in which the experiences of new immigrants living in deprived areas relate to their social networks and how aspects of the neighbourhood environment and economic deprivation shape experiences of integration and cohesion.

Chapter 7 concludes with a discussion of the implications of the findings for policy. The discussion centres upon the dimensions and determinants of integration of new immigrants and the ways the current policy context influences experiences of integration. The implications of the findings on the residential location decisions, employment and neighbourhood experiences of new immigrants are discussed for policies on housing, neighbourhood renewal, integration and social cohesion. The chapter also discusses some of the ways in which the research might be further developed.
2. The nature and consequences of new immigration

2.1 Introduction

A number of studies in recent years have highlighted the changing immigration patterns in the UK associated with the rapid acceleration in net immigration flows since the 1990s and the diversification of the new immigrant population (Kyambi, 2005; Berkeley et al., 2006; Vertovec, 2006). There has been a lot of interest in the nature of new immigration and its social, economic, political and cultural consequences. The initial wave of studies focusing on new immigration suggested that new immigrants make a positive contribution to the UK economy, increasing output and employment, creating additional demand, reducing hard to fill vacancies, and make a net positive contribution to the fiscal balance of the state (Portes and French, 2005; Pollard et al., 2008; Riley and Weale 2006; Blanchflower et al., 2007; Dustmann et al., 2009). While immigration has demonstrable benefits for the national economy there remains a lot of public and political resistance to new immigration. Public opinion polls suggest that immigration is one of the most important issues facing Britain today with public concerns revealing anxieties about the levels of immigration and the negative impacts of immigrants on local communities (Duffy and Frere-Smith, 2014). The Conservative party responded to these public concerns by promising to cut down immigration to ‘tens of thousands’ annually (Conservative Party, 2010) and adopting tougher immigration controls after forming a coalition government with the Liberal Democrats in 2010.

Immigrant integration and the impact of immigration on cohesion have featured heavily in public policy debates on immigration. Community cohesion as a term, gained prominence in New Labour policy following the race riots in 2001. The riots shifted the policy focus about the potential effect of immigration on social cohesion referring to ‘the common values and purpose in society, including a sense of belonging and solidarity for people from diverse backgrounds’ (Cheong et al., 2007). In the aftermath of the riots and subsequent events such as the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the US and the 2005 London bombings the Labour Government actively promoted a community cohesion agenda which highlighted the role of immigrants and ethnic minorities in addressing issues of self-segregation and integration, echoing wider concerns about the threat of increased diversity

---

6 Possible negative effects of immigration on low skilled workers are discussed later in the chapter.
to unity and solidarity (Cheong et al., 2007; Finney and Simpson, 2009). The increasing policy emphasis on social cohesion became evident in a series of official documents, government initiatives and guidance to local authorities on mainstreaming community cohesion objectives (Robinson, 2005). At the same time the Government introduced citizenship courses and ceremonies for the incorporation of non-British nationals and actively promoted the learning of a ‘common’ language and supposedly ‘core’ values and culture among new immigrants (Cheong et al., 2007). This was seen as a shift towards an assimilationist ideology which focuses attention away from economic inequalities on to the values and mores of minorities (ibid).

The following sections present an overview of the evidence on the nature and consequences of new immigration drawing on a range of data sources and a literature review. The literature review is not a detailed account of immigration and its consequences and is by no means exhaustive—this would be impossible given the vast literature on immigration, integration and social cohesion. Rather, the focus is on discussing the evidence that helped shape the research focus and the specific elements of new immigration relating to settlement patterns, labour market outcomes and neighbourhood experiences. Throughout this chapter the policy context of new immigration is discussed in relation to three main policy areas: immigration, community cohesion and neighbourhood renewal.

The next section discusses the emergence of new immigration, immigration trends and the policy context which influenced new immigration flows. The next sections examine the implications of the changes in immigration for local areas by discussing the factors that underly immigrant settlement and the impact of immigration on integration and social cohesion.

2.2 Immigration trends and immigration policy

Immigration legislation has played a central role in influencing both the number and characteristics of migrants coming to Britain (Heath and Yu, 2005). British Government policy prior to 1962 applied restrictions only to non-British subjects—the Nationality Act of 1948 extended the entitlements to free entry to Britain that applied to ‘all subjects of the Crown’ until then to the former colonies (Hatton and Wheatley Price, 1998). As a
consequence, there were strong flows of immigrants from the West Indies and subsequently from India who came to Britain to fill labour shortages in the expanding economy (Wheatley Price, 2001; Berkeley et al., 2006). Immigration from Pakistan and Bangladesh followed which peaked in the 1970s and 1980s respectively (Hatton and Wheatley Price, 1998). Despite a series of immigration acts during the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s aimed at restricting immigration from the former British colonies, flows from the New Commonwealth countries continued, as a consequence of ‘friends and family’ migration (Berkeley et al., 2006).

Net immigration flows during the 1980s and 1990s from the New Commonwealth countries—particularly from South Asia—to the UK remained steady at around 109,000 per decade (Hatton, 2005). In contrast, there was a strong upward trend in net immigration from Europe, particularly the European Union (EU) during this time (Hatton, 2005). EU regulations permitting the free movement between member countries under the Treaty of Rome and waves of EU enlargements in the 1980s and 1990s resulted in increased net immigration flows from Europe to Britain during this time. From the latter part of the 1990s, the UK experienced a rapid increase in immigration levels resulting in net immigration (Figure 2.1).

This marked an important change in immigration patterns as the UK traditionally experienced net emigration as a result of the larger flows of emigrants than immigrants (Berkeley et al., 2006).

The increasing levels of immigration coincided with a sharp rise in the allocation of work permits issued in the late 1990s which marked a relaxation of immigration policy under New Labour, following its election in 1997, which also included a relaxation of controls on non-economic immigration (Hatton, 2005).

During the 2000s, there were large increases in immigration flows from the eight Accession (A8) countries—the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovenia, and Slovakia—which joined the EU in 2004 (Figure 2.2). The 2004 EU enlargement was the largest to date, resulting in unprecedented flows of immigrants to the UK from Europe.
Figure 2.1 Immigration trends in the UK, 1991-2009
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Source: *Long Term International Migration Statistics*

Figure 2.2 Immigration by country of birth, 1991-2009
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Source: *Long Term International Migration Statistics*
As shown in Figure 2.3, in the first year of the EU enlargement, 79,000 National Insurance Number (NINo) registrations were issued to nationals from the EU Accession countries, nearly three and a half times higher than in the previous year. In 2005, around a quarter of a million NINos were issued to EU Accession\textsuperscript{7} nationals, more than twice the number issued to nationals from Asian and Middle Eastern countries, accounting for nearly two fifths of all registrations. Many of the EU Accession nationals who arrived in Britain in the first years following Accession may have been seasonal or temporary workers who returned to their countries of origin (Pollard et al., 2008). The number of NINo registrations to EU Accession nationals continued to rise to 368,000 registrations in 2007 but fell sharply in the two subsequent years before stabilising at just over 200,000 in 2010.

**Figure 2.3 NINos to overseas nationals by world area of origin, 2002-2010**

![Figure 2.3 NINos to overseas nationals by world area of origin, 2002-2010](image)

Source: *Department of Work and Pensions National Insurance Recording System*

As shown in Figure 2.4, the majority of new immigrants between 2002 and 2010 were Poles, accounting for one fifth of all NINos and three fifths of NINos issued to EU Accession nationals. Indian nationals accounted for 9\% of all NINos and

\textsuperscript{7}EU-Accession states includes the A8 countries, Malta, Cyprus, the A2 (Bulgaria & Romania) countries and Croatia.
Pakistani nationals for another 4% during the same period. Other nationalities that were represented in significant numbers were from the Old Commonwealth countries such as Australia, South Africa, and the EU15 countries including France, Germany, and other EU Accession countries such as Slovakia and Lithuania.

The UK was one of three countries to allow the free movement of A8 nationals without imposing transitional migration restrictions in 2004.

Figure 2.4 NINos to overseas nationals by nationality, 2002-2010

Source: Department of Work and Pensions National Insurance Recording System

The Workers Registration Scheme (WRS) administered by the Home Office was introduced to ensure that immigrants coming to the UK were in employment and to restrict their access to benefits and welfare services (Gilpin et al., 2006). A8 migrants, who were registered under the WRS, were entitled to work in the UK although they were only able to access the benefits system after 12 months of continuous employment, at which time they could apply for a residence permit.

Following the poor assessments about the scale of immigration from the A8 countries which took the Government by surprise (Anderson et al., 2006), restrictions were imposed to immigration from Bulgaria and Romania which joined the EU in 2007.

---

8The WRS was a transitional measure that was in operation in the UK between 2004 and 2011.
to restrict unskilled migration. Bulgarian and Romanian nationals until January 2014\(^9\), were required to apply for an Accession Worker Card (AWC) unless they had other work permits. Highly skilled migrants, students, the self-employed, those who were self-sufficient and their dependents could apply for a registration certificate. Like A8 nationals, Bulgarian and Romanian nationals who had been working legally in the UK for twelve months without breaks, did not require an AWC.

The number of workers coming from Bulgaria and Romania was small compared with the numbers of migrant workers from the A8 countries, with only 6,475 AWC approved applications made between 2007 and 2009\(^{10}\). The majority of AWC applications during this period were made by Romanian nationals (58%) and related to work permits although approximately a third of Romanian applications related to other categories of the AWC such as the Sectors Based Scheme (SBS). In addition to AWC applications there were 41,675 approved applications for registration certificates, the majority relating to self-employment (38%), family reunification (20%) and study purposes (19%).

In addition to the large numbers of immigrants coming from Central and Eastern Europe, UK immigration trends show large increases in immigration flows from (‘other’) countries outside the EU and the Commonwealth with particularly marked increases in immigration from these countries taking place between 1997 and 2002 (Figure 2.2). During the 1990s, the UK Work Permit scheme applicable to non-EU nationals allowed employers to employ high-skilled migrants coming from outside the UK. Under the Asylum and Immigration Act of 1996, employing migrants with no permission to live and work in the UK became a criminal offence. The 2004 Immigration Order strengthened the requirements for those wishing to take up employment by revising the documents required as evidence for entitlement to work, followed by a series of enforcement efforts that aimed to clamp down on illegal immigrants (Anderson et al., 2006).

Immigration policy in the 1990s was partly developed as a response to the growth in asylum seekers and refugees, an important feature of recent immigration in the UK and elsewhere. Since the 1990s, many African countries experienced political unrest and

---

\(^9\) On 1 January 2014, the restrictions on Bulgarian and Romanian nationals’ access to work in the UK which required permission from the Home Office were lifted.

\(^{10}\) Evidence on immigration from Bulgaria and Romania comes from the UK Border Agency Accession Statistics produced in quarterly intervals. The figures presented here have been extracted from the individual quarterly reports and aggregated to correspond to the whole period from January 2007 to March 2009.
conflict resulting in an increase in asylum seekers in the UK, particularly from Zimbabwe, Somalia, the Congo, and Nigeria. During the 1990s, asylum applications from within Europe, Asia and the Middle East also rose, particularly from Afghanistan, Iraq, Sri Lanka and Turkey (Home Office statistics online). The numbers of asylum applications in the 1990s rose from an annual rate of between 2,500 and 4,000 in the 1980s, to between 22,000 and 46,000 in the 1990s, rising further to between 70,000 and 84,000 between 1999 and 2002 (Berkeley et al., 2006). The increased numbers of asylum seekers in the UK and widespread perceptions that most were ‘economic migrants’—unskilled workers from poor countries looking for access to the UK labour market—led to a series of Asylum and Immigration Acts in the 1990s, including the Asylum and Immigration Act of 1996, which had the effect of removing rights of appeal for those refused entry, restricting benefits claims, and enhancing enforcement powers (Hatton and Wheatley Price, 1998). Asylum applications in the UK decreased significantly from around 84,000 in 2002 to 49,400 in 2003, dropping further to between 23,600 to 25,900 between 2006 and 2008 (Home Office statistics online).

During the 1990s a growing number of Eastern European Roma also settled in the UK from Romania, the Czech Republic, Poland and Slovakia, through applying for asylum, or without legal status (Matras, 1996). The Eastern European Roma population increased significantly in recent years, particularly following the 2004 and 2007 EU enlargements with the Roma population in the UK in 2012 estimated to be around 225,000.

The consequence of recent immigration flows to the UK has been that the share of immigrants from established ethnic minority groups from South Asia and the Caribbean has been declining over the last decades while the share of immigrants from non traditional sending countries has grown. As shown in Figure 2.5 the immigrant population more than doubled between 1991 and in 2011 and became more diversified in terms of the countries of origin of immigrants. For example, the top 10 countries of origin of the non-UK born population in 1991 which included Ireland, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Jamaica and Kenya accounted for 56% of the immigrant population. In contrast, in 2011 the top 10 origin countries of immigrants accounted for 45% of the immigrant population and migrants from traditional sending countries such as Ireland, India, Jamaica and Kenya accounted for a smaller share of the immigrant population in 2011 compared with 1991.

12http://hub.coe.int/web/coe-portal/roma
Poland and Nigeria also featured among the top 10 countries of origin of the non UK born population for the first time in 2011 (Figure 2.5). According to the 2011 Census, 13% of the population in England and Wales were born outside the UK. Immigrants from South Asia and the Caribbean accounted for under a quarter of the immigrant population. In comparison, more than a third of all immigrants were born in Europe, while just under a fifth of all immigrants were born in the African continent.

**Figure 2.5 Top 10 countries of origin of non UK born population, 1991, 2001 and 2011**

![Chart showing top 10 countries of origin of non UK born population from 1991 to 2011]


Immigration trends also suggest that, since 1991, the share of immigrants entering the UK for work and study purposes has grown at the expense of immigrants coming to the UK to join family or for other reasons such as to claim asylum (Figure 2.6). In 2008, the UK work permit scheme was replaced by the UK Immigration Points Based Tier System which simplified work and study routes of entry to Britain aiming to restrict the intake of low skilled immigrants further. Such migration is now expected to be sourced mainly from within the EU, and particularly from the EU Accession countries (Anderson et al., 2006). The five tiers correspond to different types of immigrants for example, *high-value migrants* (Tier 1) include entrepreneurs, investors, ‘exceptional talent' individuals; *skilled workers* (Tier 2) include those who are transferred in the UK by their employers.
or who work in sectors with skills shortages; low-skilled workers (Tier 3) include those filling specific temporary labour shortages; international students (Tier 4) and temporary workers and youth mobility scheme participants (Tier 5). Separate allowances were made for family migrants, for example, family members and spouses of British citizens.

In 2009, more than two thirds of immigrants were accounted for by migrant workers and international students. The Coalition Government which came into power in 2010, made further amendments to the immigration system which included the closure of the Tier 1 (General) route and the closure of the Tier 1 Post-Study Work Route (PSWR) which allowed non-EU graduates of UK universities to remain in the country for two years to work.

Figure 2.6 Main reason for migration, 1991-2009

Source: Long Term International Migration Statistics

Other changes included the introduction of a minimum salary threshold for some Tier 2 migrants and sponsors of family migrants, more stringent language and financial requirements, time limits to study for international students, and greater restrictions on the right to bring dependents into the UK.
2.3 The settlement patterns of new immigrants

New immigrants exhibit increasingly diverse settlement patterns compared with the settlement patterns of previous immigrants. Most immigrants are concentrated in large urban centres such as Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds and London. The largest number of recent immigrants is found in the outer London boroughs of Brent and Ealing and parts of inner London such as Newham, Westminster and Tower Hamlets, Wandsworth, Haringey and Lambeth (see Figure 2.7 and index map A1.2 in Appendix 1).

The most distinct patterns among new immigrant groups are observed for immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe. Immigrants from the EU Accession countries\(^{13}\) are more widely distributed across England with significant numbers settling in London, Edinburgh and the core cities, and in smaller towns and cities such as Peterborough, Luton, Northampton and Southampton as well as rural areas such as Herefordshire and Boston.

The increased diversification of immigration flows and immigrant settlement patterns have implications for the local experiences of new immigration. The impact of immigration would be expected to vary from one place to another since different types of immigrants would be expected to settle in different types of places. Features of the social environment such as levels of deprivation, the existence of social networks and support, as well as sociocultural and historical community features such as norms relating to shared identity and attitudes towards diversity, are likely to influence experiences of immigration (Robinson and Reeve, 2006; Robinson, 2010).

The local authority classification shown in Figure 2.8\(^{14}\) begins to capture the differential local impact of immigration that is likely to result from differences in the socio-economic characteristics of the immigrant population and the places in which they settle.\(^{15}\)

---

\(^{13}\) The A10 Accession countries include the A8 Accession countries and Bulgaria and Romania.

\(^{14}\) The map was created using the LA classification data from Poppleton et al. (2013).

\(^{15}\) The typology of local authorities was developed during a six month ESRC internship at the Home Office Migration and Border Analysis Unit for a project examining the social and public service impacts of international migration at the local level. The typology used cluster analysis to group local authorities in England and Wales into groups or clusters: 7 ‘high migration’ clusters; 3 ‘moderate migration’ clusters and 2 ‘low migration’ clusters. The ‘high migration’ clusters shown here had significantly higher than average levels of migration for single or combination groups of migrants. The full details about the methodology and classification are given in Poppleton et al. (2013).
Figure 2.7 NINos to overseas nationals by local authority, 2002-10
Figure 2.8 Local authority classification, 2010
Table 2.1 A local authority classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Migration characteristics</th>
<th>Socio-economic characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superdiverse London</td>
<td>Very high rates of migration for all migrant types (by age, migrant stream and nationality) and high turnover levels.</td>
<td>Far more young people and people in the rented housing sector and higher employment in migrant dense industries. Urban areas with history of migration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitan London and Periphery</td>
<td>High rates of migration particularly for students, migrant workers and migrants from Europe (excluding EU Accession countries).</td>
<td>Fewer children and elderly people and more young people and people in the rented housing sector. Urban areas with history of migration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Suburbs and Satellite Towns</td>
<td>High turnover and migration levels, particularly for children migrants, elderly migrants, migrant workers, Africans.</td>
<td>Urban areas with few elderly people and fewer people employed in the manufacturing sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Conurbation Centres</td>
<td>High rates of African and Asian migration, children migration, international student migration and a high proportion of supported asylum seekers.</td>
<td>Urban areas with high levels of worklessness and social housing and higher employment levels in migrant dense industries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Turnover Provincial and Student Towns</td>
<td>High levels of churn, high student migration but moderate migration of other migrants.</td>
<td>High proportion of private rented housing, lower employment levels in manufacturing and fewer children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum Dispersal Areas</td>
<td>High proportion of supported asylum seekers.</td>
<td>High worklessness and social housing levels and low turnover levels. Predominantly urban.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Worker Towns and Countryside</td>
<td>High levels of migration from the EU Accession countries, below average levels of migration from other countries and lower turnover levels.</td>
<td>Above average levels of employment in manufacturing. Predominantly rural.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classification takes into account the characteristics of immigration in local areas such as the volume of immigration, immigration route, migrant nationality; and the characteristics of local authorities including deprivation levels, turnover levels, age structure, population density and employment structure (see Poppleton et al., 2013).
The classification groups local authorities into twelve distinct clusters with a subset classified as ‘high migration’ clusters (shown in Figure 2.8) which include London boroughs and parts of the South of England characterised by large and diverse flows of new immigrants of different nationalities and migration streams (Superdiverse London, Cosmopolitan London and Periphery, London Suburbs and Satellite Towns).

Large new immigrant flows are also experienced in Diverse Conurbation Centres in the North of England and the Midlands that have long histories of migration. High migration clusters also include local areas with large immigration flows associated with one migrant type and/or groups of nationalities with little history of immigration. These include Asylum Dispersal Areas, deprived ex industrial towns in the North of England with large numbers of asylum seekers, Migrant Worker Towns and Countryside that have attracted large levels of EU Accession nationals and High Turnover Provincial and Student Towns that have attracted higher levels of international students.

The different characteristics of immigrants and the socio-economic characteristics of the areas in each of the high migration clusters (Table 2.1) suggest that immigration is likely to impact differently upon these areas. For example, in Asylum Dispersal Areas and Migrant Worker Towns and Countryside which have little history of immigration and experience in managing diversity, immigration may put greater pressures on social cohesion than in superdiverse London boroughs and diverse conurbation centres that have long histories of immigration. Similarly, housing pressures may be felt in high turnover areas, for example, London Suburbs and Satellite Towns and High Turnover Provincial and Student Towns and where migration is likely to be associated with seasonal and temporary workers as in Migrant Worker Towns and Countryside (see Poppleton et al., 2013).

2.3.1 The factors determining new immigrant settlement patterns

The preponderance of new immigrants in large cities is not surprising. Immigrants upon arrival are expected to be drawn to cities where previous immigrants have settled to take advantage of networks that offer support for dealing with the challenges of migration, including integration, discrimination, hostility and exclusion (Robinson and Reeve, 2006). Social networks and particularly kinship and friendship networks play a central role in migration decision-making, post-migration decisions and location patterns (Cornelius,
According to Boyd (1989; p.641) migration flows represent and develop from social networks which ‘connect migrants and non-migrants across time and space’ which once established become ‘self-sustaining, reflecting the establishment of networks of information, assistance and obligations’. These social networks play an important role in initial location decisions in the receiving country.

UK studies examining the experiences of immigrants from the A8 countries have suggested that they are drawn into particular areas as a result of the presence of contacts, friends or family who provide information and resources regarding employment and housing (Stenning et al., 2006; Pemberton and Stevens, 2007). Immigrants would be expected to rely on such networks for other types of information about services such as health care, for recreational opportunities and emotional and financial support (Cornelius, 1982). Fictive kin are social ties based on religious and cultural traditions rather than family association, which are also likely to be important for some immigrant groups, not just for material, social and emotional support but also for cultural continuity and social control (Ebaugh and Curry, 2000). African immigrants, for example, have household structures which comprise of non-family members including an extensive network of cousins (Bernard and Gupta, 2008).

A large body of research, particularly from the US, has shown that the presence of immigrants in an area is the strongest determinant of the residential location decisions of new immigrants (McDonald, 2004; Bartel, 1989; Jaeger 2000; Zavodny, 1997; Zavodny, 1999; Borjas 2001). Places with recently arrived immigrants would be expected to attract higher numbers of immigrants on the basis that they may represent stronger cultural and linguistic links to migrants’ home countries (McDonald, 2004). Immigrants tend to locate in areas with their co-ethnics to benefit from extended social and cultural ties, social support, a sense of belonging and well-developed community infrastructures which give rise to a sense of well-being particularly in the early stages of migration (Phillips, 2007). Immigrants may also locate in areas where ethnic minority groups are concentrated— not necessarily co-ethnics—as these areas are more likely to exhibit community experience in dealing with migration issues and be more accepting to new arrivals (Aslund, 2005). Ethnically diverse areas can act as reception areas for new immigrants protecting them from risks of discrimination and alienation and provide resources and services not available in mono-cultural areas such as religious facilities that are shared by different immigrant groups (Logan et al., 2002; Robinson and Reeve, 2006).
European studies re-enforce US findings about the importance of the size of the immigrant population in the location preferences of immigrants. Aslund (2005) suggested that it is both the presence of co-ethnics and the presence of other immigrants that matter in the location choices of immigrants in Sweden, particularly for those with lower qualifications. Zorlu and Mulder (2008) also showed that non-Western immigrant groups in the Netherlands are more likely to initially settle and subsequently move to ethnically dense neighbourhoods.

The role of deprived neighbourhoods in housing new immigrants has been recognised in the academic literature for some time. Spatial assimilation theory posits that upon arrival immigrants locate in deprived areas where previous immigrants have settled for mutual support and subsequently locate to non immigrant areas following cultural and economic assimilation (Allen and Turner, 1996). Since many immigrants, particularly those from non-Western countries, arrive in the UK without any financial assets they are expected to move to deprived areas initially, to benefit from the availability of cheap housing (Zorlu and Mulder, 2008).

The seminal work of Park and Burgess (1925) viewed deprived inner city neighbourhoods as ‘zones of transition’ positioned on the initial rungs of a stepladder, which immigrants were expected to climb as they assimilated into society and moved through the city’s zones (Schwirian, 1983). Immigrants are expected to reside in deprived neighbourhoods as a result of economic necessity, kinship ties and disadvantage. The distribution of recent immigrants across England suggests that they are overrepresented in the most deprived local authority districts, many concentrated in inner London, the West Midlands conurbation, Merseyside, Greater Manchester, and West Yorkshire (Figure 2.9). These are districts with neighbourhoods that are typically characterised by a concentration of multiple deprivation: high worklessness, low income, poor health, low educational attainment, high crime rates, poor environmental conditions and poor services (Noble et al., 2007).

The differential location patterns of immigrants also arise from differences in immigration route. ‘Family reunification’ has been a main route of entry for many recent immigrants from the former British colonies, particularly from Asia and Africa, with location patterns determined by the location decisions of earlier migrants, who will usually include the relatives they are joining (Hatton and Wheatley Price, 1998; Styan, 2003).
The initial settlement patterns of asylum seekers are likely to be predetermined by asylum agencies and the availability of assisted or social housing (Zorlu and Mulder, 2008). Applying for asylum is one of the only means of entry to the UK for many immigrants from less developed countries as a result of tighter immigration controls (Styan, 2003). Zorlu and Mulder (2008) showed that asylum seekers in the Netherlands exhibit dispersed settlement patterns upon arrival but subsequently have the highest likelihood of moving to ethnically segregated neighbourhoods compared to labour and family migrants. Damm (2009) also found that placed refugees in Denmark were more likely to relocate to locations with a large co-immigrant population and be attracted to local areas by housing attributes such as the size of the social housing sector.

In the UK, the location patterns of asylum seekers reflect National Asylum Seekers Support Service (NASS) dispersal policies which placed large numbers of asylum seekers in deprived areas mainly in the north of England with large supplies of low cost housing (Phillimore and Goodson, 2006). NASS was set up by the Home Office in 2000 under the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999, to provide welfare support to asylum seekers and coordinate asylum dispersal aimed to relieve pressure from London and the South East. Accommodation for asylum seekers has been provided by private sector companies since 2012 under Commercial and Operating Managers Procuring Asylum Support (COMPASS) contracts. Once granted refugee status asylum seekers were often relocated to social housing by local authorities and had limited choice on subsequent location decisions (Robinson et al, 2007). Local housing characteristics such as the size of the social housing sector may therefore be more important for the most disadvantaged immigrant groups such as refugees.

Labour migrants are expected to be more spatially dispersed and settle in areas with more diverse characteristics compared to family migrants or refugees. This is because the location decisions of labour migrants are likely to be determined by the availability of employment opportunities and the availability of housing in the private rather than the social rented sector (Zorlu and Mulder, 2008). EU Accession nationals have been described as ‘spatial pioneers’, representing the early stage of immigrant settlement (Robinson and Reeve, 2006) whereas newly arrived immigrants have only ties with employment or education rather than family and community ties (Anwar, 1979).

16http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmselect/cmhafl/218/21810.htm
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Figure 2.9 NINo registrations to foreign nationals, 2001-2010, by district IMD score
Large numbers of EU Accession migrants are thought to have settled in small towns and rural areas—often in areas which have previously not experienced large migration inflows—to benefit from employment opportunities in sectors that have attracted migrant workers in recent years (Stenning et al., 2006; Pemberton, 2009; Bauere et al., 2007). These are low skill and low pay sectors such as hospitality and catering, agriculture, manufacturing and food processing (UK Border Agency et al., 2009).

Worker Registration Scheme (WRS) applications by sector of employment for the period 2004 to 2009 show that the location patterns of A8 immigrants vary by sector of employment.

The largest numbers of A8 workers in the hospitality and catering sectors registered with employers in London (27%), in the agriculture sector registered with employers in Anglia (25%) and in the administration, business and management sector registered with employers in the Midlands (20%) (UK Border Agency et al., 2009).

The likelihood that immigrants will locate in ethnically dense areas, however, depends on their socio-economic circumstances with better educated immigrants and those with fluency in the language of the receiving country, for example, being less likely to move to areas with a large presence of immigrants from their own group (Bartel, 1989; McDonald, 2004). Cultural distinctiveness can also act as a source of prejudice and discrimination which can influence the spatial segregation of immigrants (Berry, 1997). Migrants from developing countries would generally be expected to be more likely to locate in ethnically dense areas than immigrants from developed countries since the cultural distance between immigrants from developing countries and receiving country nationals in developed countries is often large in terms of human capital and religious background (Zorlu and Mulder, 2008).

The size of the local population has been shown to be a determinant of the location choices of immigrants as they are more likely to be attracted to larger cities (Aslund, 2005). In the US, some studies have also found that the local welfare system influences the location choices of immigrants (Borjas 2001; Dodson, 2001) although others have suggested that the effect of welfare disappears after controlling for previous immigration (Zavodny, 1997).
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17 The main industry of work for A8 migrants between 2004 and 2009 according to the WRS was administration, business and management. This is because large numbers of migrants who worked for recruitment agencies were recorded in this sector irrespective of type of employment.
There is also mixed evidence on the effect of labour market conditions with some studies suggesting that immigrants cluster in areas with high wages and low unemployment rates (Borjas, 2001; Jaeger, 2000; Aslund, 2005) while others suggest that immigrants cluster in high unemployment areas (Buckley, 1996; Zavodny, 1997). However, regional economic differences in the receiving country may be of less importance to the location decisions of immigrants given the large differences in wages and unemployment rates between the country of origin of immigrants and the receiving country (Dodson, 2001).

### 2.3.2 Immigrant residential mobility and segregation

Another important aspect of immigrant settlement relates to the likelihood that immigrants will stay in ethnically diverse deprived areas or relocate to less ethnically concentrated and less deprived areas. The subsequent residential trajectories of immigrants are important for understanding levels of cultural and economic integration (Allen and Turner, 1996). A potential consequence of the increased diversification in the characteristics of new immigrants in terms of, for example, education and economic status, may be that those who possess or have the potential to acquire resources will be able to move up the social ladder and move to better neighbourhoods, while those with limited resources may be trapped in poor neighbourhoods as they become disadvantaged and assimilate into the poor 'underclass' (Fong and Sibuya, 2003). This is in line with the segmented assimilation model proposed by Portes and Zhou (1993) which suggests that immigrants may not become active members of society as a whole, but rather become assimilated into specific parts of it, defined on the basis of race or ethnicity and class (Castles et al., 2002).

The housing literature still draws on classic studies by Rossi (1955) and Brown and Moore (1970) to explain changes in residential preference and mobility as the outcome of a sequential decision-making process. Residential mobility is seen as the outcome of dissatisfaction with the present housing situation which arises from changes in household composition that accompany life-cycle changes or changes in the residential environment with the decision to move or stay depending on alternative housing options. Housing attributes such as housing type, size, price, and tenure, proximity to employment and services are important factors in the decision to move (Dieleman, 2001). Life-cycle stage, for example, family formation and dissolution, education and employment career are the
main drivers of residential mobility. The wider housing market structure, including the nature of the housing stock, local housing and renewal policies and local housing prices also play a role (Bowes et al., 2002).

In the context of immigrant and ethnic minority residential mobility, there is much debate over the importance of choice versus constraint. In the UK, institutionalized discrimination by housing market agencies is thought to have contributed to the persistence of spatial segregation of ethnic minorities in deprived neighbourhoods (Phillips, 2007). The settlement patterns of early post-war immigrants reflected unequal access to social housing, subsequent discriminatory housing allocations practices, ‘racial steering’ and limited financing options in the private sector and the limited employment opportunities available to immigrants upon arrival (Fieldhouse, 1999; Van Kempen and Ozuekren, 1998; Phillips, 2007; Phillips and Harrison, 2010). Racism and harassment continue to be key constraints on housing choice for some members of established ethnic minority groups such as the Pakistani ethnic group (Bowes et al., 2002). Other processes that have given rise to residential segregation relate to group preference. Phillips (2007) explains that there are many benefits that accrue to members of ethnic minorities by clustering together such as extended social and cultural ties, social support, a sense of belonging and well-developed community infrastructures which give rise to a sense of well-being particularly in the early stages of migration.

The health benefits that arise from the co-location of immigrants are well documented in the epidemiological literature. Racial discrimination has been associated with adverse effects on health with many studies suggesting that increased ethnic density is associated with a lower incidence of health problems such as psychosis, suicide, common mental disorders, and overall self-rated health and mortality for ethnic minority groups (Stafford et al., 2010). Higher levels of social cohesion have also been linked to better health outcomes. Ethnic density may be associated with better health outcomes for minorities through increased social cohesion if it is associated with greater tolerance and understanding of diversity as well as a sense of belonging, trust and reciprocity (ibid).

Immigrants and ethnic minorities first moving into deprived neighbourhoods out of necessity and cultural and religious ties may prefer to stay in these neighbourhoods for cultural reasons and a sense of security although in the absence of barriers they would be expected to gradually migrate to less deprived areas over time (Phillips, 2007). As the
length of time in the receiving country increases, economic, social and spatial integration are also expected to increase (Fong and Wilkes, 1999). The persistent association between ethnic minority segregation, deprivation and poverty has been interpreted as an indication that exclusionary forces play a role in shaping the geographies of racialized groups (Phillips, 2007; p.1148). Phillips and Harrison (2010, p.233) suggest that the legacy of discrimination has helped to cement the attachment of ethnic minorities and immigrants to deprived inner-city neighbourhoods, where they have built community relationships and institutions. However, the different housing circumstances of ethnic minority groups in the UK reveal differences in preferences in terms of housing type and location that are in line with differences in social class (Peach, 1998). Socio-economic disadvantage and in particular, the persistence of labour market ethnic inequalities, may therefore partly explain restricted mobility although cultural preferences are likely to exert stronger influences on the residential patterns of ethnic minorities in the UK (Peach, 1998).

A different perspective on immigrant residential segregation suggests that it is part of a process that involves ‘white flight’. There are widespread views that new immigration is leading to ‘white flight’ which is transforming the makeup of London and other large UK cities and deepening racial segregation. ‘White flight’ a term that become popular in explaining ethnic neighbourhood transition in the US can be traced back to the Chicago school of sociologists who viewed residential mobility at the heart of neighbourhood transition. The ‘invasion’ of newly arrived immigrants and succession of the previous population was seen to initiate a chain reaction with each population group moving closer to the outer parts of the city (Short, 1978). In the US, a lot of interest centred upon the transition of white to black neighbourhoods whereby the penetration of black people in white neighbourhoods was followed by a sustained increase in the black population and a decrease in the white population until the population of the neighbourhood changed entirely from white to black. As the proportion of black residents living in a neighbourhood increased, the likelihood of white people moving in these neighbourhoods was seen to diminish, perpetuating invasion-succession cycles (Dixon and Durrheim, 2003). Duncan and Duncan (1957) suggested that racial transition occurred in stages which they identified as penetration, invasion, consolidation, and piling up, which neighbourhoods were seen to pass through at different rates but without having to go through every stage (Schwirian, 1983). The invasion and succession of neighbourhoods by
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black people in the US has been used to describe processes of ‘white flight’ and the 
expansion of black ghettos. The low socio-economic status and disadvantage of black 
persons in the US meant that racial transition was followed by neighbourhood decline (Fong 
and Sibuya, 2003). More recent evidence has suggested that the presence of small numbers 
of minorities in US neighbourhoods may not necessarily be followed by rapid population 
turnover, instead resulting in an integrated neighbourhood racial-ethnic structure and 
greater ethnic diversity (Hou and Milan, 2003; p.389).

Ethnic transition is also not necessarily associated with declining neighbourhood status. 
Ethnic communities are usually formed after economic and cultural adjustment has taken 
place with residential decisions based on choice over necessity (Logan et al., 2002; Hou 
and Milan, 2003). Hou and Milan, (2003) suggest that ‘immigrant enclaves’ are more 
likely to be transitional neighbourhoods for new immigrants providing affordable housing 
and mutual support but with time the more successful would be expected to move out. 
These areas are invariably characterised by poor socio-economic conditions and may 
become minority ghettos if members of a minority immigrant group are trapped in their 
resettlement areas, and socio-economic conditions are likely to further deteriorate as a 
consequence. Minority ghettos reflect the historical outcome of discrimination and social 
exclusion and are found largely in the US where black ghettos in inner city 
neighbourhoods are characterised by the persistence of poverty and poor socio-economic 
conditions (Hou and Milan, 2003).

There is little evidence to support the view of ‘white flight’ and increasing ethnic 
residential segregation in the UK. Recent analysis of the settlement and mobility patterns 
of ethnic minority groups has showed that the reported self-segregation of ethnic 
minorities is not supported by evidence and that there is dispersal away from traditional 
settlement areas, although this process is taking place at differential rates for different 
ethnic groups (Simpson, 2007; Simpson and Finney, 2010; Finney and Simpson, 2009). 
Instead, neighbourhoods are increasingly becoming more ethnically diverse and there is 
support for the view that neighbourhood ethnic transition has not resulted in white flight or 
ghettos on the basis of race (Simpson, 2007; Simpson and Finney, 2010). Finney and 
Simpson (2009) examined the expansion of ethnic minority populations in Bradford and 
showed that the number of mixed areas with populations of white and other ethnic groups 
grew during the 1990s. They also showed that ethnic minority populations in areas with a 
minority white population grew mainly through natural growth (the difference between
births and deaths) rather than immigration and that more ethnic minority people were leaving than arriving in these areas (and more white people arriving than leaving). Stillwell and McNulty (2012) examined internal migration patterns for the Asian, Black and Mixed groups within London and showed dispersal from areas of high to low ethnic concentration. Their findings also suggested that Asian immigrants arriving in the year prior to the 2001 Census were more likely to settle in neighbourhoods with lower concentrations of established Asian populations. Kaufmann (2014) observed that the rate of flows out of London for the White British group remained relatively stable between 1971 and 2011 (15% and 13% respectively) despite the ethnic minority population growing from 14% in 1971 to 55% in 2011. Kaufmann also found that ethnic minorities are leaving areas of ethnic concentration but in his view, White British people were increasingly moving out of ‘superdiverse’ areas and into white areas for reasons relating to ‘cultural attraction’ rather than ‘cultural repulsion’ (Kaufmann, 2014, p.75).

2.4 Immigration and integration

Integration and cohesion have been central planks of policy on immigration in Britain since the late 1940’s (Saggar et al., 2012). Against the backdrop of new immigration there has been renewed interest in aspects of integration and community cohesion and the ways new immigration is impacting on local communities in Britain.

New immigration has implications for integration since it presents challenges to reduce or remove socio-economic differences between immigrants and established communities that may prevent a successfully integrated society (Saggar et al., 2012). Integration is a complex and contested concept with multiple dimensions conceptualised as a two-way process between newcomer and receiving communities (Atfield et al 2007). Integration experiences relate to a broad range of factors including migration motivations and statuses and conditions in the receiving country, and outcomes in employment, education, housing, and health (Ager and Strang, 2004; 2008). Functional processes such as the ability to speak the language and mix with people in the receiving country, feelings of belonging and acceptance, having a passport, feeling safe and having the same legal rights and opportunities as people in the receiving country, are also part of the integration experience (Atfield et al., 2007).
Integration is one of many forms of acculturation that explain the cultural changes that a group or an individual encounters following migration. Berry (1997) identifies four types of acculturation: assimilation, separation, integration and marginalisation. Assimilation refers to the situation when immigrants do not wish to maintain their cultural identity and seek daily interaction with other cultures while integration occurs when immigrants maintain their own culture and are able to participate in society as an integral member. On the other hand, separation occurs when immigrants hold on to their original culture by avoiding interaction with others while marginalisation occurs when there is little possibility or interest in cultural maintenance and little interest in having relations with others. Berry posits that immigrants are not always able to choose acculturation strategies freely unless ‘the dominant society is open and inclusive in its orientation towards cultural diversity’ and might face restricted choices or even be forced into certain forms of acculturation by the majority group in the receiving society (Berry, 1997; pp.9-10).

According to Berry in situations when separation is forced upon immigrants it becomes segregation while marginalisation usually occurs as a result of forced assimilation and segregation. There is general consensus that acculturation does not involve a linear process of change involving assimilation into a new culture and loss of the old culture but a two-dimensional process whereby ‘preservation of one’s heritage culture and adaptation to the host society, are conceptually distinct and can vary independently’ (Phinney et al., 2001; p.495).

The different ethnic and cultural identities of immigrants are associated with different degrees of acculturation of immigrants in society. Large cultural differences between immigrants and receiving communities can be associated with poorer integration because adaptation comes with a higher risk of cultural conflict (Berry, 1997; p.23). According to Phinney et al. (2001; p.495) ethnic identity is that aspect of acculturation that focuses on the subjective sense of belonging to a group or culture so that identifying with the receiving society while maintaining a strong ethnic identity would be considered an integrated identity. An assimilated identity is one that involves loss of ethnic identity and identification of only the receiving society culture, while loss of ethnic identity combined with inability to identify with the receiving country culture would give rise to a marginalized identity. Maintaining a strong ethnic identity without identifying with the receiving society gives rise to a separated identity.
Cultural distinctiveness can act as a source of prejudice and discrimination particularly if it coincides with physical distinctiveness; for instance, new immigrants not readily identified as ‘foreign’ (e.g. by skin colour) are more likely to be accepted by existing residents (Robinson and Reeve, 2006). In situations when distinctive physical features act as a source of prejudice and discrimination this can influence the willingness of immigrants to associate with other groups and their level of segregation (Berry, 1997). Hostility and prejudice may be directed from the majority white group in the receiving country towards minority groups or from one minority group towards another. In the UK studies have highlighted the existence of tensions between people from established ethnic minorities as well as between new migrant groups, ethnic majority and minority groups (see Hudson et al., 2007).

Berry (1997) also notes that the broader national context may affect the choice of acculturation strategies employed by immigrants ‘such that in explicitly multicultural societies individuals may seek to match such a policy with a personal preference for integration; or in assimilationist societies, acculturation may be easiest by adopting an assimilation strategy for oneself’ (Berry, 1997; p.12).

Multicultural ideology can affect positively the experiences of immigrants in that ‘they are less likely to enforce cultural change (assimilation) or exclusion (segregation and marginalisation) on immigrants; and they are more likely to provide social support both from the institutions of the larger society and from the continuing and evolving ethnocultural communities that usually make up pluralistic societies’ (in Berry, 1997; p.17).

UK policies on the adaptation of immigrants since the 1960s were based on ideologies of assimilation, integration and multiculturalism (Cheong et al., 2007). The idea that cultural differences were a barrier to the integration of immigrants dominated much of the thinking during the 1960s and 1970s (Worley, 2005). In the 1980s, multiculturalism dominated public policy particularly in the areas of education, health and social services (Cheong et al., 2007). Cheong et al. (2007) discern that recent policy developments such as the institutionalisation of citizenship courses and ceremonies for the incorporation of non-British nationals and the establishment of citizenship education in the national curriculum,
represent a shift from multiculturalism towards a partial return to the assimilationist ideology of the 1960s.

The local experiences of immigration are also influenced by inaccurate and unbalanced media portrayals of immigration which influence negatively the settlement experiences of immigrants and escalate community tensions. Negative portrayals of immigrants have dominated newspaper headlines in the UK for some time. In the 1970s non-white Commonwealth immigrants featured regularly in media reports but in recent years attention has shifted to asylum seekers and economic migrants from Central and Eastern Europe (Berkeley et al., 2006). A recent study by the Migration Observatory found that the most common descriptor for the word ‘immigrants’ was ‘illegal’ while ‘failed’ was the most common descriptor for ‘asylum seekers’ in national British newspapers between 2010 and 2012 (Migration Observatory, 2013). Negative portrayals of immigrants perpetuate stereotypes and popular myths about immigrants and fuel prejudice, and hostility towards immigrants which negatively affect social cohesion and immigrant integration (CRESR et al., 2003; Robinson and Reeve, 2006).

The presence of social networks which immigrants can draw upon for support in the receiving country would also be expected to facilitate integration. Individuals’ social networks promote a sense of belonging within particular places, as well as feelings of security, freedom, opportunity and empowerment (Spicer, 2008). Social networks extend outside local places and are often transnational. Transnationalism, the presence of cross-border socio-economic and political connections maintained by migrants (Vertovec, 2007), has implications for the nature of integration of immigrants and the significance of the neighbourhood in shaping immigrant identities and cohesion (Phillips, 2007). Vertovec (2007) ascertains that many migrants develop and maintain strong modes of community cohesion with others outside their locality and Britain without undermining integration and cohesion.

Belonging, loyalty and sense of attachment are not parts of a zero-sum game based on a single place. That is, the ‘more transnational’ a person is does not automatically mean the ‘less integrated’ he or she is, and the ‘less integrated’ one is does not necessarily prompt or strengthen ‘more transnational’ patterns of association (Vertovec, 2007; p.20).
There are a number of characteristics among migrants that are expected to have a strong influence on their lived experiences in the receiving country and their future prospects. Age and gender are expected to influence both economic and social integration with integration generally found to be easier for younger and male immigrants than for older immigrants and females (Berry, 1997). The level of education and skills that immigrants possess enables integration by acting as resources to help obtain other means of support such as income, employment and social networks (ibid).

Education is associated with language skills which affect the economic and social integration of immigrants. Lack of language can act as a barrier to social interaction with the potential to creating ‘social distance’ hindering the integration of new immigrants and limiting their access to information and support (CLG, 2007). Poor language skills have also been identified as a barrier to immigrants becoming more spatially integrated even in situations when economic resources are available to enable improvements in residential choice (Fong and Wilkes, 1999). Higher levels of education and income are associated with lower segregation and greater overall cultural and economic integration (Allan and Turner, 2010).

An important determinant of the social integration of immigrants and their participation into British society is labour market status. Access to employment is seen as one of the most fundamental areas of integration because it impacts on all other aspects of life—for example, it facilitates economic independence and self-reliance, interactions with people in the receiving society, planning for the future, the development of language skills and it enhances well-being (Phillimore and Goodson, 2006; Ager and Strang, 2008).

2.4.1 Integration and immigrant labour market outcomes

Integration is often defined as group outcomes set against the societal average and relates to the ways immigrants adapt to economic and social life in the receiving country and the way established communities adapt to immigration (Saggar et al., 2012). The economic integration of immigrants is a main preoccupation of policymakers and a key determinant of the lived experiences of immigrants and their impact on local communities.
The economic performance of immigrant groups in the UK has been examined extensively in terms of labour market outcomes. Immigrants from established ethnic minority groups in the UK have been shown to face a disadvantage in the labour market in terms of lower earnings and a higher risk of unemployment. Chiswick (1980) first showed that the earnings of white immigrants and the white UK born population were somewhat similar but the earnings of non-white immigrants were significantly lower compared to the white UK born population. More recent studies have confirmed the finding that ethnic minority immigrant earnings lag behind those of white immigrants and the White British born (Denny et al., 1997; Blackaby et al., 2002; Dustmann and Fabbri, 2003; Dustmann and Fabbri 2005; Clark and Lindley, 2009). Bangladeshi and Pakistani groups have been shown to be particularly disadvantaged, together with Black Caribbean and Black African groups, facing a higher risk of unemployment compared to white groups (Blackaby et al., 1997; Dustmann and Fabbri, 2003; Dustmann and Fabbri, 2005).

Explanations about the factors that affect individual labour market outcomes lie in neoclassical economic theory and immigration theories from sociology, the first emphasising the role of human capital and the second the role of social context in determining individual outcomes. Investments in human capital such as educational qualifications and work related experience have been associated with individual job-specific skills and job prospects for some time (Mincer 1974). Newly arrived immigrants often lack host country specific human capital, reflecting perhaps the quality of education they received in their origin country, the possession of qualifications that are not directly transferable or of limited use to employers in the host country, and language barriers. As a result, they are more likely to face disadvantage in the labour market (Berthoud, 2000a). Studies have shown that immigrants in the UK are more likely to face labour market disadvantage if they hold foreign qualifications with significantly lower returns to their education levels (Blackaby et al., 2002; Shields and Wheatley Price, 1998).

Length of stay in the host country is central in theories of assimilation and adjustment (Clark and Drinkwater, 2008). Newly arrived immigrants lack knowledge in terms of job-search and the networks required to obtain jobs but with time such resources accumulate (Berthoud, 2000a). The initial disadvantage in the labour market position of immigrants is expected to diminish over time with integration, as language skills improve along with labour market knowledge and the acquisition of training and education in the host country.
The different routes of entry to Britain may provide an indication about the economic position and future success of immigrants; for instance economic migrants are more likely to be skilled and integrated in the labour market compared to other types of migrants such as ‘family reunion’ migrants and asylum seekers and refugees (Constant and Zimmermann, 2005).

Employer discrimination has played a central role in explaining the differential labour market outcomes of non-white immigrants as it is thought to be a major component of ‘ethnic penalties’: the disadvantage that remains after controlling for observable socio-economic characteristics (Heath and Cheung, 2006). Immigrants from ethnic minority groups face a disadvantage in the labour market because they are more likely to experience employer discrimination, affecting their labour market position, earnings, and career progression opportunities (Berthoud, 2000a). On the other hand, white immigrants from EU15 and Old Commonwealth countries have been shown in UK studies to face lower ethnic penalties in the labour market (Dustmann and Fabbri, 2003; Dustmann and Fabbri, 2005).

The persistent inequalities in employment experienced by ethnic minority communities are thought to be the outcome of a variety of a ‘complex set of mutually reinforcing influences in the labour market relating to migration, expectation, alienation, family formation, the structure of the economy and discrimination’ (Berthoud, 2000a). Bangladeshi and Pakistani groups are found to face the highest disadvantage in the UK labour market (Blackaby et al., 2002; Fieldhouse, 1999; Dustmann and Fabbri, 2005). Tackey et al. (2006) suggest that the disadvantage of Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups can be explained by early settlement patterns and a variety of structural, community and personal factors. Pakistani immigrants settled in northern towns and the Midlands and worked in industries that were affected by the large-scale decline in manufacturing in the 1980s while Bangladeshi immigrants who settled largely in deprived areas in London during the 1980s suffered as a result of the economic recession at that time (Tackey et al., 2006). The poorer labour market outcomes of these groups have been shown to be related with lower levels of human capital and country specific skills including English language proficiency (Tackey et al., 2006). The very high worklessness rates among Pakistani and Bangladeshi women for example, have been associated with low educational attainment, early marriage, family formation practices, and cultural expectations regarding work and education (Dale, 2002).
Evidence on the relative labour market position of new immigrants in the UK is sparse and piecemeal, the majority of studies focusing either on the experiences of immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe or asylum seekers and refugees. These studies have shown that asylum seekers and refugees face the highest risk of worklessness compared to ethnic minorities and other recent immigrant groups (Sanderson, 2006). Bloch (2002) conducted a survey of 400 asylum seekers and refugees and found that less than a third were in employment. The disadvantaged economic position of asylum seekers and refugees reflects a combination of poor language and literacy skills, lack of UK work experience, lack of information about employment and training, and employer discrimination (Sanderson, 2006). As many asylum seekers are skilled and highly motivated, it is thought that restrictions to work which are only lifted if they are granted refugee status, and discrimination, contribute to their high levels of worklessness and increased likelihood of employment in the informal economy (CRESR et al., 2003; Phillimore and Goodson, 2006). Phillimore and Goodson (2006) argue that the dispersal of asylum seekers and refugees in deprived areas and the continued barriers to integration they face is likely to contribute towards increased concentrations of worklessness in deprived areas. This in turn could lead to increased difficulty in sustaining basic local institutions, and problems of achieving adequate levels of social organisation, the removal of structural resources and the loss of cultural resources such as positive role models in these areas (Phillimore and Goodson, 2006; p.1729).

In contrast, Central and Eastern European immigrants who arrived during the first five years of the EU enlargement were shown to have particularly high employment rates although employment was characterised by poor working conditions and low earnings (Pollard et al., 2008; Anderson et al., 2006; Markova and Black, 2007). This is evident from WRS applications between 2004 and 2009 which were mainly in low skills sectors such as hospitality and catering, agriculture, manufacturing and in the food, fish and meat processing sectors. The main occupations of registered migrants were routine occupations including factory and warehouse workers, packers, kitchen and catering assistants and cleaners with over three quarters of all migrants earning below £6 per hour and around half were in temporary employment (UK Border Agency et al., 2009).

There is evidence that many EU Accession nationals in low paid jobs were employed in professional and skilled occupations prior to coming to the UK indicating a potential mismatch between the type of employment they perform and their education levels (Clark
and Drinkwater, 2008; Markova and Black, 2007; Pemberton, 2009). It is thought that lack of language and other country specific skills, for instance, qualifications that are not directly transferable, and lack of information about training and education, all contribute to poor labour market conditions among immigrants including poor pay, underemployment and unemployment (Robinson and Reeve, 2006; Clark and Drinkwater, 2008). The concentration of EU Accession migrants in low skill jobs also reflects to some extent their poor English language skills. In some cases, low motivation to learn English due to transitory migration aspirations, exposure to own-language culture and limited access to language courses have hindered improvements in English language ability over time (Europia, 2010).

Immigrants and ethnic minority groups also tend to have higher self-employment rates than the majority group in the receiving country. The literature on ethnic minority self-employment has highlighted the important contribution of immigrant entrepreneurs in revitalising deprived neighbourhoods through income and employment generation, and new provision of goods and services (CRESR et al., 2003; Sepulveda et al., 2007; Ram and Jones, 2008). Self-employment rates tend to be highest among some ethnic minority groups with the poorest employment rates such as the Pakistani group. Fear of discrimination, unemployment and low pay in the labour market can act as ‘push’ factors to self-employment (Metcalf et al., 1996). Fear of unemployment is likely to be exacerbated by a lack of country specific skills at arrival, such as language ability, making the option of self-employment more attractive for recent immigrants. The higher self-employment rates of immigrants may also be the result of immigration restrictions that favour self-employment. For instance, self-employed immigrants coming to Britain from the A8 countries prior to 2004 and Bulgaria and Romania following the 2007 EU enlargement, were exempt from immigration restrictions which may partly explain the higher rate of self-employment of EU Accession nationals compared to other groups.

Migrants from the A8 countries who arrived between 2004 and 2011 were also not required to register with the WRS if they were self-employed. Analysis of data from the LFS used in this study suggests that the self-employment rate of EU Accession immigrants was around 14% in the years 2002-2008 which was significantly higher than the self-employment rate of the White British UK born (8%). The higher self-employment rates of new immigrants may indicate that they are creating new employment opportunities for successive migrants from the EU Accession countries. The higher self-employment rate of
immigrants may, however, be indicative of poor employment conditions if it is used by employers as a means to reduce employment rights and benefits as in the construction industry which relies heavily on self-employed workers (Harvey and Behling, 2008).

There is limited evidence on the influence of contextual factors in determining immigrant employment outcomes. A few studies investigating the labour market position of immigrants have examined contextual effects arising from the presence of ‘enclaves’—areas of high ethnic minority concentration—and the influence these exert on immigrant labour market decisions. The spatial concentration and growth of ethnic minority populations has been associated with the expansion of the enclave economy which offers higher returns than alternative opportunities through ‘protected’ markets for ethnic minority entrepreneurs and new employment opportunities for the ethnic and immigrant communities in which they operate (Clark and Drinkwater, 2008). The effect of ethnic concentration may not always be positive, as in Clark and Drinkwater’s (1998) study which showed that ethnic clusters in the UK have adverse effects on the employment outcomes of immigrants. Immigrants who depend on employment opportunities within the ethnic economy are less likely to invest in country specific skills such as language skills, and for this reason they might face a disadvantage when competing for jobs in the wider labour market. Modood and Berthoud (1997) provided support for this view suggesting that English language fluency is poorer in areas of high ethnic concentration.

The role of social networks in the neighbourhood is pertinent in terms of linking people to employment opportunities, acting as a ‘perceptual filter’ through which information is received which often acts as an advantage in the labour market since employers have a preference in hiring through informal recruitment mechanisms (Dickens, 1999; Sanderson, 2006). Forrest and Kearns (1999) found that in deprived areas mono-cultural communities' social networks are likely to be locally constrained and the community more introverted, while in ethnically diverse areas, they found evidence of overlapping social networks, strong traditions of mutual aid and assistance and more outward looking communities. The benefits of immigrant social networks on employment would be expected to disappear if these networks consist only of links with co-ethnics who are economically disadvantaged. Since those who are out of work often find out about employment opportunities from others who are in employment, in neighbourhoods where there is a high concentration of individuals out of work there may be ‘network failure’ as there are fewer people to provide
job information diminishing the likelihood of access to employment (Dickens, 1999). Buck’s (2001) study of the effects of area deprivation on social exclusion using the British Household Panel Study provided support for this view. He found that a higher neighbourhood unemployment rate is associated with increased likelihood of having no employed friends as well as not starting work and not leaving poverty.

Many studies have demonstrated that in deprived neighbourhoods people are well connected through bonding ties, or the ties with close friends and family, but have scarce access to bridging ties drawn from outside family and friends (Forrest and Kearns, 1999; Taylor, 2000; Warr, 2005; Power and Willmot, 2007). Mark Granovetter’s (1973) seminal study highlighted the influence of social networks in accessing employment opportunities by placing emphasis on the importance of personal contacts in passing on important information about employment opportunities. Granovetter suggested that it is the ‘weak’ (bridging) ties from outside the family and close friends that are most valuable to employment outcomes by providing access to a more diverse set of opportunities although more recent studies have suggested that bonding ties are as effective for accessing opportunities in the labour market (Field, 2008). On the one hand, immigrants may have limited contact with established residents, restricting their access to information about employment opportunities. On the other hand, links with co-ethnics are likely to improve employment prospects, particularly in the enclave economy. In sum, access to ethnic networks may improve access to information about employment opportunities however if they are restricted to the enclave economy they are likely to be characterised by poor pay and employment conditions (Waldinger, 2005).

2.4.2 Neighbourhood deprivation and neighbourhood effects

The effects of unemployment and inactivity in the labour market have knock on effects in other aspects of life. William Julius Wilson, the well known American sociologist who studied inner city ghettos in the US, highlighted the detrimental effects of worklessness.

In the absence of regular employment, a person lacks not only a place in which to work and the receipt of regular income but also a coherent organization of the present: that is, a system of concrete expectations and goals. In the absence of
regular employment, life, including family life, becomes less coherent (Wilson, 1999; p.482).

In his seminal work, The Truly Disadvantaged, Wilson posited that high concentrations of poverty were associated with adverse ‘concentration effects’ which affected the life chances of the poor (Wilson, 1987). In this, and subsequent work, he associated the problems of deprived neighbourhoods such as high crime, family dissolution, welfare dependence, and low levels of social organisation, with the disappearance of work (Wilson, 1987; 1999). Wilson viewed the concentration of workless adults who are unemployed or not part of the labour market as a major feature of deprived neighbourhoods associated with the emergence of a ‘new urban poverty’ (Wilson, 1999).

Concentration effects in deprived neighbourhoods are thought to operate through a variety of mechanisms relating to physical, institutional and geographical characteristics of the neighbourhood, such as the quality of local resources and services, physical isolation and barriers to opportunities such as employment, and through interaction with other people living in the neighbourhood (Lupton, 2003; Galster, 2012). Neighbourhood stigma, for example, is one of the many processes which may affect the opportunities and perceptions of residents such as employment and self-esteem (Galster, 2012).

Individual behaviour is shaped by the behaviour and values of others in a variety of ways. These include peer influence on perceptions of attaining success, role models that monitor and influence the behaviour of children, and social networks offering critical information, material support or moral examples (Buck, 2001).

George Galster identified seven social-interactive mechanisms through which neighbourhood effects operate (Galster, 2012; p.2):

- Social Contagion: Behaviours, aspirations, and attitudes may be changed by contact with peers who are neighbours. Under certain conditions these changes can take on contagion dynamics that are akin to “epidemics.”
- Collective Socialization: Individuals may be encouraged to conform to local social norms conveyed by neighbourhood role models and other social pressures. This socialization effect is characterized by a minimum threshold or critical mass being achieved before a norm can produce noticeable consequences for others in the neighbourhood.
• Social Networks: Individuals may be influenced by the interpersonal communication of information and resources of various kinds transmitted through neighbors. These networks can involve either “strong ties” and/or “weak ties.”

• Social cohesion and control: The degree of neighborhood social disorder and its converse, “collective efficacy” ( Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls, 1999), may influence a variety of behaviors and psychological reactions of residents.

• Competition: Under the premise that certain local resources are limited and not pure public goods, this mechanism posits that groups within the neighborhood will compete for these resources amongst themselves. Because the outcome is a zero-sum game, residents’ access to these resources (and their resulting opportunities) may be influenced by the ultimate success of their group in “winning” this competition.

• Relative Deprivation: This mechanism suggests that residents who have achieved some socioeconomic success will be a source of disamenities for their less-well off neighbours. The latter, it is argued, will view the successful with envy and/or will make them perceive their own relative inferiority as a source of dissatisfaction.

• Parental Mediation: The neighborhood may affect (through any of the mechanisms listed under all categories here) parents’ physical and mental health, stress, coping skills, sense of efficacy, behaviors, and material resources. All of these, in turn, may affect the home environment in which children are raised.

Wilson’s work formed the basis of what has been termed the ‘neighbourhood effects’ thesis, the belief that “living in a deprived area adversely affects individuals’ life chances over and above what would be predicted by their personal circumstances and characteristics” (ODPM, 2005; p.6).

Under the Labour Government, a series of neighborhood renewal policies were developed to address the needs of ‘deprived’ neighbourhoods (SEU, 1998). Deprived neighbourhoods were understood as those with the following characteristics:

A high level, or proportion, of individuals or households, who experience a range of negative or undesirable circumstances, either singularly, or in combination, which significantly reduce their overall well being: these include, for instance, low incomes, unemployment, poor health, bad housing conditions, and lack of skills. The concentration of these ‘deprived’ households and individuals in an area coupled with the undesirable aspects of that area: poor environment, poor housing, neglected open spaces, abandoned shops and houses, high crime levels, lack of services, shortage of job opportunities, all of which can act to reinforce the level of deprivation experienced by the community (Smith, 1999; p.1).
Although the Coalition Government has not shown the same commitment towards reducing neighbourhood deprivation levels and inequalities, it recognises the role of neighbourhoods in limiting life chances. The Deputy Prime Minister for example, states in the foreword of Opening Doors, Breaking Barriers—the Governments’ Social Mobility Strategy—‘in Britain today, life chances are narrowed for too many by the circumstances of their birth: the home they’re born into, the neighbourhood they grow up in or the jobs their parents do’ (UK Cabinet Office, 2011; p.3).

The picture Wilson painted on the decline of the inner city neighbourhood in the US has parallels with the UK. Worklessness among the low skilled has been rising since the 1970s, in both the UK and the US, as a consequence of structural changes and the weakening labour market for the unskilled, with the fall of relative wages affecting mostly the unskilled, who increasingly dropped out of the labour market (Nickell, 2004; Wilson, 1999). Wilson (1999) suggested that in the US, the rise of poverty in inner city black ghettos followed from the suburbanisation of industry and the out-migration of whites and middle class ethnic minorities resulting in the depopulation of inner city neighbourhoods and their abandonment. The declining proportion of non-poor families and the overall depopulation in inner city neighbourhoods made it difficult to sustain basic neighbourhood institutions and to achieve adequate levels of social organization contributing to the decline of neighbourhoods.

Inner city neighbourhoods in the UK have also suffered from population decline, with the most disadvantaged left behind, unable to sustain services and facilities, and neighbourhoods fallen into a spiral of decline (Power and Wilson, 2000). From the late 1990s onwards, neighbourhood (and population) decline begun to stabilise—the expansion of the UK economy, large-scale investment in housing and the physical environment through major urban renewal programmes and gentrification are likely to have contributed to the revitalisation of many deprived neighbourhoods (Lupton et al., 2013).

While there has been significant repopulation of deprived inner urban city neighbourhoods in recent years, neighbourhood inequalities have persisted over time. However, unlike the US where high poverty is a feature of neighbourhoods with high concentrations of ethnic minorities and particularly of black ghettos, in the UK there are no ghettos on the basis of race (Finney and Simpson, 2009) and concentrations of poverty are found in both
ethnically diverse and white neighbourhoods. White neighbourhoods in the north of England have exhibited among the highest levels of deprivation for some time (Glennester et al., 1999). Fieldhouse (1999), using data from the 1991 Census of Population, showed that the disadvantage of ethnic minorities in Greater London in terms of unemployment, varied geographically in a similar pattern to white unemployment. This was taken as an indication that it is not just the concentration of ethnic minorities causing high unemployment in particular areas, but rather it is a more general problem of those areas. An analysis of the residential patterns of ethnic minorities in the UK based on the 2001 Census found that concentrations of ethnic minority unemployment is a feature of some of the most deprived neighbourhoods in England but the greatest degree of within group disadvantage was found for the ‘White British/Irish’ group living in the most deprived neighbourhoods who had an unemployment rate of almost three times that of those who lived elsewhere (CLG, 2010). Analysis of the 2011 Census shows that people from ethnic minority groups are more likely to be unemployed if they live in the most deprived areas but the difference in the unemployment rate between deprived and better-off neighbourhoods is greatest for the White British and Mixed ethnic groups (Jivraj and Khan, 2013).

Previous studies in the UK have shown that ethnic minorities are more likely to live in neighbourhoods with the highest rates of worklessness than in areas with the lowest rates. According to the 2001 Census Pakistanis and Bangladeshis were for example, seven times and nine times more likely to live in concentrations of worklessness respectively, while Black Caribbean and Black African groups were six times and five times more likely respectively to do so (SEU, 2004). Although the proportion of people from ethnic minority groups living in the most deprived neighbourhoods decreased between 2001 and 2011, in 2011 one in three in the Bangladeshi and Pakistani groups still lived in deprived neighbourhoods (Jivraj and Khan, 2013). The concentration of immigrants and ethnic minorities in neighbourhoods with high levels of worklessness implies that immigrants and ethnic minorities, like other residents in these areas, are subject to adverse effects that exacerbate deprivation and restrict economic opportunity. Neighbourhood deprivation is also associated with negative impacts on social cohesion.
2.5 Immigration and cohesion

The arrival of New Labour in government in 1997 was accompanied with an increased policy emphasis on tackling social exclusion and segregation. Community cohesion gained prominence in public policy debates in the aftermath of the 2001 race riots in northern England. The term community cohesion was initially used to describe how well people from different backgrounds get on together or ‘the process that must happen in all communities to ensure different groups of people get on well together’ (Commission on Integration and Cohesion, 2007, p. 38). Community cohesion has become a contested concept because the focus on ‘communities’ enabled the language of debate to become deracialized (Worley, 2005) and shifted attention away from the underlying sources of persistent social inequalities and residential segregation (Zetter et al., 2006). Community cohesion is related to the more substantive concept of social cohesion which emphasises unity and stability (Zetter and Flynn, 2005) and harmonious relations that have emerged from diminishing community divisions on the basis of ethnicity, age, gender and socio-economic status (Ratcliffe, 2012).

The community cohesion agenda was underpinned by New Labour governance rationales of community and communitarianism and ideas of social capital influenced by theories developed by Robert Putnam (Flint, 2010). Putnam (2000; p.20) defined social capital as ‘the connections among individuals-social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them’. Putnam emphasised the importance of distinguishing between bonding—or the exclusive ties between homogeneous groups—and bridging social capital, proposing that the former reinforce exclusive identities and homogeneous groups while the latter are based on inclusive ties encompassing people from different backgrounds. Woolcock (2001) posited that bonding social capital denotes ties with people from similar situations such as family, and close friends and neighbours while bridging capital denotes distant ties such as loose friendships and work mates. He defined a third dimension of social capital, linking social capital, as the ties of people from dissimilar situations that enable individuals to gain access to a wider range of resources available outside their immediate community (Woolcock 2001; pp.13-14).

Putnam’s (2007) assertion that immigration and ethnic diversity can lead to the erosion of social capital and social cohesion, resonated with concerns that emerged following the 2001 disturbances in the north of England ‘about the ways ethnic minorities develop and
associate with their wider social world: in other words, the extent of cohesion or differentiation’ (Zetter et al., 2006, p.9). Social capital building was seen as a means for alleviating the racial tensions with bridging social capital perceived as a positive resource whilst bonding social capital among immigrants and minority ethnic communities seen as less desirable (Cheong et al., 2007; p.30).

Putnam’s dimension of social capital relating to the gains accrued to the community as a whole is not shared by other scholars who have proposed different perspectives on social capital. Coleman (1988) viewed social capital as ‘merely a resource that allows individual and collective actors to achieve specific goals that could not be achieved in its absence’ while Bourdieu viewed social capital as ‘both an outcome and exacerbation of social and ethnic inequalities’ with roots in economic capital (Mayer, 2003; Cheong et al., 2007). Zetter et al. (2006) stress that Putnam’s notions of cohesion and consensualism may not be present among different communities as conflict and consensus may coexist within and between ethnic and religious minority groups and dominant social groups. As Mayer (2003) highlights, although Putnam has acknowledged that there are negative consequences of social capital these tend to be downplayed and difficult to identify, diverting attention from those forms of sociability that have anti-democratic or oppressive effects. Zetter et al. (2006; p.10) also argue that Putnam’s theory fails to capture the complexity of communities, the highly contested territory of political power, and ‘the real struggle that community groups face over scarce resources (with which to ‘establish’ social capital and thus cohesion) at different levels of governance’.

According to Putnam (2007) immigration is expected to have detrimental effects on social cohesion by increasing ethnic diversity which in turn erodes social capital and social cohesion. Alesina and Ferrara (2002) suggested that ethnic diversity lowers interpersonal trust because of a natural aversion to heterogeneity. This argument is based on the principle of homophilly—personal networks are homogeneous with regard to many socio-demographic, behavioural, and intrapersonal characteristics—in other words, similarity breeds connection (McPherson et al., 2001; p.415).

The threat of increased ethnic diversity for social capital is founded on the ‘racial threat’ hypothesis (Blumer 1958; Blalock 1967) which postulates that as a minority group in an area increases this fuels prejudice and hostility as formerly majority groups feel threatened and perceive that new minority groups increase competition for scarce resources (Laurence
and Heath, 2008). As Quillian (1995; p.590) explains, prejudice is closely interlinked with economic conditions and often arises from either blaming a subordinate group for economic hardship (scapegoating), or from competition with a subordinate group for scarce resources.

The link between prejudice and poor economic circumstances is most evident in deprived neighbourhoods with large concentrations of disadvantaged groups where it is expected that ‘when dominant group members perceive their economic circumstances as precarious, they fear they will lose their economic advantages over the subordinate group’ (Quillian 1995; p.590). Quillian (1995) stresses that feelings of threat among dominant group members would be expected to gradually recede with improvements in economic circumstances that will minimise perceptions of competition for resources. Letki (2008; p.23), in an empirical investigation of the effects of ethnic diversity on social capital in England and Wales, found that once deprivation levels and ethnic diversity are accounted for ‘there is no evidence for the eroding effect of racial diversity on interactions within local communities’ and ‘no deficiency of social capital networks in diverse communities’.

Laurence (2009), in reviewing the evidence on the effects of diversity on cohesion, suggests that a number of studies and particularly those in the UK have shown that increased diversity can have neutral or positive effects on cohesion which support the ‘contact’ hypothesis. The ‘contact’ hypothesis developed by Allport (1954) posits that interpersonal contact can dissolve stereotypes based on ignorance between ethnic groups reducing prejudice and improving cohesion. When ethnic diversity increases, the likelihood of inter-ethnic interaction is also expected to increase and meaningful interactions and friendships between ethnic groups develop, preventing negative perceptions, misinformation, and rumours regarding other ethnic groups that create tensions. As highlighted by Laurence and Heath (2008, pp.14-15), although suggesting different effects of increased diversity on cohesion, the ‘contact hypothesis’ and ‘threat hypothesis’ may be part of the same process. In the view of the Chicago school of sociology, competition followed from the arrival of new immigrants as a result of poor language skills and limited interaction with the wider community. This competition was expected to diminish over time as immigrants and established communities adapted to each other and with increased social interaction. Laurence and Heath argue that second generation immigrants may find it easier to mix with people from different backgrounds and to build bridging social capital and greater cohesion, and if this is the case, the ‘contact’
and ‘threat’ hypotheses may simply represent different stages that communities pass through over time (Laurence and Heath, 2008; p.15).

2.5.1 Immigration, neighbourhood deprivation and cohesion

There is a common belief that disadvantaged areas suffer from a lack of the qualities and elements which produce and sustain social cohesion (Forrest and Kearns, 2001). Neighbourhoods facing multiple problems such as poor employment opportunities, high crime levels, poor housing and poor services are thought to be more conducive to poor community relations associated with manifestations of animosity and resentment between groups who compete for scarce resources (Amin, 2002; Robinson and Reeve, 2006). The Riots Communities and Victims Panel, for example, found that half of those on trial for taking part in the 2011 riots in English cities which followed Mark Duggan's killing in Tottenham lived in the most deprived areas of England (Kintrea, 2013).

Hickman et al. (2008; p.127) explain that ‘good community relations in areas of poverty and multiple inequalities are reduced both by the poor resources and by lives diminished in myriad ways by sustained poverty’. In many areas, tensions arise from concerns that the needs of immigrants are being prioritised over the needs of long-term residents who may be out of work or waiting to be housed. This in turn instigates ‘feelings of displacement and being pushed out’ among long-term residents, and perceptions that immigrants are a burden to local services that are already overstretched and poorly organised (CRESR et al., 2003).

Migrants in the UK are overwhelmingly concentrated in the private housing sector and do not face favourable social housing allocation over UK citizens (Rutter and Latorre, 2008). The allocation of social housing is outlined in the Housing Act 1996 as amended by the Housing Act 2002 and the Housing Act 2004 which gives priority to homeless and other priority needs groups, such as families with children and the elderly (Rutter and Latorre, 2008). Migrants need to meet residency requirements before they are eligible to apply for social housing and other social assistance and satisfy the Habitual Residence Test (HRT). Migrants with settled status, those with European Economic Area (EEA) worker status or refugee status do not need to satisfy the HRT although a minimum of two year residency
has recently been introduced by local authorities following a government consultation on the allocation of social housing conducted in 2013\textsuperscript{19}. Social housing is allocated through a system of Choice Based Letting (CBL) whereby applicants can bid for properties on the basis of points allocated according to their need and the time waiting to be housed.

There is extensive evidence that neighbourhood deprivation contributes towards the depletion of social networks (Letki, 2008). One of the main effects of deprivation is that ‘it limits the resources of a community not least because it diminishes, in both quantity and quality, the shared spaces and amenities for social gatherings, and thus limits the formation of and relations between different groups within communities’ (Hickman et al., 2008; p.131)

Many studies have demonstrated that in deprived neighbourhoods people are well connected through bonding ties but have limited access to bridging ties (Forrest and Kearns, 1999; Taylor, 2000; Warr, 2005; Power and Willmot, 2007). Bonding ties in deprived areas can be ‘exclusive and separate excluded people further from the society around them’, and create pressures ‘to conform to a set of norms and values which make it difficult for individuals to enter mainstream society’ (Forrest and Kearns, 1999; p.10; Taylor, 2000; p.1027). The effect of the stigma of living in deprived neighbourhoods further restricts the ability of individuals to participate in diverse social networks and utilise bridging capital (Warr, 2005).

The ethnic composition of deprived areas has been shown to determine levels of social capital. Sturgis et al. (2013) showed that neighbourhood ethnic diversity in London was positively related to perceived social cohesion once the level of economic deprivation was taken into account. New immigration in areas with little experience of prior immigration is thought to be more likely to instigate community tensions, although even in diverse areas, tensions within and between immigrant communities, for instance over employment and housing opportunities, are commonplace (Robinson and Reeve, 2006; Audit Commission, 2007; Stenning et al., 2006). In an investigation of the impact of immigration on social cohesion in six local areas in the UK, Hickman et al. (2008; p.113) concluded that the arrival of new immigrants in local areas ‘where diversity and multiculturalism is part of the texture of daily life’ has been less problematic.

\textsuperscript{19}https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/providing-social-housing-for-local-people
There are many benefits that accrue to deprived neighbourhoods as a result of ethnic diversity. Laurence and Heath’s (2008) examination of attitudes towards cohesion in England based on the 2005 Citizenship Survey provided additional evidence that deprived areas with higher ethnic diversity tend to have higher community cohesion than deprived white areas. They concluded that ‘it is thus deprivation that undermines cohesion, not diversity’ (Laurence and Heath, 2008; p.8).

Saggar et al. (2012) examined the relationship between immigration and social cohesion and showed that once pre-existing diversity and socio-economic deprivation were controlled for, the relationship between immigration and community cohesion disappeared at the local level suggesting that the relationship is complex and that effects are dependent on the local context. A study examining the factors affecting change in deprived neighbourhoods in England also suggested that higher concentrations of some ethnic groups may be associated with an increased probability of improvement in these neighbourhoods over time (CLG, 2010). Higher levels of social capital and entrepreneurialism in diverse neighbourhoods are thought to be plausible explanations of their higher likelihood of improvement over time (Power and Wilson, 2000; CLG, 2010).

Immigration has been associated with adverse effects in deprived neighbourhoods by contributing to increased levels of residential turnover—the flow of households moving into and out of neighbourhoods—although turnover is not solely driven by immigration. A series of studies commissioned by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation focusing on deprived neighbourhoods in four English cities (Forrest and Kearns, 1999) found that residential turnover, although a normal feature of all neighbourhoods, can have more adverse effects on social capital in deprived neighbourhoods. In some high turnover areas there was evidence of ‘communities within communities’ with more established residents tending to view population turnover as a factor which undermined trust, tolerance and familiarity (Forrest and Kearns, 1999). The studies highlighted that in these areas ‘community had been eroded through population churning and the exodus of those seeking work and more attractive living environments’ with high turnover affecting contacts which were found to be weak and transitory. The researchers commented that ‘it is difficult in these circumstances (of high turnover) to build up trust and feelings of commonality and belonging. High turnover in poor neighbourhoods breeds suspicion and accentuates differences’ (Forrest and Kearns, 1999; p.12).
Residential turnover in deprived areas can be problematic if it is associated with decreasing social capital and social cohesion, and places greater demands on local services (Beatty et al., 2009). The effect of high turnover on cohesion depends on both the scale of flows and the composition of people (migrants and non-migrants) moving in and out of neighbourhoods. The temporary settlement of some immigrant groups, such as seasonal workers, thus may have a disruptive effect on social cohesion by increasing turnover levels.

Laurence and Heath (2008), examining the predictors of social cohesion in England using multi-level modelling of the 2005 Citizenship Survey, found that at the community level, population turnover does not have a significant effect on perceptions of community cohesion but found a negative effect on cohesion associated with the arrival of large numbers of BME immigrants. Beatty et al., (2009) examined the relationship between residential turnover and progress in area outcomes such as employment, education, and crime in New Deal for Communities (NDC) areas and found that higher levels of mobility were associated with lower levels of outcome change, most notably in education. CLG (2010) also examined the role of residential turnover in the process of neighbourhood change in the most deprived neighbourhoods in England and found that very high residential turnover in a neighbourhood was associated with neighbourhood decline and increased deprivation levels over time.

The economic position of new immigrants also has implications for the socio-economic composition of deprived neighbourhoods. Lupton (2005) examined changes in worklessness rates between 1991 and 2001 in English wards and found that in Pakistani and Bangladeshi neighbourhoods worklessness rates have tended to fall more slowly than in other neighbourhoods or even to rise, suggesting that some of these neighbourhoods have become relatively worse off while, on the whole, most neighbourhoods have tended to improve over this period. Lupton (2005) explains that in high worklessness areas with large relatively recently arrived Bangladeshi and Pakistani groups, chain migration and high birth rates are likely to have contributed to population growth in the working age population which may not necessarily be in line with trends in labour supply in those areas, contributing to the persistence of worklessness. If immigrants moving into deprived neighbourhoods have higher skills and are more likely to be in employment than existing residents then this will result in an improvement in the skills and employment profile of neighbourhoods. On the other hand, if the majority of immigrants in these neighbourhoods
are low skilled, unemployed or economically inactive, this is likely to reinforce levels of
worklessness and deprivation.

In areas with high concentrations of workless asylum seekers and refugees, existing
economic problems such as skills shortages and a reliance on precarious low-skilled jobs
are likely to be reinforced, and as a result, regeneration initiatives are less likely to be
successful (Phillimore and Goodson, 2006; p.1728). Similarly, the arrival of unskilled
immigrants in deprived neighbourhoods with a high concentration of low-skilled residents
can lead to intense competition for low-skill jobs, resulting in lower wages, higher
unemployment and withdrawal from the labour market, creating higher levels of
worklessness (Power and Wilson, 2000; Green et al., 2007).

The impact of immigration on local labour markets is expected to affect differentially the
unskilled for a variety of reasons. Wilson and Jaynes (2000; pp.137-138) explain that
skilled immigrants can be more readily absorbed into labour markets as a result of
increased demand for skilled workers and are unlikely to affect skilled native workers
because the latter have an advantage in terms of country specific skills. On the other hand,
immigrants can more easily substitute for unskilled native workers as training and
qualifications for low skill jobs are less important. Employers may prefer to employ
immigrants if they are as productive as native workers yet willing to work for lower pay, as
well as being subject to a weaker bargaining position on pay and conditions. Immigrants in
this case, can increase competition and potentially displace low-skilled native workers,
particularly in migrant intensive industries where immigrants establish their presence
through referrals and networking. If on the other hand, immigrants are willing to take jobs
natives will not take either because of low wages, poor working conditions, or access to
alternative sources of income, this displacement will not take place.

There is little empirical evidence to support the view that new immigration has significant
negative labour market effects with most studies in the UK suggesting small or negligible
effects on employment and wages (Dustmann et al., 2003; Green et al., 2007; Lemos and
Portes, 2008). Some studies have provided evidence of small negative effects on the wages
of the low skilled (Dustmann et al., 2005; and Nickell and Salaheen, 2008). Despite this,
the negative effects found are generally shown to disappear in the medium to long-term
(Peri, 2010; Devlin et al., 2014) suggesting that the overall benefits of immigration on the
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economy which include for example welfare contributions by migrants generally outweigh
the costs of immigration.

2.5.2 Immigration, cohesion and neighbourhood renewal

A particular feature of neighbourhood deprivation is the concentration of poor quality and
often sub-standard housing. Immigrants typically reside in poor quality housing found in
deprived neighbourhoods, experience problems of overcrowding, unsafe conditions, and
lack tenancy agreements and information about tenant rights (ICOCO, 2007). These issues
have recently been highlighted in studies documenting the experiences of Eastern
European immigrants who often live in accommodation that is characterised by
overcrowding, a high tenant turnover, unsuitable sleeping spaces and hot bedding practices
(Stenning et al., 2006; Thunhurst et al., 2007; Poppleton et al., 2013). Robinson and Reeve
(2006; pp.25-26) stress that housing is one of the most important determinants of the
experiences and well being of immigrants ‘providing the realm within which the
ontological security and safety of home is nurtured and, as such, can represent a sanctuary
from hostility and exclusion that many new immigrants encounter in wider society’. The
increased concentration of immigrants in some neighbourhoods has also been associated
with growing numbers in Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) with poor housing
conditions and noise nuisance becoming sources of conflict between residents (ICOCO,
2007; Zaronalte and Tirzite, 2007).

Community tensions can arise from perceptions that immigrants are hindering
neighbourhood renewal plans, for instance by ‘occupying low demand properties that
would otherwise be demolished’ and by ‘attracting speculative and absentee landlords’ that
have no interest in the regeneration of areas and local communities (CRESR et al., 2003).
Economic immigrants, particularly EU Accession nationals in temporary and low paid jobs,
were reported to be moving into cheap housing to lower their cost of living in order to
maximise their earnings during their stay in the UK (Pemberton and Stevens, 2007;
Phillimore et al., 2008). Pemberton and Stevens (2007) suggest that, in Housing Market
Renewal (HMR) areas in the north west of England, this has increased the risk of
unsuitable housing being used as HMOs by landlords wishing to maximise profits and also
increased the risk of local residents being pushed out of the market as a result of higher rental prices. At the same time, new immigrants were found to increase the demand for private housing, helping ensure the vitality of local housing markets and were associated with aspirations to invest in owner occupation and long-term settlement intentions.

Phillimore et al. (2008; p.6), examining the impact of new immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe upon housing markets in the East Midlands, also found that ‘neighbourhoods, which had previously been in decline, had apparently now stabilised and migrant workers were insulating the local markets from the national downward trend in prices’. In some neighbourhoods, however, with a high visibility of immigrants living in social housing there were reports of tensions between residents particularly where there was evidence of housing pressures and high demand for social housing accommodation (Phillimore et al., 2008).

Poor community relations and racial harassment have been reported in deprived neighbourhoods with a high concentration of asylum seekers and refugees in the social housing sector stemming from perceived competition over social housing allocation and feelings that housing agencies prioritise the needs of immigrants over the needs of long-term residents (CRESR et al., 2003).

The concentration of new immigrants in deprived neighbourhoods has been associated with pressures on other services such as mental health and counselling services, language services and schooling (Stenning et al., 2006; Poppleton et al., 2013). The perceived pressures on local services is thought to be contributing towards tensions in local communities as these are perceived to be at the expense of more established populations (Robinson and Reeve, 2006). These perceptions are often ill-founded and local studies have generally shown that new immigration is not creating significant pressures on services. As many new immigrants are economic migrants, young and without dependents they are thought to have low demand for public services and where pressures on services exist, they often pre-date the arrival of new immigrants (Audit Commission, 2007; Pemberton and Stevens, 2007). Demand for services is usually associated with particular groups, for instance, related with the higher incidence of mental health needs among asylum seekers and refugees (Robinson and Reeve, 2006). While immigrant families are likely to increase demand for school places and language support provision, it is the most mobile groups who are likely to have the
highest impact on schools by contributing to pupil turnover which may impact on class disruption and difficulties in tracking the educational progress of children (Poppleton et al., 2013).

Regeneration programmes are thought to have had mixed effects on cohesion ‘in ways that both hinder and improve social cohesion, and the experiences of the different places of deprivation’ (Hickman et al., 2008; p.132). The stream of new resources that accompany regeneration activities for example, can create competition and resentment over the allocation of these resources but the effect of interventions may be to enhance social capital in an area through creating new opportunities for local people to interact and by tackling issues that create friction (ibid).

Urban regeneration and housing programmes were recognised as key policy themes in government guidance on community cohesion, for their potential to influence community cohesion and segregation patterns (Green and Robinson, 2004; Robinson and Reeve, 2006). While the residential segregation of ethnic minorities was viewed as problematic in policy discourses, urban renewal and housing policies were not targeted to ethnic minorities and immigrants but to deprived neighbourhoods (Phillips and Harrison, 2010). Since the 1960s UK urban regeneration policies have aimed to tackle deprivation, improve life-chances, enhance mobility, and assist community relations through geographically targeted programmes (Phillips and Harrison, 2010). New Labour’s response to the growing spatial disparities in deprivation levels was the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal (NSNR) launched in 2001 aiming to address the persistence of inequalities in the most deprived neighbourhoods in England. An increasing emphasis was placed on the role of housing in addressing long-term decline and the concentration of deprived households through the creation of ‘mixed’ income communities.

Equality legislation prevented housing policies from targeting different ethnic groups on an unequal basis while past housing dispersal schemes have shown that ethnic mixing cannot be engineered (Tunstall and Fenton, 2006; Amin, 2002; Phillips and Harrison, 2010). Instead urban renewal policies were aimed at tackling exclusion of vulnerable groups including ethnic minorities in deprived areas, providing new opportunities and facilities to enable inter-group interaction and through housing interventions that aimed to increase tenure mix (Tunstall and Fenton, 2006).
As highlighted by Kintrea (2013; p.141), despite the emphasis of regeneration programmes on community cohesion, there was careful negotiation of the distinction between social mix and ethnic mix under New Labour policy making. Social mix became part of housing, planning and regeneration policy under the remit of Communities and Local Government (CLG) and focused on housing tenure and mixing income groups. In contrast, ethnic mix became part of community cohesion policy under the remit of the Home Office and focused on elements of national security and identity.

The ‘mixed communities’ objective was embedded in New Labour regeneration and housing policy on the premise that mixed housing tenure would attract higher income households and eradicate the adverse effects associated with the geographical concentration of deprivation. Social mixing through housing was expected to create ‘knock-on effects in terms of sustainability, cohesion and the transmission of aspiration and ‘know-how’ that deprived residents can learn from’ (Beatty and Wilson, 2010; p.21). The focus was on mixing groups not on the basis of ethnicity but income. The mixing of housing tenure was also a response towards tackling area stigmatisation or poor reputation of social housing estates (Kearns and Mason, 2007). In recent years, some local authorities have adopted new approaches towards allocating social housing which place less emphasis on needs-based allocation that would give priority to vulnerable groups, for example workless refugees over those in employment to achieve mixed income communities (Gray et al., 2013). The tougher eligibility criteria towards accessing social housing means that social housing will be out of reach for many migrants, including those most in need of social housing.

Socially mixed neighbourhoods are thought to be more stable than low income neighbourhoods as residents have access to beneficial networks and role models that can raise aspirations, improve employment opportunities and provide resources needed to support neighbourhood services and facilities (Lupton, 2003). The existing evidence suggests that mixing housing tenure tends to reduce the concentration of poverty and disadvantage, improve neighbourhood reputation and reduce crime and anti-social behaviour through greater informal enforcement of social norms and increased community organisation (Tunstall and Fenton, 2006). The perceived benefits in terms of networks and role models and support for local facilities are not supported, however, by existing evidence. Atkinson and Kintrea (1998) found that mixing social renters and owners in housing estates in Scotland lowered the stigma attached to the estates but had little if any
impact on social networks or the local economy. The study found that owners, unlike renters who relied on the neighbourhood, tended to conduct their daily lives outside the neighbourhood without any interaction with other people from their estates.

Evidence from the evaluation of the Housing Market Renewal (HMR) programme, which involves large-scale housing renewal in low housing demand areas in the north of England and the midlands, highlighted that demolition plans have been met with vociferous resistance from local communities. The plans created tensions in many areas where HMR Pathfinders (the delivery vehicles of the HMR programme) were left ‘grappling with ethnic and religious tensions within their areas, as well as juggling between support for long-term (and mostly deprived) residents and attracting new households, for example into mixed tenure developments’ (Leather et al., 2007). In some pathfinders housing market renewal plans have also taken into account the needs and aspirations of new immigrants through consultations although overall the role of immigration in housing market renewal areas has not been considered across the board in this way (ibid).

Regeneration activities have been highlighted for their potential for working with and building on the stock of social capital of neighbourhoods to ensure the success of interventions. There have been several examples that highlight the benefits of sustaining and developing social capital in excluded neighbourhoods. Hibbitt et al. (2001) found evidence that the ‘Pathways to Integration’ programme in Merseyside through the creation of new groups, partnerships and projects and support for existing activities, contributed to higher levels of cooperation and trust between local residents and social capital formation. They concluded that, through these activities, the programme contributed to the creation of new networks, opportunities for integration and social inclusion, with improvements in the quality of life for local residents and increased levels of trust and enhanced contact with residents in other areas. The regeneration process in Merseyside was also found to have instigated cross-sectional networks of trust and channels of communication between local residents and mainstream agencies.

There was also increased emphasis on community activities, such as community festivals, events, and clean up days in the New Deal for Communities (NDC) programme where ‘partnerships were recognised as acting decisively and successfully engendering social networking within neighbourhoods and helping to restore the local social infrastructure’ (Green and Robinson, 2004; p.4). By promoting contact and understanding between
residents, community engagement activities were contributing to alleviating tensions and misunderstandings between and within ethnic communities, fostering a shared understanding and a common vision and raising awareness about aspects of diversity among local communities and service providers (Green and Robinson, 2004). It was thought that urban regeneration programmes, by increasing participation in community events, can promote ‘a sense of community togetherness and unity’ in local areas (Power and Willmot, 2007; p.7). More importantly, regeneration activities that aim to improve existing neighbourhood facilities such as schools, community centres, parks and other recreational facilities are likely to increase interactions between different ethnic and social groups as these are the places where interactions are most likely to take place (Tunstall and Fenton, 2006).

The overall impact of regeneration on cohesion has been somewhat mixed. Hickman et al. (2008) suggest that regeneration programmes had an effect on cohesion ‘in ways that both hinder and improve social cohesion, and the experiences of the different places of deprivation’. Regeneration activities can pose a threat to community relations by bringing in new resources and creating competition and resentment over the allocation of these resources. The funding-led nature of regeneration has been associated with raising expectations, inevitably resulting in disappointment among groups who feel they have lost out when the funding is split between different objectives undermining the development of trust and relationships (Taylor, 2000). As Taylor (2000; p.1027) suggested, deprived communities ‘are no more homogeneous than any others and the first impact of intervention can be to expose the conflicts within a locality, as different needs emerge and as parts of the community are seen to become empowered at the expense of others’. If however, local agencies and local projects engage with immigrants to raise awareness and information about laws and regulations that often create misunderstandings, and work on community capacity and development, promoting accurate information through local media racial issues, tensions are thought to be minimised (CRESR et al., 2003; Robinson and Reeve, 2006; Audit Commission, 2007).

The successful implementation of regeneration programmes is also crucial to community cohesion. Resident involvement through consultation and participation in regeneration activities invariably raises expectations, and lack of progress towards delivery and poor management of regeneration projects have contributed to disillusionment among residents,
impacting negatively on social cohesion (Green and Robinson, 2004; Hickman et al., 2008).

In spite of these criticisms social capital has been a dominant theme in urban and economic policy discourses in the UK suggesting that ‘stocks of social capital in an area, in the form of networks, norms and trust, must be maintained and enhanced as a precondition for economic development, as well as for effective government’ (Hibbitt et al., 2001; p.144). The community cohesion agenda favoured a political communitarianism approach whereby ‘problems evident in particular areas were to be tackled by people taking more responsibility for their lives and for the future of their neighbourhoods’ (Ratcliffe, 2011b; p.163). Cohesion policies and communitarianism were thus seen as ‘having the potential to solve perceived social problems’ in particular localities and the ‘key to fix the broken society’ (ibid; p.164).

The approach adopted towards the regeneration of deprived neighbourhoods was based on the premise that ‘without sufficient social capital, regeneration policies will not be sustainable’ (Forrest and Kearns, 1999). The idea of enhancing linking social capital in deprived areas became important since one of the consequences of poor resources and overt discrimination in deprived areas was that people living in deprived areas had little access to people in positions of influence in formal organisations and were not in a position to influence decisions in their area (Groves et al., 2003). Neighbourhood renewal interventions under New Labour were thus designed to increase linking social capital, by giving communities a greater say in the management of their neighbourhoods and in the delivery of services (Groves et al., 2003). The same core ideas have continued to guide Coalition Government policy since it was elected in 2010 but the lack of targeted neighbourhood interventions and funding for the revitalisation of deprived neighbourhoods have been a main departure from previous Labour policy.

2.6 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the nature and consequences of new immigration drawing on a variety of data sources on immigration and a review of the available literature. The
immigration trends examined indicate that the flows and composition of new immigrants in the UK have changed dramatically in recent years. The large increases in the numbers of immigrants who are increasingly from countries without prior—historical and colonial—links to the UK have important implications for local neighbourhoods and communities, for integration and social cohesion. Much of the public policy discourses about immigration and ethnic diversity in the UK however, have drawn on the experiences of post-war immigrants from the Commonwealth countries.

In recent years, new immigration has increasingly featured in public debates about multiculturalism and social cohesion. The evidence informing these debates is rather piecemeal and pays little attention to the diverse circumstances and experiences of immigration in different localities. The literature review highlighted that the local experiences of immigration depend on a variety of factors relating to the demographic and socio-economic composition of immigrants, conditions relating to the immediate and wider places in which immigrants settle and the national context. Few studies to date, have examined how the experiences of recent immigrants differ across different groups or how they differ depending on the places in which they settle. For example, the literature review on immigrant settlement patterns showed that relatively little is known about the underlying factors behind the settlement patterns of new immigrants in the UK. Identifying the factors that attract new immigrants to particular localities however, is crucial in understanding where immigrants are likely to have the largest economic and social impact. One of the main objectives of the thesis is therefore to examine the variation in the settlement patterns of different immigrant groups and identify the relative importance of place characteristics in immigrant settlement (chapter 3).

Similarly, previous studies have highlighted the disadvantage of immigrants in the labour market but these have overwhelmingly focused on immigrants from established ethnic minority groups. The role of contextual factors in determining the labour market position of immigrants is largely ignored in most studies. To address these limitations the analysis on the labour market position of immigrants focuses on immigrants from both new and established immigrant groups taking into account both individual and contextual determinants of labour market outcomes (chapter 4).

The literature review highlighted that immigrant settlement experiences are determined by a plethora of factors relating to individual circumstances—for example, migration status,
employment, education, language ability—and place characteristics—for example
neighbourhood deprivation and history of immigration settlement. It also highlighted that
experiences of integration and cohesion can be better understood by examining how and
why immigrants form their social networks and the types of support they draw from them.
In order to explore the settlement experiences of new immigrants living in deprived
areas the qualitative interviews explored how experiences are grounded in the context of
places and how they are shaped by social networks (chapter 5 and 6).

The aim of the thesis is to provide new evidence on the settlement patterns of new
immigrants, their experiences in the labour market and their neighbourhood experiences.
The research draws out policy implications to help inform the development of national and
local policies (chapter 7).
3. Ethnic concentration, area deprivation and the location choices of new immigrants

3.1 Introduction

Upon arrival to the destination country, immigrants are expected to locate in large cities where previous immigrants have settled, where there is a large pool of jobs from which they can benefit, and initially move to deprived areas to take advantage of the availability of affordable housing. The existing evidence on the determinants of the location choices of immigrants, drawn largely from US studies, suggests that the presence of immigrants in an area is a stronger predictor of immigrant location choice than labour market conditions (see chapter 2). These studies have shown that the effect of ethnic concentration on location choice varies for different migrant groups by country of origin (for example, Bartel, 1989; Zavodny, 1999).

Immigrant location choice and settlement is an under-researched area in the UK reflecting to some extent past issues regarding the availability and quality of data on immigration (see chapter 1). As discussed in chapter 2, the relative importance of local socio-economic characteristics on the location choices of immigrants would be expected to vary for different immigrant groups by immigration route, cultural distinctiveness and socio-economic status. Most immigrants would be expected to move to larger cities and ethnically dense neighbourhoods upon arrival although ethnic density, the concentration of ethnic minorities in an area, is expected to be less important to immigrants coming from wealthier countries. As there are larger cultural differences between immigrants from less developed countries and the British than between immigrants from developed countries and the British, and since immigrants from less developed countries, for instance Asians and Africans, are more likely to be family migrants they would be expected to be more likely to move to ethnically dense areas than immigrants from developed countries. Labour migrants such as EU Accession nationals would be expected to base their location decisions more on local economic conditions while Africans and Asians who are more

20 A large part of this chapter has been published in an article entitled "The area determinants of the location choices of new immigrants in England" [Lymperopoulou, K. 2013]. The definitive, peer-reviewed and edited version of this article is published in Environment and Planning A, 45(3), 575 – 592, 2013. [doi:10.1068/a44673].
likely to be refugees (although refugees account for a small proportion of the foreign born population) than other migrant groups in the UK, would be expected to move to areas with availability of social housing. Overall, new immigrants would be expected to move to deprived areas, particularly immigrants from less developed countries who are more likely to have limited financial resources upon arrival to the UK.

The analysis presented in this chapter draws on Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) National Insurance Number (NINo) registrations to examine the settlement patterns of new immigrants in England, where the majority of immigrants coming to the UK settle. The main research objective is to identify the relative importance of area characteristics such as ethnic concentration and area deprivation in attracting new immigrants and examine how the settlement patterns of new immigrants differ by world area of origin (Objective 1).

The next section discusses the data and methods used in this chapter followed by the results of the analysis on the determinants of immigrant settlement in England. The final section concludes with a discussion of the main findings of the analysis presented in this chapter. The implications of the results for the overall study are discussed in more detail in chapter 7.

### 3.2 Data and methods

The share of immigrants in an area is measured by the total number of NINos in Census Area Statistics (CAS) wards in England for the years 2007-09 expressed as a percentage of the 2007 working age population. Ward level NINos were obtained following the submission of a request to DWP to access small area NINo data. Access to ward level NINos, the only small geography for which the data could be released, was granted by DWP, with information on country of nationality by broad world area.

CAS wards are based on administrative ward boundaries and are widely used in the UK as an approximation for ‘neighbourhoods’ although they tend to be very heterogeneous with sizes ranging from 100 to 30,000 residents\(^2\). One of the main limitations of NINos is that they can be obtained by immigrants at any time after taking up residence in the UK and

---

\(^2\) Neighbourhoods are generally very difficult to define as they do not have fixed boundaries and any attempt to define them needs to take into account the different functions they serve (see for example, Kearns and Parkinson, 2001) which requires a level of disaggregation of the data that is not available.
may therefore not correspond to their first place of residence. This could create
difficulties when trying to identify the relative importance of factors associated with
new immigration flows as the initial and subsequent location choices of immigrants may
differ as a result of changed preferences and circumstances and the imperfect
information on which they base their initial location choices (Aslund, 2005). For
example, large differences may exist in the location preferences of labour migrants
who are likely to obtain a NINo following arrival in the UK, and refugees, who may
obtain a NINo years or decades after arrival to the UK. However, studies have shown
that the presence of co-immigrants and favourable labour market conditions are
equally important in both the initial and subsequent location decisions of
immigrants (Aslund, 2005) with asylum seekers being more likely to relocate to
neighbourhoods with higher concentrations of ethnic minorities than other groups (Zorlu
and Mulder, 2008).

The data also have a number of features which pose challenges for the analysis. First,
as the data measure immigration levels in small areas there is a high frequency of
zeros. There are 4,518 wards corresponding to zero values for EU15 nationals (57% of
wards); 2,459 for EU Accession nationals (31% of wards); 5,422 for Africans (68%
of wards) and 3,970 for Asians (50% of wards) (see Table 3.2). Second, it is not
possible to determine whether the zero values are true zero values as low numbers in
the data have been suppressed by the data provider. Modelling this type of data usually
entails treating the zeros as censored observations. Ordinary Least Squares (OLS)
regression would not yield consistent parameters because the censored sample is not
representative of the population (Cameron and Trivedi, 2010). The tobit model uses all
the observations in the sample, including censored observations providing consistent
estimates. The main tobit assumption is that the predictors in the model are fully
observed but the response is not observed when it is zero. In this model the share of
immigrants can be interpreted as a left-censored variable that equals zero when the latent
share of immigrants equals zero (see Cameron and Trivedi, 2010).
The standard tobit model can be defined as:

\[ y_i^* = x_i \beta + u_i \]  
(1)

\[ y_i = y_i^* \quad \text{if} \quad y_i^* > 0 \]
\[ y_i = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad y_i^* \leq 0 \]

where \( y_i^* \) in equation (1) is the latent share of immigrants in ward \( i \), \( y_i \) is the observed share of immigrants in ward \( i \) and \( x_i \) is a vector of ward and district characteristics. The model assumes that the share of immigrants who moved to a specific location are those whose utility is maximised at that location given a set of characteristics relating to the immigrants’ country of origin and potential destinations (see Zavodny, 1997).

Separate regressions are estimated for each of four immigrant groups based on world area of origin: European Union (EU15), EU Accession, Africa and Asia\(^{22}\). As the response variables corresponding to each of the four world area of origin groups exhibit a strong positive skew, they have been transformed to their logarithmic form.

The ward characteristics in equation (1) include area deprivation levels based on the 2007 Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), the size of the co-ethnic population and overall ethnic diversity. Ethnic diversity, the diversity of the mix of ethnicities within an area, is measured by Simpson’s diversity index\(^{23}\) which measures the percentage of times two randomly selected people would differ by ethnicity.

Additional factors included in the models are local housing market availability, measured by the percentage of households in social and private rented housing in each ward and the percentage of jobs within a 5km radius of a ward’s centroid that are in routine or semi-routine occupations\(^{24}\).

---

\(^{22}\)EU Accession countries comprise of the A10 countries, Cyprus and Malta while Asia includes the Middle East.

\(^{23}\)For an explanation on how the index is calculated see: http://cdu.mimas.ac.uk/materials/unit14/43_calculating_the_index_of_diversity.html.

\(^{24}\)The access to employment indicator was derived from a workplace-based measure constructed in ArcGIS by creating 5 km buffers from the centroid of each ward and then summing the total number of low skilled jobs within each buffer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-ethnic density</td>
<td>The percentage of the ward population who were born in EU15 countries, Eastern Europe, Africa and Asia.</td>
<td>2001 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>Dummies for medium and high ethnic diversity based on a ward level ethnic diversity index. The index was constructed using twelve ethnicity categories: White British, White Irish, other White, Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, other Asia, Black Caribbean, Black African, other Black, Chinese, and Mixed or other ethnic group. Medium diversity corresponds to diversity levels of 0.15-0.31 (values corresponding to the England mean and one standard deviation above the mean) while high diversity corresponds to diversity levels of 0.31 and above (values higher than one standard deviation above the mean).</td>
<td>2001 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) quintiles</td>
<td>Dummies for IMD quintiles based on population weighted deprivation scores for wards calculated from the 2007 IMD for Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs).</td>
<td>CLG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social renters</td>
<td>The percentage of households in a ward who are social renters.</td>
<td>2001 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private renters</td>
<td>The percentage of households in a ward who are private renters.</td>
<td>2001 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low skill jobs 5km radius</td>
<td>The percentage of routine and semi-routine jobs within a 5 kilometre radius from a ward’s centroid.</td>
<td>2001 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Quotients (LQ) for i) Distribution, hotels &amp; restaurants ii) Transport &amp; communications iii)Public admin. education &amp; health and iv) Manufacturing</td>
<td>The location quotients (LQ) measure local employment according to workplace relative to national employment in different industrial sectors. They are calculated as the ratio between the proportion of employment in industry $i$ in a district and the proportion of employment in industry $i$ in England.</td>
<td>APS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>Average unemployment rate in 2004-06.</td>
<td>APS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large urban</td>
<td>Dummy indicating major and large urban areas based on the DEFRA district urban-rural classification. Major urban areas are districts with either 100,000 people or 50% of their population in an urban area with a population of more than 750,000. Large urban areas are districts with either 50,000 people or 50% of their population in one of 17 urban areas with a population between 250,000 and 750,000.</td>
<td>DEFRA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local authority district variables in the models are included to capture labour market conditions such as the unemployment rate, employment structure and include a district urban-rural indicator (see Table 3.1). Since there is differentiation in the employment sector allocation of immigrants by country of origin (see Dustmann et al., 2003) the models also include location quotients corresponding to employment in four industries: distribution, hotels and restaurants; transport and communications; public administration, education and health; and manufacturing.

As wards are clustered within districts it was necessary to correct for the dependence of errors of wards within the same districts by obtaining robust standard errors.

3.3 Results

3.3.1 New immigration, area deprivation and ethnic concentration

This section investigates the relationship between the location of new immigration and i) area deprivation; ii) ethnic concentration. Specifically, it examines whether deprived areas and areas with a high concentration of ethnic minorities account for higher levels of new immigrants and whether there are differences between immigrant groups by world area of origin.

As shown in Figure 3.1, there is a positive relationship between the levels of NINo registrations and area deprivation suggesting that on the whole more deprived areas have higher inflows of new migrants. The NINo registrations broken down by world area of origin shown in the right-hand side of Figure 3.1 suggest that the strength of the relationship between NINo registrations and area deprivation differs across migrant groups.

25The agricultural sector has attracted a large number of EU Accession migrants although it is not included here because many observations were missing due to data suppression.

26The tobit regression models were estimated with the intreg command in STATA in order to obtain robust standard errors as these cannot be directly obtained after tobit.

27This section draws on the preliminary analysis that preceded the modeling. Ethnic concentration in this section is measured by the percentage of people in 2001 who belong to an ethnic group other than White British.
Overall, there is a weak relationship between NINos and area deprivation for most groups (0.20<r<0.30) but a moderate relationship between the flows of new immigrants from Africa and area deprivation (r=0.33) suggesting that on the whole, areas with high numbers of new immigrants from Africa have higher deprivation levels compared to areas with high numbers of other immigrant groups.

The next figure examines the relationship between the flows of immigrants and the size of the ethnic minority population by immigrant group. As shown in Figure 3.2, there is a very strong relationship between the flow of new immigrants and the size of the ethnic minority population suggesting that areas with proportionally higher levels of new immigrants have a higher ethnic minority population.

The relationship between immigration levels and ethnic concentration is strong for most new immigrant groups particularly those from Asia and the Middle East, Africa and the EU countries.

Figure 3.1 NINo registrations in English wards and area deprivation

This indicates that like previous immigrants in the UK, new immigrants choose to live in close proximity to other immigrants and established minority populations in the early stages of migration to take advantage of information and support networks. As shown in
Figure 3.2, more than half of the variation in immigration flows in 2007-09 in an area is accounted for by the size of the ethnic minority population.

Figure 3.2 NINo registrations in English wards and ethnic concentration

In contrast, the relationship is moderate for EU Accession nationals suggesting that compared to other groups new migrants from the EU Accession countries are less likely to settle in areas with a higher ethnic minority population. This reflects to some extent the distinct settlement patterns of EU Accession nationals who choose to live in proximity to employment opportunities, particularly in agriculture and the food processing sectors, in rural areas and small towns that have a low ethnic minority population (chapter 2).

3.3.2 The determinants of the settlement patterns of immigrants

In the tobit model the dependent variable takes either zero or positive values where the zeros are the censored observations. Table 3.2 shows the variable means for areas with positive shares of immigrants by world area of origin and for the full sample. On average immigrants, and particularly Africans, are more likely to locate in deprived areas and areas with a higher share of social rented households.
As shown in Table 3.2, the share of co-ethnics is lower in wards where EU Accession nationals settled and highest in wards where Asians settled. The areas in which most immigrants settled also tend to be more likely to exhibit higher ethnic diversity levels, particularly the areas in which Africans settled, although there are proportionally more areas in which EU Accession nationals settled with low diversity levels than higher ethnic diversity levels.

The areas in which EU Accession nationals chose to locate also have a higher share of low skill jobs in the immediate and surrounding areas and are more likely to be in districts with a lower unemployment rate and in smaller urban or rural districts.

On average, areas in which immigrants settle tend to have a lower concentration of employment in the manufacturing sector and a higher concentration in services. Table 3.3 shows the results of the tobit regression.

The tobit model is based on the assumption that the same probability mechanism generates both the zeros and positive values with each of the predictors expected to influence the probability that immigrants will locate in a ward as well as the share of immigrants. Assessed in this way, the results suggest that new immigrants are more likely to locate and concentrate in areas with a higher density of immigrants from the same countries of origin. This is in line with previous findings which suggest that new immigrants are attracted to areas where previous immigrants have located. In addition, new immigrants are attracted to areas with higher ethnic diversity levels with the likelihood of settlement and the share of immigrants being higher in wards with high and medium ethnic diversity than low diversity levels. Again, this is consistent with the proposition that immigrants locate in ethnically diverse areas to benefit from ethnic minority structures and community resources that can help with adaptation.

As expected, more deprived areas are associated with a higher likelihood of settlement and a higher share of new immigrants with the relationship found to be more pronounced for EU Accession nationals and Africans. The estimated effect of area deprivation on the latent share of immigrants is generally higher for wards in the bottom two deprivation quintiles (IMD4 and IMD5) for all groups although the relationship between area deprivation and the share of EU15 immigrants is not found to be statistically significant. This could reflect the overall better socio-economic position of EU15 immigrants compared to the other immigrant groups.
Table 3.2 Mean values for each variable in the model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of immigrants (dependent variable)</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Middle East</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ward characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deprivation Quintile 1 (least deprived)</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Middle East</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deprivation Quintile 5 (most deprived)</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-ethnic density</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% social renters</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>19.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td>14.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% private renters</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>11.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>14.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>12.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Low skill jobs 5km radius</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td>27.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>25.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>25.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low diversity</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium ethnic diversity</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High ethnic density</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LQ Distribution,hotels &amp; restaurants</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LQ Transport &amp; communications</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LQ Public admin. education &amp; health</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LQ Manufacturing</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% unemployed</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large urban district</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small urban or rural district</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of wards</th>
<th>Reduced Sample</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>3483</td>
<td>7,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>5,497</td>
<td>7,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>7,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>3,986</td>
<td>7,957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model also suggests that there is a negative relationship between the level of low skill jobs locally and the inflow of new immigrants. This indicates that new immigrants tend to locate not only in the most deprived areas but also in areas with poor access to employment. The negative effect of the level of low skill jobs on the share of new immigrants is observed for all immigrant groups except for EU Accession nationals. The regression results for EU Accession nationals suggest that areas with better access to low skill jobs tend to attract new immigrants to a greater extent.

---

28The City of London and the Isles of Scilly are excluded from the analysis.
skill jobs are associated with a higher share of EU Accession nationals although the relationship is not found to be statistically significant.

Table 3.3 Tobit regression results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward characteristics</th>
<th>EU15</th>
<th></th>
<th>EU Accession</th>
<th></th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th></th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% co-ethnics</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.26***</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.13***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium diversity</td>
<td>1.41***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.16***</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.01***</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.50***</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High diversity</td>
<td>1.68***</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.47***</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.52***</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.44***</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD2</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD3</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.48***</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.82***</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD5</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.29***</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% social renters</td>
<td>0.02***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% private renters</td>
<td>0.04***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low skill jobs (5km)</td>
<td>-0.04***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District characteristics</th>
<th>EU15</th>
<th></th>
<th>EU Accession</th>
<th></th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th></th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LQ Distribution, hotels &amp; restaurants</td>
<td>0.89**</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.07**</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.82*</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Transport &amp; communications</td>
<td>0.85***</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.85***</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.29***</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.00***</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Public admin. education &amp; health</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Manufacturing</td>
<td>-0.39**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% unemployed</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.08**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large urban</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.78***</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.36***</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-5.66***</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-4.62***</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-7.73***</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-6.06***</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>7956</td>
<td></td>
<td>7956</td>
<td></td>
<td>7956</td>
<td></td>
<td>7956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncensored observations</td>
<td>3483</td>
<td></td>
<td>5497</td>
<td></td>
<td>2534</td>
<td></td>
<td>3986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sigma</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log pseudolikelihood</td>
<td>-8736.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>-12891.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6911.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>-9266.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p*<0.05; p**<0.01; p***<0.001; robust standard errors reported.

As shown in Table 3.3, immigrants are more likely to settle and concentrate in areas with higher availability of both private and social rented housing. In terms of the social housing sector, the results suggest that the impact of social housing is more pronounced on the settlement patterns of African immigrants compared to the other groups. This may well reflect the higher likelihood of African migrants to be refugees than the other groups, and
therefore be more likely to make use of social housing. In contrast, the effect of social housing is not a significant predictor of the share of EU Accession nationals.

EU Accession nationals have had restricted access to the benefits system including social housing which they could only access after 12 months of continuous employment in the UK. These restrictions together with the higher employment levels of EU Accession nationals (see chapter 4) compared to other immigrant groups can help explain why EU Accession nationals base their location decisions on the availability of private, rather than social housing.

Districts with a higher concentration of employment in services, particularly in distribution, hotels, restaurants, and also transport and communication sectors are also associated with a higher likelihood of settlement and concentration of new immigrants although Asian immigrants also tend to concentrate in districts with higher employment in public services, education and health services. Conversely, there is a negative relationship between the level of employment in the manufacturing sector and the latent share of immigrants but the relationship is only found to be statistically significant in the regression for EU15 nationals. This is likely to reflect the higher preponderance of EU15 nationals in large cities, particularly London where employment is concentrated in services and the lower wages in the manufacturing sector which would make employment in this sector less attractive to EU15 nationals.

The model results suggest that all immigrants are more likely to settle in large urban districts apart from EU Accession nationals. EU Accession nationals, unlike immigrants from more established immigrant groups, are found to be less likely to settle in large urban districts than small urban or rural districts. This reflects the more dispersed settlement patterns of EU Accession nationals compared to other immigrant groups—this group is more likely to settle and concentrate in small urban and rural areas where other immigrant groups are rarely found. This is in line with theoretical propositions about the formation of immigrant communities which assume that location decisions in the early stage of the immigration process are dependent on the availability of employment (Anwar, 1974).
Small urban and rural areas have a higher concentration of employment in sectors that have attracted EU Accession migrants such as agriculture and manufacturing which can help explain why EU Accession nationals move to these areas.

The effect of the unemployment rate on the latent share of immigrants is more mixed although it is only statistically significant in the regression for EU Accession nationals. The model results suggest that EU Accession nationals are more likely to settle and concentrate in districts with lower unemployment levels. This is in line with expectations that labour migrants are more likely to base their location decisions on the availability of employment than other types of migrants.

As suggested earlier, the tobit coefficients shown in Table 3.3 show the effect of changes in each of the predictors on the expected value of the latent share of immigrants. Since the dependent variable is unobserved, it is easier to focus on the results based on what is observed. Table 3.4 shows the expected share of immigrants in wards in which immigrants settled (with non-censored observations). The predictions\(^{29}\) were calculated using the values reported in Table 3.3 for different values of the predictors corresponding to percentiles or categories of the predictor variables found to have significant effects, holding all other variables constant at their means.

The expected share of immigrants is calculated for three values corresponding to the 25\(^{th}\), 75\(^{th}\) and 95\(^{th}\) percentile of the distribution of each predictor variable. As shown in Table 3.4, the expected share of immigrants in wards where EU Accession and Asian immigrants settled with an average share of co-ethnics in the 25\(^{th}\) percentile is about 0.16 and 0.17 percentage points lower respectively, than it is for wards in the 95\(^{th}\) percentile. The difference in the effect of the share of co-ethnics on the share of EU15 nationals and Africans in wards with a share of co-ethnics in the 25\(^{th}\) and 75\(^{th}\) percentiles is much smaller at 0.06 and 0.01 percentage points respectively. The effect of co-ethnic density therefore, is strongest for Asians and weakest for Africans. This may be because the African group is more heterogeneous than the Asian group. Two thirds of immigrants in the Asian group are from India, Bangladesh and Pakistan who historically have clustered together in the UK with recent migrants being more likely to be family migrants than other groups (Home Office, 2010). On the other hand, Africans are a heterogeneous group of more recent

\(^{29}\) Since the dependent variable is the log share of immigrants predictions required retransformation (see Cameron and Trivedi, 2010).
settlers with the numbers of immigrants from individual African countries being, until recently, relatively small. There are also more Africans coming to the UK through the asylum route compared to the other groups and therefore subject to dispersal. For instance, between 2007 and 2009 there were 7,991 total grants for asylum in the UK to Africans compared to 1,718 to Asians.30

Ethnic diversity has a larger estimated effect on the share of new immigrants than co-ethnic density. There is a 1.3 percentage point difference in the expected share of EU Accession nationals between wards with low and high ethnic diversity levels although the difference in the expected share of Asians and Africans between areas with low and high ethnic diversity levels is much smaller.31

Deprivation levels also have a larger effect on the share of immigrants compared to the other predictors. As shown in Table 3.4, there is a 0.8 percentage point difference in the share of EU Accession nationals in wards which are amongst the top and bottom deprivation quintile. Looking at the share of immigrants in wards in the top two most deprived quintiles (IMD5 and IMD4) the effect of deprivation is a lot smaller with the difference in the share of EU Accession nationals in wards in the most deprived and the second most deprived quintile being 0.4 percentage points. On the other hand, the share of Africans and Asians in wards in the two most deprived quintiles is approximately equivalent. This suggests that EU Accession nationals are more likely to be concentrated in the most deprived wards than the other groups.

In terms of the effect of housing conditions, the difference in the share of EU Accession nationals in wards where the percent of private renters was in the 25th percentile and 95th percentile is 0.6 percentage points. A ward with a percent of social renters amongst the 25th percentile would be expected to receive 0.18 and 0.08 percent of Asian and African immigrants respectively compared to 0.13 and 0.23 percent if the ward was in the 95th percentile. The effect of the availability of low skilled jobs locally is similarly small with the expected share of immigrants in wards in the 25th percentile

30 Table as.05: Asylum initial decisions from main applicants, by sex and country of nationality. http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/science-research-statistics/research-statistics/immigration-asylum-research/immigration-q4-2011/
31 These differences are seemingly small but since they relate to the total population in a ward they are dependent on ward size.
of that variable expected to be between 0.02 and 0.05 percentage points higher than in
wards in the 95th percentile.

Changes in district level characteristics have a smaller overall effect on the share of
immigrants than the ward level characteristics. For instance, the difference in the share of
EU Accession nationals in a ward within a district where the location quotient for
employment in transport and communications was in the 25th percentile and 95th percentile
is 0.2 percentage points. The share of EU Accession nationals in a ward within a district
where the unemployment rate was in the 25th percentile is predicted to be 0.7% compared
to 0.5% if the ward was in the 75th percentile. The effect of district characteristics on the
share of the other immigrant groups is even smaller. For instance, the difference in the
share of Asian nationals in wards where employment levels in public administration, education and health sectors placed it in the 25th and 75th percentile is
0.04 percentage points. The share of Asian and African nationals in wards within
large urban districts would be expected to be 0.04 and 0.03 higher respectively than in
smaller urban or rural districts. Conversely the share of EU Accession nationals in
wards within large urban districts is expected to be 0.13 percentage points lower
than in smaller urban or rural districts. This suggests that the size of the district
population has a more modest effect on the share of EU Accession nationals than the
other variables.

Since a lot of policy interest lies in the social and economic impact of new immigration in
local areas, particularly in deprived areas where most immigrants are likely to settle
initially, and where new migration may intensify existing problems of deprivation and
cohesion, predictions of the expected share of immigrants were estimated for deprived
areas.

The predictions were generated for deprived areas in large urban and smaller urban or rural
districts with selected characteristics: low and high co-ethnic density, low and high
diversity levels, low and high levels of social renting, and low and high unemployment
levels, with all other predictors held constant at their means.

Figures 3.3-3.6 provide further support for the clustering of immigrants in deprived areas
with the values for the expected share of immigrants in wards with each of the
characteristics examined, being higher than the corresponding values in Table 3.4.
Table 3.4 Expected share of immigrants conditional on settlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward characteristics</th>
<th>EU15</th>
<th>EU Accession</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% co-ethnics (p25)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% co-ethnics (p75)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% co-ethnics (p95)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low diversity</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium ethnic diversity</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high ethnic diversity</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD1 (least deprived)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD5 (most deprived)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% social renters (p25)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% social renters (p75)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% social renters (p95)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% private renters (p25)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% private renters (p75)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% private renters (p95)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Low skill jobs in 5km radius (p25)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Low skill jobs in 5km radius (p75)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Low skill jobs in 5km radius (p95)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Distribution, hotels &amp; restaurants</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Distribution, hotels &amp; restaurants</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Transport &amp; communications (p25)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Transport &amp; communications (p75)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Transport &amp; communications (p95)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Public admin. education &amp; health</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Public admin. education &amp; health</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Public admin. education &amp; health</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Manufacturing (p25)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Manufacturing (p75)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ Manufacturing (p95)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Unemployed (P25)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Unemployed (P75)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Unemployed (P95)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large urban</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.3 Expected share of EU15 immigrants in deprived areas with selected characteristics
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Figure 3.4 Expected share of EU Accession immigrants in deprived areas with selected characteristics

![Bar chart showing expected share of immigrants in different areas with selected characteristics.](image)
Figure 3.5 Expected share of African immigrants in deprived areas with selected characteristics

Figure 3.6 Expected share of Asian immigrants in deprived areas with selected characteristics
Differences in ethnic diversity levels can therefore have a large effect in terms of the number of immigrants settling in deprived wards, particularly in large wards. For instance, a deprived ward within a large urban district with an average working age population of 20,000 and high ethnic diversity levels would be expected to attract an additional 440 EU Accession immigrants than a ward of the equivalent population size with low ethnic diversity levels.

Similarly, the difference in the expected share of African, Asian and EU15 immigrants in areas with high and low ethnic diversity levels in large urban districts is 0.53, 0.46 and 0.34 percentage points respectively.

The estimated effect of co-ethnic density on the share of immigrants is smaller, for instance there is a 0.3 percentage point difference in the share of immigrants from the EU Accession countries and Asia between areas in the 25th and 75th percentile of the distribution of co-ethnic density. Similarly, the expected share of EU Accession nationals is around 0.4 percentage points lower in a deprived ward within a district with low unemployment levels (in the 25th percentile) than in a ward within a district with high unemployment levels (in the 75th percentile).

3.4 Conclusion

The analysis presented in this chapter identified the factors that attract new immigrants to particular localities (RQ1)—this can determine where immigrants are likely to have the largest economic and social impact and assist the planning of services in these areas. The impact of immigration will depend on a variety of local area factors associated with the physical and social environment, the characteristics of both immigrant and established communities in local areas as well as social, cultural and historical community features (Robinson, 2010).

The analysis also sought to examine which groups are more likely to settle in ethnically diverse and deprived areas (RQ2). In line with previous studies, the results suggest that new immigrants are attracted to areas with a presence of people from their own countries of origin. The analysis in this chapter also shows that immigrants are more likely to settle in areas with higher ethnic diversity levels with the effect of ethnic diversity found to be strongest for EU Accession nationals.
This is not surprising given the many benefits that accrue to immigrants by locating in close proximity to other immigrants irrespective of country of origin. Ethnically diverse areas offer social support, community infrastructures, shared resources and services to immigrant communities which enhance their well-being particularly those in the early stages of migration by protecting them from alienation and discrimination (Phillips, 2007).

The results suggest that high levels of immigration experienced in local areas would be expected to be re-enforced by subsequent flows of immigrants and result in an increase in the share of immigrants both from the same and other countries of origin as recent immigrants. As with previous immigrants, the formation of kinship networks between EU Accession nationals is expected to pass on information about employment and housing to others and attract new immigrants who would choose to live in proximity to other immigrants as this can help ease the transition process and help bring about a sense of security (Anwar, 1974).

The assertion that EU Accession nationals have a tendency to concentrate in smaller towns and rural areas finds support in this study. In addition, this study provides evidence that EU Accession nationals are more likely to settle and exhibit higher concentrations in neighbourhoods with higher ethnic diversity levels in both large urban and small urban or rural areas. EU Accession nationals are also more likely to settle in high numbers in the most deprived areas in the country, more so than other recent immigrant groups. The preponderance of immigrants locating in deprived areas suggests that deprived areas in England continue to play a central role in acting as reception areas for new immigrants who are likely to move in these areas to benefit from the availability of cheap housing.

The results show that there are important differences in the settlement patterns of new immigrants in England by world area of origin reflecting to some extent, differences in immigration routes and accessibility to the labour market. The effect of immigration route on the location choices of immigrants could not be measured directly since NINos do not collect this information although country of origin can be indicative of immigration status. This is more likely to be the case for immigrants belonging to more homogeneous country of origin groups but less so for those from heterogeneous groups. The inclusion of migrant characteristics such as immigration route, education levels and
more detailed country of origin groupings would be expected to show greater inter-and intra-group differentiation among immigrants. The release of data from the 2011 Census will enable some of these issues to be addressed.

Favourable labour market conditions appear to be important to the location choices of EU Accession nationals, a group comprising largely labour migrants with unrestricted rights of access to the UK labour market, but not to the other immigrant groups. The availability of social housing was shown to be more important to immigrants from Africa and Asia who upon arrival are more likely to face restrictions to employment. Overall, areas with large social and private rented housing sectors are more likely to attract large numbers of immigrants than areas with a large owner occupier housing sector. The effects of area ethnic composition, labour and housing market conditions are found to be larger in deprived areas where immigrants are more likely to settle and concentrate. These are areas with large concentrations of deprived households, which experienced significant population decline in the past and were left with poor housing conditions, poor services and local resources. If new immigrants tend to concentrate in deprived areas, as suggested by this study, the effect of immigration can be to reverse population decline and provide the critical mass of people needed to support services, facilities, shops and the revitalisation of these areas (Robinson and Reeve, 2006; Stenning et al., 2006). In the short term however, a large concentration of new immigrants in deprived neighbourhoods can put pressure on public service provision including housing, health, schools and language provision which can contribute towards inter-community tensions (Stenning et al., 2006; Robinson and Reeve, 2006). These results have implications for regeneration and housing policies which are discussed in the final chapter of the thesis.
4. Neighbourhood deprivation, ethnic minority concentration and experiences of worklessness among new immigrants

4.1 Introduction

The experiences of immigrants in the labour market determine to a large extent their economic success in the host country and their social integration and participation into British society. Studies in the UK and elsewhere have consistently shown that non-white immigrants face a disadvantage in the labour market compared to the white population in the receiving country. Chiswick (1980) first showed that the earnings between white immigrants and the white UK born population were somewhat similar but the earnings of non-white immigrants were significantly lower compared to the white UK born population. More recent studies have confirmed the finding that ethnic minority immigrant earnings lag behind those of white immigrants and white natives (Denny et al., 1997; Blackaby et al., 2002; Dustmann and Fabbri, 2003; Dustmann and Fabbri 2005; Clark and Lindley, 2009). Bangladeshi and Pakistani immigrants are thought to be particularly disadvantaged, together with Black Caribbean and Black African immigrants, facing a higher risk of unemployment compared to white immigrants and white natives (Blackaby et al., 1997; Dustmann and Fabbri, 2003; Dustmann and Fabbri, 2005).

Explanations about the factors that affect individual labour market outcomes lie in neoclassical economic theory and immigration theories from sociology, the first emphasising the role of human capital and the second the role of social context in determining individual outcomes. Investments in human capital such as educational qualifications, and work related experience and skills are expected to improve individual job-specific skills and job prospects (Mincer, 1974). As discussed in chapter 2, immigrants are likely to be disadvantaged upon arrival to the host country as a result of the quality of education they received in their home countries or a lack of recognition of their qualifications in the host country (Berthoud, 2000a). The possession of foreign qualifications is generally associated with lower returns to education levels (Blackaby et al., 2002; Shields and Wheatley Price, 1998).
Length of stay in the host country is central in theories of assimilation and adjustment (Clark and Drinkwater, 2008). Immigrants lack knowledge in terms of job-search and the networks required to obtain jobs but with time this knowledge is likely to increase (Berthoud, 2000a). The initial disadvantage in the labour market position of immigrants is expected to diminish over time with integration, as language skills improve along with labour market knowledge and the acquisition of training and education in the host country (Chiswick, 1980).

As discussed in chapter 2, employer discrimination is thought to be a major component of ‘ethnic penalties’ in the labour market—the disadvantage that remains after controlling for individual observable socio-economic characteristics. As previous studies have shown that white immigrant groups face lower ethnic penalties in the labour market, it would be expected that the incidence of worklessness among recent EU Accession migrants would be lower compared to non-white immigrant groups.

A small number of studies investigating the labour market position of immigrants in the UK have examined the contextual effects of ethnic concentration and the influence these exert on immigrant labour market decisions. The spatial concentration of ethnic minorities may suggest the presence of social networks that provide job information, which may improve employment prospects, particularly in the enclave economy. These networks may, however, also be harmful if those who depend on employment opportunities within the ethnic economy are less likely to invest in country specific skills such as language skills (Clark and Drinkwater, 1998). Employment opportunities within the ethnic economy are also more likely to be characterised by poor pay and employment conditions (Waldinger, 2005). Immigrants in ethnically diverse areas may have limited contact with the host country population restricting their access to information about employment opportunities in the wider economy and for this reason may face a higher risk of worklessness.

These propositions are tested through a multilevel model examining the incidence of worklessness given a set of individual, household and neighbourhood characteristics. The outcome investigated is worklessness which refers to the incidence of unemployment or economic inactivity. Upon arrival to the host country, immigrants are likely to experience unemployment due to a lack of language and other country specific
skills. They are also more likely to be economically inactive as a result of restrictions to work imposed by their immigration status or due to family formation practices and cultural expectations towards work as in the case of some immigrant women. It is therefore important to examine both unemployment and economic inactivity as a labour market outcome.

The analysis presented in this chapter differs from previous studies in a number of respects. First the analysis takes into account individual, household and neighbourhood characteristics that are shown to influence individual labour market outcomes. Second, the analysis focuses on those who settled in the UK after the second half of the 1990s in order to capture recent immigrants distinguishing between those from established and new immigrant communities. Unlike most previous studies, the analysis examines the economic position of EU Accession migrants and classifies other new immigrants from smaller groups into Commonwealth and non-Commonwealth country groupings. This distinction is important since tighter immigration controls in recent years has meant that those coming from outside the EU countries are less likely to be admitted to work in the UK unless they have high incomes, skills or educational qualifications.

The next sections present the data and methods used in this chapter followed by the modelling results. The final section concludes with a discussion of the main findings of the analysis presented in this chapter. The implications of the results for the overall study are discussed in more detail in chapter 7.

### 4.2 Data and methods

The Labour Force Survey (LFS) is a national survey of around 60,000 households drawn from five waves conducted at quarterly intervals. The LFS is based on a single stage sample of addresses with a random start and constant interval drawn from the Postcode Address File (PAF) with the sampling frame covering around 97% of private addresses in Great Britain.\(^{32}\)

---

\(^{32}\)This work contains statistical data from ONS which is Crown copyright and reproduced with the permission of the controller of HMSO and Queen's Printer for Scotland. The use of the ONS statistical data in this work does not imply the endorsement of the ONS in relation to the interpretation or analysis of
As the sample of households within each quarter is not sufficiently large to examine different immigrant groups it is necessary to pool together quarters from different years. The analysis presented here is based on a pooled sample of the quarterly LFS individual datasets comprising of July-September quarters based on wave 1-4 respondents for the years 2004-2009. The sample consists of working age males and females aged 16-64 and 16-59 respectively (excluding students) living in urban areas in England as defined in the Department for Environment for Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) district urban-rural classification.

Let $y_{ijk}$ be a binary indicator variable taking the value of 1 if workless and 0 otherwise for individual $i$ living in household $j$ and neighborhood $k$. Workless individuals are defined as those who are either unemployed or economically inactive. The probability of worklessness is defined as $p_{ijk} = Pr(y_{ijk} = 1)$.

Following Guo and Zhao (2000) a three level model allowing for the clustering of the household and the neighbourhood with a single explanatory variable $X_{ijk}$ can be written as:

$$
\text{Logit}(p_{ijk}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{ijk} + u_{0jk} + v_{0k}
$$

where $\beta_0$ and $\beta_1$ are the coefficients to be estimated and $u_{0jk}$ and $v_{0k}$ are the random effects representing unobserved household and neighbourhood characteristics which follow a Normal distribution with mean 0 and variance $\sigma^2_{u0}$ and $\sigma^2_{v0}$ respectively.

In this model, household and neighbourhood conditions are expected to give rise to contextual effects which can influence individual outcomes by affecting differentially individual opportunity structures and employment outcomes (Baum et al., 2008).
### Table 4.1 Regression variables and description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Workless</th>
<th>Unemployed or economically Inactive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual and household characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married or cohabiting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British White</td>
<td>Born in Great Britain and ethnicity White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Indian</td>
<td>Born in Great Britain and ethnicity Indian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Bangladeshi and Pakistani British born</td>
<td>Born in Great Britain and ethnicity Bangladeshi or Pakistani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British non-white</td>
<td>Born in Great Britain and other non-white ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>Born in EU Accession countries and ethnicity White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>Born in the EU15 countries and ethnicity White (including Switzerland, Norway and Iceland)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Commonwealth</td>
<td>Born in South Africa, New Zealand, Canada and Australia and ethnicity White (including USA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi and Pakistani</td>
<td>Born in Bangladesh or Pakistan and ethnicity Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Born in India and ethnicity Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean Black</td>
<td>Born in the Caribbean and ethnicity Black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth African Black</td>
<td>Born in Commonwealth Africa and ethnicity Black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non Commonwealth</td>
<td>Born in countries not specified above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest qualification</td>
<td>NVQ Level 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NVQ Level 1-3 or Apprenticeship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay</td>
<td>Lives in the UK for less than five years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>One child or more (aged under 16) in household</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived</td>
<td>Lives in one of the 20% most deprived wards in England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority density</td>
<td>Lives in a ward with 50% or more people belonging to an ethnic minority group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lives in a ward with 25-50% people belonging to an ethnic minority group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lives in a ward with under 25% people belonging to an ethnic minority group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multilevel models effectively account for the hierarchical structure in the data, whereby individuals are nested within households and neighbourhoods by modelling the

---

33The ethnic minority density indicator was drawn from the 2001 Census. Population weighted ward deprivation scores were calculated from the 2007 IMD for Lower Super Output Areas available from the Department of Communities and Local Government.
variation at all levels, allowing for individuals belonging to a particular household and neighbourhood to be more alike than those belonging to other groups (Goldstein, 2003).

To identify and group immigrants, a combination of characteristics relating to ethnicity and country of birth were used, as shown in Table 4.1. The Pakistani and Bangladeshi are combined in line with other studies on the basis of similarities of pre-migration characteristics and their similarities in terms of socio-economic characteristics in Britain (Modood et al., 1997, Berthoud, 2000a; Lindley et al., 2004).

Non-white immigrants from Commonwealth and non-Commonwealth countries are grouped separately as they are expected to differ in terms of economic outcomes given the differences in immigration routes and access to employment which may exist between these two groups. Additionally, as the majority of observations in the pooled dataset were White British, a 50% random sample from this group was included in the analysis.

Consistent with previous research, individual level predictors in the model include age, sex, marital status, education and length of stay in the UK. Previous studies have shown that there are significant differences between males and females and young and older groups in labour market participation and employment outcomes (Dustmann and Fabbri, 2005). Those who are married are also more likely to be in employment as they have more stable employment histories and more motivation to work (Wheatley Price, 2001).

As discussed earlier, education and skills are the main determinants of labour market performance. Qualifications have been grouped into four categories as shown in Table 4.1. ‘Other’ qualifications are included separately as they include foreign qualifications. Even though the majority of studies investigating labour market outcomes do not make this distinction, Blackaby et al., 2002) have showed that the distinction between foreign and domestic qualifications has a very important effect on labour market outcomes. Furthermore, at the household level, the presence of children is another consideration determining labour force participation and employment.

---

34 The models were estimated using different random samples of White British and the results were generally consistent.
The presence of several children has been associated with higher propensities of unemployment not just for women but also for men (Blackaby et al., 1997; Wheatley Price, 2001).

The effect of neighbourhood characteristics including deprivation levels and ethnic density are also explored in the model (Wang, 2008; Wang, 2009; Buck, 2001; Simpson et al., 2006). The full list of explanatory variables are shown in Table 4.1.

### 4.3 Descriptive analysis

Table 4.2 shows that on average, EU Accession immigrants were younger upon arrival to the UK than most other immigrant groups with the majority arriving in the five years following the EU Accession. The majority of Commonwealth Africans and new immigrants from outside the Commonwealth in the sample were older at time of arrival than other groups with the majority arriving between 2000 and 2004. Conversely, over a third of EU, Pakistani and Bangladeshi immigrants arrived to the UK between 1995 and 1999.

As shown in Table 4.3, South Asian households are larger, compared to other households, particularly the Bangladeshi and Pakistani with 74% of the Bangladeshi and Pakistani born in Britain and 68% of Bangladeshi and Pakistani immigrants being in households with four or more persons. This is likely to reflect high fertility rates and the ‘three-generation’ household pattern among the Bangladeshi and Pakistani whereby married couples live with their parents (Berthoud, 2000b). In contrast, EU immigrants, the White British and other British born groups have a higher occurrence of single person households. White groups are less likely to be in large households with the exception of EU Accession immigrants who are more likely to be in households with four or more persons compared to other white groups. This is likely to reflect the large numbers of Eastern European immigrants living in Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs) (Spencer et al., 2007)\(^{35}\).

---

\(^{35}\)A household comprises of one or more people who may or may not be related, living (or staying temporarily) at the same address, with common housekeeping, who either share at least one meal a day or share common living accommodation.
The educational attainment of immigrants is diverse with some immigrant groups having lower qualifications than others (Table 4.4). The least qualified are the Bangladeshi and Pakistani with 32% having no qualifications. A quarter of non-white immigrants from outside the Commonwealth are also without qualifications. Among the British born, the Bangladeshi and Pakistani are also the least qualified. This is in part a reflection of the lower educational attainment among South Asian women due to marriage, family formation and cultural factors (Dale, 2002).

Table 4.2 Age and decade of arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at arrival</th>
<th>Year of Arrival (%)</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Commonwealth</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani and Bangladeshi</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth African Black</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-Commonwealth non-white</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, white immigrant groups tend to have lower numbers without any qualifications although there are both white and non-white immigrant groups with high level qualifications. For instance, over a third of EU, old Commonwealth, Black Commonwealth Africans and Indian immigrants have NVQ level 4 or above qualifications. British Indians are also amongst the most qualified. EU Accession immigrants on the other hand, have the lowest levels of degree level qualifications together with the Pakistani and Bangladeshi. Unlike the Pakistani and Bangladeshi, the low incidence of Central and Eastern Europeans with degree level education reflects the large numbers (61%) with ‘other’ qualifications, suggesting that qualifications are likely to have been acquired abroad36.

---

36 Qualifications are classified as “foreign” in situations whereby LFS respondents hold qualifications that they do not recognise in the LFS qualification categories. Degree level qualifications form a separate category and as long as LFS respondents identify themselves as being in this category, regardless of where the degree is obtained, they will be categorised as having a degree.
As shown in Table 4.5, white immigrant groups have the highest employment rates and lower unemployment rates among immigrant groups. Unemployment rates are highest among the British Bangladeshi and Pakistani and the other non-white British group together with Black Africans. The highest inactivity rates are amongst Bangladeshi and Pakistani and non-white immigrants outside the Commonwealth. On the other hand, immigrants from the EU Accession countries have higher employment and lower
unemployment rates than ethnic minority immigrant groups. Gender inequalities in participation and employment patterns among some ethnic minority immigrant groups, in terms of lower female educational attainment, early marriage and family formation and cultural expectations, are expected to account for some of the differences in the overall economic position between white and ethnic minority immigrants groups (Dale, 2002). The exception are Indian groups showing significantly higher employment and lower worklessness rates than the other non-white groups.

Table 4.5 Economic activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Activity</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Workless</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British White</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>63049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Indian</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>1721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Pakistani and Bangladeshi</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>1478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British other non-white</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>4139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Commonwealth</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani and Bangladeshi</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth African Black</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-Commonwealth non-white</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>1429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over half of the Pakistani and Bangladeshi immigrants and just under half of non-white immigrants from non-Commonwealth countries and British born Pakistani and Bangladeshi in the sample are workless. In comparison, the average worklessness rate for white immigrants is just 15%.

As expected, non-white immigrants and ethnic minorities are more likely to live in areas with higher ethnic density levels. As shown in Table 4.6, 43% of Pakistani and Bangladeshi immigrants and 39% of the British born Pakistani and Bangladeshi live in wards with more than 50% of the population belonging to an ethnic group (Table 4.6). Conversely, 88% of the White British live in areas with less than 25% ethnic minority population.
Around half of Black Commonwealth Africans and EU Accession immigrants in the sample also live in areas with a small ethnic minority population.

Table 4.6 Neighbourhood ethnic density levels and deprivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic density levels</th>
<th>Ethnic minority pop&lt;25%</th>
<th>Ethnic minority pop 25%-50%</th>
<th>Ethnic minority pop 50% or more</th>
<th>Lives in a deprived ward</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British White</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>63049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Indian</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>1721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Pakistani and Bangladeshi</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>1478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British other non-white</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>4139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>1352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Commonwealth</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>1123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani and Bangladeshi</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth African Black</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-Commonwealth non-white</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>1429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Pakistani and Bangladeshi are overwhelmingly concentrated in deprived areas, with 80% of immigrants and 76% of the British born Pakistani and Bangladeshi living in one of the 20% most deprived areas in England compared to 37% of the White British\textsuperscript{37}.

4.4 Multilevel modelling results

The modelling strategy adopted to estimate the incidence of worklessness among new immigrants in England involved a number of stages. First, single level logistic models were estimated, and then two and three level random intercept models were estimated based on individual characteristics with individuals at the first level, households at the second level and neighbourhoods at the third level.

\textsuperscript{37} The large numbers of people living in deprived areas reflects the overrepresentation of urban wards classified as deprived and the exclusion of wards in non-urban areas from the sample.
In the final stage the random intercept models were estimated using both individual and contextual variables and cross-level interactions. The models were first estimated using Marginal Quasi-Likelihood (MQL) and Penalised Quasi-Likelihood (PQL) methods and then Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods. These are simulation-based methods producing point estimates on a specific number of iterations and they are commonly used for logistic multilevel estimation as they are known to improve on results obtained through MQL and PQL methods (Hox, 2002). The models presented in the next sections are based on MCMC methods and were assessed using MCMC diagnostic plots\textsuperscript{38}. The models were estimated in MLwiN (Rasbash et al., 2005).

4.4.1 Individual characteristics

Table 4.7 shows the results from the three-level model with individual level predictors. The results\textsuperscript{39} suggest that increases in age are associated with lower probabilities of worklessness but at an increasing rate, as indicated by the positive coefficient for age squared. Consistent with previous findings higher educational attainment levels are associated with a lower incidence of unemployment or non-participation in the labour market. Those with qualifications have lower odds of worklessness than individuals without qualifications, with the odds being lower the higher the qualification levels. Specifically, the odds of being workless for those with NVQ level 4 and NVQ level 1 to 3 qualifications are 89% and 77% lower than for those without qualifications. Consistent with previous findings, the odds of being workless for males and those who are married are lower compared to those who are not married while a shorter length of stay in Britain is associated with a higher probability of being workless.

The results suggest that after controlling for individual characteristics, non-white immigrants are more likely to be workless than White British born people and white immigrants. The odds of being workless are 3.9 times higher for the British Bangladeshi than for the white UK born while for Bangladeshi and Pakistani immigrants and non-

\textsuperscript{38} As the results are based on a number of models it was not practical to report all the models here.

\textsuperscript{39} To test the significance of the coefficients, Z ratios are compared with the standard normal distribution for the fixed parameters and the DIC was used for the random parameters.
white immigrants originating outside the Commonwealth countries the odds of being workless are 5.2 and 3.9 times higher respectively than the white UK born.

Similarly, the odds of worklessness for immigrants from India and British Indians are 1.4 and 2.2 times higher than for the White British.

Table 4.7 Multilevel model for worklessness with individual level predictors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age squared</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
<td>0.00†</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.88*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or cohabiting</td>
<td>-0.52*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ Level 4</td>
<td>-2.25*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ Level 1-3</td>
<td>-1.45*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualifications</td>
<td>-1.21*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay &lt;5 years</td>
<td>0.50*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Indian</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Bangladeshi and Pakistani</td>
<td>1.37*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British other non-white</td>
<td>0.51*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>-0.50*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Commonwealth</td>
<td>-0.40*</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi and Pakistani</td>
<td>1.65*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0.78*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth African Black</td>
<td>0.50*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-Commonwealth non-white</td>
<td>1.35*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_v^2$</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_u^2$</td>
<td>1.40*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>75619.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td>81689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†<0.005, *p<0.05, ** p<0.01

Reference categories are female, non-married, without qualifications, length of stay more than 5 years, White British.

Conversely, the odds of being workless for EU Accession and Old Commonwealth immigrants are 39% and 33% lower respectively than for the White British born. The lower odds of worklessness for EU Accession immigrants is not surprising given the majority enter Britain through the employment route and the benefit restrictions applying to newly arrived immigrants.
4.4.2 Household and neighbourhood characteristics

As shown in Table 4.8 the presence of children in the household increases the risk of worklessness. The results also suggest that neighbourhood deprivation levels and ethnic density are significant predictors of individual worklessness. Specifically, higher area deprivation levels are associated with a higher propensity of being workless with those living in the most deprived areas in the country being more likely to be workless. The odds of being workless are 60% higher for those who live in the most deprived areas in the country compared to those who live in less deprived areas. The odds of being workless are 27% higher for those who live in ethnic enclaves where the majority of the population (more than 50%) belong to an ethnic minority group compared to those who live in areas with a majority white population (with less than 25% ethnic minorities). Similarly, the odds of being workless are 15% higher for those who live in areas with moderate and high ethnic density levels (25-50% ethnic minorities).

The results in Table 4.9 include interaction terms to investigate whether the effect of ethnic density on worklessness depends on ethnicity and country of birth. As shown, there are significant interactions between ethnic density (25%-50% ethnic minorities) and the Bangladeshi and Pakistani, and between ethnic density (50% ethnic minorities) and non-white immigrants. The effect of ethnic density on worklessness is positive and strongest for non-white immigrants from non-Commonwealth countries while it is weakest for the Bangladeshi and Pakistani.

As the interaction term is negative the odds of being workless are lower for the Bangladeshi and Pakistani who live in ethnically diverse areas compared to the Bangladeshi and Pakistani who do not.

However, the deviance information criterion (DIC) suggests that the inclusion of the interaction terms does not improve the fit of the model. Conversely, the inclusion of interactions between ethnic group and area deprivation improves the fit of the model suggesting that the effect of area deprivation on individual worklessness depends on ethnicity.
Table 4.8 Multilevel model for worklessness with individual and contextual predictors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age squared</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
<td>0.00†</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.83**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or cohabiting</td>
<td>-0.66**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ Level 4</td>
<td>-2.08**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ Level 1-3</td>
<td>-1.39**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualifications</td>
<td>-1.17**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay &lt;5 years</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Indian</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Bangladeshi and Pakistani</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British other non-white</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>-0.59**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Commonwealth</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi and Pakistani</td>
<td>1.20**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth African Black</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-Commonwealth non-white</td>
<td>1.14**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in the household</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived ward</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward ethnic pop&gt;50%</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_v^2$</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_u^2$</td>
<td>1.32**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$DIC \quad 74629.28$
Observations 81689

† <0.005, *p<0.05, ** p<0.01

Reference categories are female, non-married, without qualifications, length of stay more than 5 years, White British, non-deprived ward and ethnic pop<25%.
### Table 4.9 Multilevel model with interactions-ethnic group and ethnic density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Indian</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Bangladeshi and Pakistani</td>
<td>1.18**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British other non-white</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>-0.66**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Commonwealth</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi and Pakistani</td>
<td>1.44**</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth African Black</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-Commonwealth non-white</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived ward</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward ethnic pop &gt;50%</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Indian x ward ethnic pop &gt;50%</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Bangladeshi and Pakistani x ward ethnic pop &gt;50%</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British other non-white x ward ethnic pop &gt;50%</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession x ward ethnic pop &gt;50%</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU15 x ward ethnic pop &gt;50%</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Commonwealth x ward ethnic pop &gt;50%</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi and Pakistani x ward ethnic pop &gt;50%</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian x ward ethnic pop &gt;50%</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth African Black x ward ethnic pop &gt;50%</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-Commonwealth non-white x ward ethnic pop &gt;50%</td>
<td>0.43*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other x ward ethnic pop &gt;50%</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Indian x ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Bangladeshi and Pakistani x ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>-0.45*</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British other non-white x ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession x ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU15 x ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Commonwealth x ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi and Pakistani x ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>-0.53*</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian x ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth African Black x ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-Commonwealth non-white x ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other x ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>-0.52*</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\sigma_v^2 = 0.05^* \quad 0.01
\]

\[
\sigma_u^2 = 1.32** \quad 0.07
\]

\[DIC = 74631.06\]

Observations 81689

\(\dagger p<0.005, \quad *p<0.05, \quad ** p<0.01\)

The model controls for age, sex, qualifications, marital status, length of stay and children as shown in previous tables. Reference categories are White British, non-deprived ward and ethnic pop<25%.
Table 4.10 Multilevel model with interactions-ethnic group and area deprival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Exp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Indian</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Bangladeshi and Pakistani</td>
<td>1.06**</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British other non-white</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>-0.45**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Commonwealth</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi and Pakistani</td>
<td>1.74**</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0.90**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth African Black</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-Commonwealth non-white</td>
<td>1.24**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived ward</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward ethnic pop 25-50%</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward ethnic pop&gt;50%</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Indian x deprived ward</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Bangladeshi and Pakistani x deprived ward</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British other non-white x deprived ward</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession x deprived ward</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU15 x deprived ward</td>
<td>-0.70**</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Commonwealth x deprived ward</td>
<td>-1.06**</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi and Pakistani x deprived ward</td>
<td>-0.74**</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian x deprived ward</td>
<td>-0.64**</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth African Black x deprived ward</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-Commonwealth non-white x deprived ward</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other x deprived ward</td>
<td>-0.37*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\sigma^2_v = 0.05** \\
\sigma^2_u = 1.32**
\]

DIC 74587.98
Observations 81689

*<0.005, *p<0.05, ** p<0.01

Controls include age, sex, qualifications, marital status, length of stay and children as in previous tables.

As shown in Table 4.10, there are significant interactions between area deprivation and ethnicity for all immigrants groups apart from the EU Accession immigrants, Black Africans from Commonwealth countries and other non-white immigrants from outside the Commonwealth countries.

The odds of worklessness of immigrants who live in deprived areas are higher than those who live in less deprived areas although the negative sign of the interaction terms suggests that area deprivation reduces the risk of worklessness associated with ethnicity.
This effect is most pronounced for immigrants from Bangladesh, Pakistan and India who are less disadvantaged in terms of worklessness relative to the UK born if they live in the most deprived than in less deprived areas.

To evaluate the extent of homogeneity between individuals in the same neighbourhoods the intra-class correlation (ICC) was estimated using the latent variable method as:

\[
ICC = \frac{\sigma_v^2}{\sigma_u^2 + \sigma_v^2 + \pi^2 / 3}
\]

The ICC suggests that an estimated 31% of the total variation in the incidence of worklessness is attributable to differences between households and 5% to differences in ward of residence (Table 4.12).

Even after controlling for ward level characteristics the ICC suggests that there are significant differences in worklessness attributed to differences between neighbourhoods\textsuperscript{40}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma_u^2)</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma_v^2)</td>
<td>1.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC</td>
<td>84738.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>81689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neighbourhood deprivation and ethnic density account for some of this variation although there is some unexplained variation at the neighbourhood level that remains which could be explained by additional variables measured either at the area level, the individual or household levels. In other words, the analysis provides additional support about the importance of contextual as well as individual level characteristics in explaining the incidence of worklessness among immigrants with the variation largely

\textsuperscript{40} Estimation of the dependency of observations at higher levels for binary outcomes can vary depending on the preferred estimation approach (see Snijders & Bosker, 1999).
explained by differences between households and to a much smaller extent between neighbourhoods.

4.4.3 Local authority characteristics

In addition to ethnic concentration and area deprivation in the neighbourhood there is some evidence that wider labour market conditions can play a role in explaining differences in the employment prospects of immigrants (Wang, 2008; Wang, 2009). The expansion of services in the knowledge based economy has led to the creation of both high skilled professional jobs and low skilled jobs, with the latter attracting disproportionately immigrants who are more willing to take jobs in the services sector, increasingly characterised by low pay and flexible working conditions (Sassen, 1988; Waldinger, 1996). The size of the services sector in the district could therefore influence the employment and income prospects of immigrants (Wang, 2008). Immigrants may also be more disadvantaged because they are concentrated in high unemployment areas where there are fewer employment opportunities in the wider labour market (Fieldhouse, 1998) and may suffer from unequal selection during periods of high unemployment from employers who might give preference to the UK born (Thurow, 1975). On the other hand, during periods of low unemployment demand for labour may increase and create favourable conditions leading to higher employment rates for both natives and immigrants (Wang, 2009).

The effect of district level characteristics was examined in earlier model specifications whereby the three level model was extended to include an additional level for districts and found to be negligible. The four level model results shown in Table A2.1 and A2.2 in Appendix 2 indicate that just 0.5% of the variation in worklessness can be attributed to districts. The district unemployment rate had a positive effect on the propensity of worklessness although additional labour market characteristics such as the employment structure and the size of the immigrant population were not found to be significant (Table A2.2 in Appendix 2). Since the results suggested that the proportion of variation in individual worklessness attributed to district level characteristics was negligible after controlling for individual, household and ward
level characteristics, three level models were estimated in the final stage of the analysis as shown in section 4.4.2.\textsuperscript{41}

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter examined the employment outcomes of new immigrants relative to other immigrant groups and White British born people and how they depend on place characteristics (objective 2). Specifically, it examined whether new immigrants face a higher risk of worklessness relative to immigrants from more established groups (RQ3) and whether contextual characteristics such as neighbourhood area deprivation and ethnic concentration influence the likelihood of being out of work (RQ4).

The results indicate that non-white immigrants continue to be disadvantaged in the labour market compared with white immigrants and white Britons. People from Bangladeshi and Pakistani ethnic groups—both new immigrants and those born in the UK— were shown to be the most disadvantaged in the labour market facing a higher risk of worklessness than people from other ethnic groups and white Britons. Non-white immigrants originating in countries outside the Commonwealth were nearly as disadvantaged as the Bangladeshi and Pakistani groups. These groups were shown to be less qualified than other recent immigrant groups—a quarter of non-white Commonwealth immigrants and nearly a third of Bangladeshi and Pakistani immigrants had no qualifications. This suggests that higher employment rates among these groups could be achieved to some extent through better access to education. Targeted labour market programmes aimed at improving the education and skills levels of migrants may therefore be effective in improving their employment prospects. The poorer employment prospects among these groups which persist even after controlling for individual observable socio-economic characteristics such as qualifications, suggest other factors impede access to employment. These factors are likely to include employment restrictions upon arrival to the UK and racial discrimination.

A fifth of non-white non-Commonwealth immigrants in the sample were Black.

\textsuperscript{41}In the results shown in the Appendix the ward level variables were specified slightly differently—deprivation is captured by five categories while ethnic concentration is captured by two categories. This does not affect the intra-class correlation coefficient which suggests that a very small proportion of the variation in worklessness can be attributed to districts after controlling for individual, household and ward level characteristics.
Africans. It has been reported that many African immigrants from non-Commonwealth countries enter the UK through the asylum route as it is one of the only legal routes of entry to the UK (Styan, 2003). As discussed in chapter 2, asylum seekers are less likely to be in employment than other immigrant groups not just as a result of restrictions to work imposed by their immigration status—after these restrictions are lifted they suffer lower employment rates as a result of employer discrimination (Bloch, 2000; Sanderson, 2006). The presence of ethnic penalties in the labour market has been shown to relate to employer discrimination and attributed to the failure of previous policies aimed at promoting equal opportunities in the workplace and to reduce employer discrimination (Heath and Cheung, 2006).

In contrast, white immigrants, particularly those from the EU Accession countries were the least disadvantaged, being less likely to be workless than other recent immigrant groups and the White British born. The lower incidence of worklessness among EU Accession migrants suggests better access to the UK labour market compared with other groups although this may not necessarily reflect better economic prospects. The LFS shows that EU Accession migrants are less likely to hold degree level qualifications and are overrepresented in routine occupations compared with other migrant groups which may suggest lower earnings prospects and lower social mobility. The higher employment rates of EU Accession migrants, notwithstanding, have important implications not just for their integration in Britain but also for their impact on local areas, particularly for deprived areas where they are more likely to locate upon arrival to the UK (see chapter 3). Since EU Accession migrants are more likely to be in employment than existing residents they are likely to contribute towards tackling problems associated with the concentration of worklessness in deprived areas (chapter 2). As discussed in chapter 2, in the short-term, the local impact of immigration on worklessness will depend however, on whether there are displacement effects on local labour markets, for instance through competition for low-skill jobs, lower wages and higher unemployment levels for existing residents (Power and Wilson, 2000; Green et al., 2007).

The analysis presented in this chapter suggests that variations in worklessness among immigrants and the UK born are largely explained by individual and household characteristics and to a much smaller extent by differences among neighbourhoods. The
effect of district of residence on the experiences of worklessness was found to be negligible, after controlling for individual and ward level characteristics. Neighbourhood characteristics such as area deprivation and ethnic composition accounted for some of the variation in the incidence of worklessness. The results indicate that those living in the most deprived areas have a higher probability of being workless, and so do those who live in areas with large ethnic minority populations. In these areas immigrants may be more disadvantaged due to a lack of host country specific skills such as language or lack of information about employment opportunities in the wider labour market. There is support for these propositions as indicated by the accounts of migrants in the two study localities (chapter 6). The results suggest that the effect of area deprivation on worklessness depends on ethnicity, with the Bangladeshi and Pakistani and Indians found to be less disadvantaged than white Britons if they live in deprived areas. This may reflect location preferences— Bangladeshi and Pakistani and Indian groups may be living in deprived areas despite having economic resources available, perhaps due to motives like proximity to ethnic networks and cheap housing. These motives may not apply to the White British, who generally end up in the most deprived areas because they have no resources to live anywhere else. The findings presented in this chapter and the associated policy implications are discussed in more detail in the last chapter of the thesis.
5. Diversity and cohesion in two Manchester neighbourhoods: Migrants from Africa and Central and Eastern Europe

5.1 Introduction

New immigration patterns ‘defy migration theories that expect migrants to settle in countries with which their country of origin has colonial, trade or cultural and linguistic links’ (Koser, 2003, p.12). The large-scale immigration from Central and Eastern Europe was underpinned by the institutional changes that came into effect with the 2004 EU enlargement that allowed freedom of movement of workers from the ‘new’ to the ‘old’ member states. These changes, together with the absence of transitional restrictions to entry of A8 migrants to the UK labour market, resulted in the largest single wave of in-migration ever experienced in Britain (Bauere et al., 2007). Between 2004 and 2010 there were over one and a half million NINo registrations issued to A8 nationals, at an average of around 240,000 registrations a year. The majority of workers, accounting for 65% of all registrations originated in Poland. Transitional restrictions imposed on Bulgaria and Romania, both of which joined the EU in 2007 ensured that immigration from the new EU Accession states was at a much smaller scale, at least until 2014 when these restrictions were lifted. Between 2007 and 2009 there were only 105,000 registrations to A2 nationals, at an average of 35,000 registrations a year.

Immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe coming to the UK post the 2004 EU enlargement were viewed as the ‘archetypal new migrant’, as the majority were young, well qualified economic migrants who were unlikely to settle long-term in areas of arrival that included areas with little history of immigration outside the major urban centres where migrants previously settled (Stenning et al., 2006). Most A8 migrants, regardless of qualifications, were also more likely to be in low skilled occupations, earning less than £6 per hour (UK Border agency et al., 2009).

This is not the first wave of immigration from Eastern Europe to the UK, with strong flows of migrants arriving from Poland following the Polish resettlement Act in 1947 and from other Eastern European countries, the Balkans and former Soviet countries as part of the European Voluntary Workers programme at the end of the Second World
War (Hatton and Wheatley Price, 1998). Migration flows from Eastern Europe declined in subsequent years and the Polish population in the UK dropped from 160,000 in 1951 to around 60,000 in 2001 (Sword, 1996). During the 1980s and 1990s, a growing number of Eastern Europeans arrived in the UK as asylum seekers initially to escape oppression of the communist governments although many of those who claimed asylum during the 1990s were economic migrants (Duvell and Garapich, 2011). During the 1990s, a growing number of Eastern European Roma settled in the UK and then again in the 2000s, following the 2004 and 2007 EU enlargements, with estimates of the size of the UK Roma population ranging from about 100,000 to one million (Craig, 2011). The Council of Europe Roma and Travellers Division estimates the Roma population in the UK to be closer to 225,000.42

Recent evidence suggests that there is significant variation in the experiences of immigrants from the EU Accession countries in the UK, who are increasingly diverse in terms of migration strategies and channels, settlement patterns, labour market experiences as well as nationalities and ethnicities (Spencer et al., 2007; Eade et al., 2006; Ryan et al., 2007; Burrell, 2009). Migration from Eastern Europe has been described as cyclical, responding to UK economic conditions (Somerville and Sumption, 2009). Nevertheless, a substantial number of Eastern European migrants would be expected to be living in the UK on a long-term basis, as a growing number of family members have joined those who had initially migrated alone. The School Census, suggests that around 40,000 pupils in England had Polish as a first language in 2010 (D'Angelo and Ryan, 2011). Between 2007 and 2009 migration levels from Eastern Europe to the UK dropped significantly, reflecting the deterioration of the UK economy and lower demand for migrant workers although from 2009 onwards the numbers of EU Accession migrants coming to the UK showed less fluctuation.

Immigration from Africa to the UK accelerated during the 1990s as a result of forced migrations associated with political unrest, war and conflict although recent migration patterns suggest that economic migration is increasingly becoming more important among African migrants (Koser, 2003; Owen, 2009). The African population in the UK is thought to be part of a ‘new African diaspora’ with vast diversity and multiplicity of characteristics in terms of countries of origin, ethnicities, language, religious

affiliations, immigration and legal statuses, social statuses and social networks giving rise to diverse immigrant experiences. Koser (2003) discusses the heterogeneity of the African population in the UK who arrived in the UK via many different migration channels, as students, professionals, asylum seekers and ‘clandestine migrants’ and argues that these channels determine the organisation of migration and experiences in the host country (Koser, 2003). Styan (2003) suggests that twenty years ago the overwhelming majority of Africans in the UK were from Anglophone West Africa, with the four largest groups coming from Nigeria, Ghana, Sierra Leone and Gambia. The African population in the UK started to become more diverse from the 1990s onwards with growth in migrant populations originating in countries outside the Commonwealth including many African countries (see chapter 2). This became evident from the significant presence of Francophone Africans in London and the Somali communities in many parts of the country (Styan, 2003; Montclos, 2003). A survey of languages spoken in London schools in 2000 showed that around 1,000 schoolchildren were speaking Lingala and it identified many other languages spoken in the Congo, the Ivory Coast, Benin, Tongo, Cameroon, Rwanda and Burundi (Styan, 2003).

According to Styan (2003), the bulk of the African Francophone settlement occurred in the UK in the 1990s. African Francophone migrants came from former African French and Belgian colonies and settled mainly in London and other major UK cities including Manchester. Styan (2003) suggests that by the end of the 1990s there were around 12-15,000 migrants from the Republic of Congo in London, 5-7,000 Ivorians and small numbers of Togolese, Rwandese and other African countries with no historical or colonial links to the UK. There were 17,000 asylum applications received between 1991-1999 (Styan, 2003) from the Democratic Republic of Congo in the UK and another 9,000 applications between 2001 and 2009 (Home Office Immigration Statistics)\(^43\). Estimates of the Ivorian community in the UK, according to community leaders, ranged between 5,000 and 9,000 in 2008, with the majority concentrated in large conurbations including London and Birmingham\(^44\). Recently released figures from the 2011 Census suggest that there were 19,200 Congolese from the DRC and 8,000 from the Republic of Congo, 9,800 Cameroonians, and 7,700 Ivorians in England and Wales in 2011.


\(^{44}\)http://www.iomuk.org/doc/mapping/IOM_IVORY_COAST.pdf
Styan (2003) suggests that many Francophone migrants arrived in the UK as students and decided to settle in the UK rather than Belgium or France mainly due to assessments about their safety in locating in Francophone countries which maintained links with the ruling parties, and partly due to the increasing immigration restrictions in France and Belgium. More recent Francophone migrants are also thought to be less well educated than earlier migrants (Styan, 2003).

A large number of recent African Francophone migrants are thought to have arrived to the UK via the asylum route reflecting to a large extent the tightening of immigration legislation in the UK which meant that unlike Anglophone Africans who largely came to the UK via the family reunion route, applying for asylum is the only legal way of entry for many Francophone Africans (Styan, 2003). Immigration statuses may not necessarily reflect migration motives, as in the case of the Congolese who are thought to be largely economic migrants who have fled Africa to escape economic hardship rather than political persecution (Koser, 2003).

This chapter discusses the research design of the qualitative study which draws on interviews with migrants from the EU Accession countries and Francophone African countries in Manchester. The next sections present the research objectives and research design followed by the neighbourhood profiles of the study localities. The remainder of the chapter examines the migration motivations and journeys of new immigrants drawing on the experiences of migrants in the two localities. The differential experiences of migration, summarised in the conclusion of this chapter, are also discussed in the next chapter which presents the main findings from the qualitative interviews.

5.2 Research objectives and design

In order to understand the neighbourhood experiences of new immigrants, a series of semi-structured interviews with recent migrants from the EU Accession countries and Africa were conducted in two neighbourhoods, Cheetham and Gorton, in Manchester. In studying migrant populations a case study approach is often adopted to bridge ‘the gap between grand world-system theory and concrete situations’ with the main advantage of local studies being their ‘micro’ design which enables access to migrants
through micro-level social networks and economic structures in which migrants are enmeshed (Cornelius, 1982; p.401).

The Manchester district, located at the centre of the Greater Manchester conurbation has had the highest levels of immigration in the North West region and has attracted large numbers of new immigrants in recent years including migrant workers, students and asylum seekers and refugees. The profiling of Manchester neighbourhoods using administrative ward boundaries showed that large numbers of migrants settled in Gorton and Cheetham, two areas with similar deprivation levels but different socio-economic characteristics and migration histories. The different experiences of ethnic diversity and migration in the neighbourhoods were expected to contribute to a better understanding of the ways ethnic and immigrant resources influence the local experiences of immigrants.

The fieldwork was carried out between November 2010 and July 2011 and involved two stages. In the first stage, interviews were conducted with twelve key informants comprising representatives from local groups and organisations engaging with immigrant populations in the two case study neighbourhoods (see A3.1 in Appendix 3). As explained earlier, neighbourhoods are difficult to define, as their boundaries are not fixed, and given they exist at different levels, depending on the functions they serve. They are also experienced and understood in different ways by the people who live within them, who may view their boundaries and identities in different ways. The neighbourhoods were defined by their administrative ward boundaries for the purposes of this research, so that all the study participants lived in postcodes within the Cheetham and Gorton ward boundaries.

The purpose of the key informant interviews was to enable the profiling of neighbourhoods, and provide insights about the nature of new migration, and the local impacts of migration on services and social cohesion. Following Ratcliffe (2011a; p.31), social cohesion here refers to a situation where harmonious relations stem from a reduction of intra and inter-community divisions (based, for example, on age/generation, gender and socioeconomic background).

In the second stage, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 27 immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe and Francophone African countries. The study aimed to compare the experiences of immigrants from these two groups of countries, and to
explore how their experiences varied across the two case-study neighbourhoods. It was necessary to limit the interviews to specific countries of origin given time and resource constraints. For the same reason, it was not possible to conduct interviews with White British people and established ethnic minority groups in the two neighbourhoods which would have provided insights about how experiences of cohesion vary across new and established communities. The groups of migrants included in the study were selected on the basis that they exhibit intra- and inter-group diversity in a variety of characteristics associated with the new immigration including country of origin, ethnicity, immigration status, socio-economic status and settlement patterns. Styan (2003) for example, commented that the notion of a unitary or distinct Francophone presence is false based on the disparate settlement patterns of Francophone Africans in London and the weak relationship between nationalities such as the Congolese and Ivorians. The Democratic Republic of Congo, the largest Francophone African country, is as large as Western Europe, and has high socio-economic, political and linguistic diversity (Styan, 2003). There are also important differences between migrants from different Eastern European countries and within individual countries; for example, Slovaks of Roma ethnic origin who are a significant minority in Britain, are thought to be quite distinct from the Slovak ethnic majority (Rutter et al., 2008). Both neighbourhoods have experienced significant inflows of French-speaking African and Eastern European migrants in recent years and this was expected to facilitate access to these groups.

The interviews aimed to explore migrants’ neighbourhood experiences and use of social networks and to explore ‘the range and complexity of different experiences grounded in interviewees’ perspectives of their local settings’ (Spicer, 2008; p.494).

The interviews examined the experiences of immigrants around five main themes:

- migration
- work and skills
- neighbourhood and housing
- social interactions and relationships
- belonging, future plans and aspirations
The qualitative interviews explored the role of social networks in the experiences of migrants in order to understand the processes that determine how and why immigrants form social relationships and interactions with others and what this tells us about social cohesion (Zetter et al., 2006). More specifically, the research explored the types of networks and support immigrants draw upon within and beyond their neighbourhoods, trust and relations with neighbours and community involvement.

As migrants have very diverse characteristics and experiences, effective interviewing required a flexible, open-ended interview schedule to capture this diversity, allowing the interviewee to ‘tell his story’ (Cornelius, 1982; p. 395). A semi-structured interview guide allowed for both open ended questions and the collection of background information, for instance on age, year of migration, education, employment and migration status through a series of standardised questions. Although to some extent all interviews are subject to interviewer bias, open ended questions help minimise this by enabling interviewees to express their opinions and views in their own words. Other sources of bias arising from age, gender, social status, and ethnicity differences between interviewer and interviewee could not be eliminated since it was not possible to recruit additional interviewers. These possible sources of bias of the interview situation were considered when analysing the interviews.

A purposeful sample was selected as the research aimed to capture the diverse experiences of migrants given their personal characteristics and the characteristics of the areas in which they settle. The study participants were identified through snowball sampling whereby interviewees were asked to provide referrals from their social networks in order to identify other interviewees and through referrals from key informants, for instance, representatives from local service providers and community and voluntary organisations working with new migrant populations (See Appendix 3). Access to several African interviewees was facilitated through existing contacts of the African Francophone Integration Association (AFIP) in East Manchester. The research was advertised on MojaWyspa, an online community and resource website for Poles in the UK and through posters placed in Polish shops in Cheetham and Gorton to help with the recruitment of Polish participants.
The majority of Eastern European interviewees were Polish with two interviewees born in the Czech Republic and one born in Slovakia. The Czech and Slovakian interviewees were of Roma origin. The Roma are a distinct ethnic group of migrants with very different experiences to non-Roma Eastern European groups. The Roma Czechs are a sizeable and visible immigrant community in Gorton and for this reason were included in this study. African interviewees originated in four countries, Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), the Republic of the Congo (R) and Angola although the Angolan interviewee grew up in the Congo (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.1 Interviewees by country of birth in each neighbourhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Czech Republic</th>
<th>Slovakia</th>
<th>Cameroon</th>
<th>Congo (DRC)</th>
<th>Congo (R)</th>
<th>Angola</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gorton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheetham</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 5.2, 19 interviewees were in the 25-30 and 30-34 age groups, 8 were aged 35 years or above and the sample included more females than males. Several interviewees came to the UK to join their partners, and since their experiences, including the decision to migrate and housing and neighbourhood decisions, were inexorably linked to their partner’s experiences, additional questions were asked to capture both their own and their partners’ experiences in the UK.

Table 5.2 Age and sex of interviewees by country of birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age 25-29</th>
<th>Age 30-34</th>
<th>Age 35-39</th>
<th>Age 40+</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (DRC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to encourage participation and minimise problems arising from language barriers interviewees were presented with the option of having the interview conducted in their native language.

Interpreters were therefore present in the interviews if they were requested by the interviewees. To minimise fieldwork costs the interpreting and translation was carried out by postgraduate students from the University of Manchester Translation and Interpreting Studies programme. Efforts were made to recruit interpreters with familiarity to the linguistic and cultural background of the interviewees.

The duration of the interviews was just under two hours and all the interviews were recorded and transcribed and analysed using thematic analysis, a method which involves identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data (Braun and Clarke, 2006; p. 79). This method was preferred because it allows the researcher to determine themes in different ways using a flexible approach so the themes were reviewed and redefined throughout the analysis stage (ibid).

The majority of interviews took place at the OASIS centre in Gorton and Northwards Housing in Cheetham. Interviewees received shopping vouchers for participating in the research to compensate them for their time and encourage participation. It was deemed appropriate to offer non-monetary incentives such as vouchers set at £15 to minimise practical, methodological and ethical issues associated with the practice of paying research participants (Head, 2009).

5.2.1 Ethics

The research was carried out in accordance with the British Sociological Association’s (BSA) statement of ethical practice (BSA 2002) and formal approval was obtained from the University of Manchester ethics committee.

A number of ethical issues relating to respondent confidentiality, informed consent and issues that arise from cultural and linguistic differences were identified. Interviewees received assurances about anonymity and confidentially prior to the interviews and

---

45 The exception was the Czech interpreter who was employed as an interpreter at a local migrant support organisation although two out of the three interpreters were also working as freelance interpreters at the time of the study.
were invited to participate on a voluntary basis. Prior to the qualitative interviews study participants received an information sheet explaining the purpose of the research, procedures and ethical standards. To ensure that respondents were aware of the research procedure consent forms were translated in French, Polish and Czech. Participants were asked to sign a consent form to confirm they agreed to take part in the research.

Interpreters were asked to sign an agreement with the researcher whereby the interpreter stated that they will act in accordance with the code of professional conduct set out by the National Register of Public Service Interpreters (NRPSI, 2011). By signing this agreement the interpreter agreed that communication between researcher and participant was carried out consistently, competently and impartially by interpreting faithfully what was said and that all those involved in the research were clear about what may be expected from them. Interpreters were asked to respect the confidentiality of the research participants in accordance with University of Manchester ethical guidelines and confidentiality and provisions under the Data Protection Act 1988 and act in an impartial and professional manner. The personal details of respondents were not included in the recordings or transcripts. Pseudonyms were used for participant quotes to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

5.3 The Neighbourhoods

5.3.1 People and place

Gorton, located south east of Manchester city centre, is split into two wards—Gorton South and Gorton North—and is the largest neighbourhood in East Manchester (see Figure 5.1). It is one of nine neighbourhoods in East Manchester, an area that has experienced large scale regeneration under the remit of New East Manchester (NEM) Urban Regeneration Company (URC). During the 1970s and 1980s East Manchester experienced population loss, housing market collapse, high crime and poor economic outcomes following the collapse of the manufacturing industry, making it one of the most deprived parts of England.
Figure 5.1 The study localities

Note: The map was created using digimap data from Edina. © Crown Copyright and Database Right [2015]. Ordnance Survey (Digimap Licence)
Gorton is situated next to Beswick and Clayton—two areas that have benefited from significant regeneration funding including Single Regeneration Budget and New Deal for Communities (NDC) funding. In recent years, Gorton has received investment to improve its physical environment and shopping areas including the Gorton Market Hall. It is a predominantly residential neighbourhood with many open spaces and parks including Debdale Park and Gorton Park and has four primary schools and one secondary school.

The profiling of the neighbourhoods at the beginning of the study showed that Gorton had higher than average unemployment levels compared with Manchester as a whole, with around 7% of the working age population being unemployed in 2009, and over a third of households were living in social rented housing according to the 2001 Census. Gorton, like the rest of East Manchester, has had lower ethnic diversity levels compared to Manchester as a whole. According to the 2001 Census around 10% and 23% of the population in the Gorton North and South wards respectively, belonged to an ethnic group other than White British with the Asian group comprising the largest ethnic group in Gorton South and the Black group being the largest in Gorton North (Table 5.3).

In the last decade, Gorton has experienced growing ethnic diversity as a consequence of the large numbers of new immigrants moving into the Manchester district. Cheetham in North Manchester is one of the most ethnically diverse wards of the district and has been one of the main arrival points for new migrants.

According to the 2001 Census 57% of people in Cheetham belonged to an ethnic group other than White British (Table 5.3), with a third of the population being of Asian ethnic origin. There are also an estimated 33 languages spoken in the area according to a local informant. In 2010, 73% of pupils did not have English as their first language compared with 30% of pupils in Manchester as a whole (Manchester City Council, 2012). Cheetham has one of the largest ‘old’ Eastern European communities in the UK associated with Jewish East European migration in the 19th century.
Table 5.3 Selected indicators in the case study neighbourhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gorton</th>
<th>Cheetham</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Manchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rank of IMD score</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social rented households in 2001 (%)</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate in 2009 (%)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People aged 0 to 15 in 2001 (%)</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People aged 20 to 29 in 2001 (%)</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People aged 60 or above in 2001 (%)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with LLTI in 2001 (%)</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority population in 2001 (%)</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian ethnic population in 2001 (%)</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black ethnic population in 2001 (%)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese ethnic population in 2001 (%)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People born outside the UK 2001 (%)</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All people in 2001</td>
<td>12,854</td>
<td>12,854</td>
<td>12,686</td>
<td>11,509</td>
<td>392,845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CLG and 2001 Census.

Compared to Gorton and Manchester as a whole, in Cheetham there are proportionately more young people aged 0 to 15 and 20 to 29 and a lower proportion of elderly aged 60 and over. Cheetham is also one of the most deprived wards in the country and had experienced significant population loss over the last two decades although there has been a reversing of this trend in more recent years in both areas. Cheetham has also attracted significant regeneration investment including Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) and Housing Market Renewal (HMR) funding and has the highest concentration of businesses outside the city centre with many of the small businesses owned by ethnic minorities.

Immigration trends in recent years indicated by NINo registrations suggest that Gorton has attracted more international migrants than other areas of Manchester, with the majority of migrant flows into Gorton accounted for by Central and Eastern European and African migrants (Table 5.4). According to a resident perception survey conducted in 2008, 21% of residents in East Manchester belonged to an ethnic group other than

---

46 The IMD ranks are based on population weighted deprivation scores for wards calculated from the 2007 IMD for Lower Super Output Areas.

47 The survey was based on 1,357 face-to-face interviews. For details of the methodology see [http://www.east-manchester.com/downloads/5/residents-surveys/index.htm](http://www.east-manchester.com/downloads/5/residents-surveys/index.htm).
White British and 7% were of African origin. The survey showed that the most common languages reported among those whose first language was not English were French and Polish.

The 2011 Census showed that the population of Gorton and Cheetham Hill has become more diverse over the last ten years. For example, in Gorton North and Gorton South the Asian ethnic group increased by 8 and 15 percentage points respectively, while the Black group increased by 9 and 4 percentage points respectively since 2001. In Cheetham, the Asian and Black ethnic groups experienced more modest increases of 6 and 2 percentage points respectively.

**Table 5.4 Average number of migrants 2007-9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gorton</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheetham</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All nationalities</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Middle East</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DWP National Insurance Numbers

According to the African Francophone Integration Project (AFIP) which was established in 2003 in Beswick to provide help and support to French speaking African refugees, there is a large Francophone African population in East Manchester. The majority of Francophone Africans are thought to be Congolese from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and to a smaller extent from the Ivory Coast, Congo, Cameroon and Guinea.

At the start of the study it was thought that there were around 4,000 Francophone Africans living in Manchester, around 2,000 being Congolese from the DRC. A variety of Francophone African languages are spoken in the area including French, Mboshi, Kuyu, French, Lingala, Swahili, Kikongo and Kipunu. According to AFIP, Francophone Africans living in East Manchester are spread around the whole area although there are some residential clusters, most notably in Miles Platting. They also tend to be in families and single parent households, and have mixed skills, with some
migrants being high skilled and some without any qualifications. According to the same
source, many Francophone Africans are self-employed and include business owners and
market traders operating in North Manchester, and to a lesser extent, in East Manchester.

As in other parts of the country, the population of asylum seekers in East Manchester
started to increase during the 1990s. According to a representative from a local
community organisation, there is a large number of asylum seekers and refugees from
Francophone African countries in Manchester, most thought to be recent arrivals from
Africa with some economic migrants having arrived to the UK from other European
countries such as France and Belgium. Many asylum seekers in Gorton are thought to
be ‘legacy cases’ (with asylum applications made before March 2007) having to wait
for their application to be resolved for an average of five years with some receiving
Section 4 support (for those whose claims and appeals have been rejected but who
cannot be removed). Most asylum seekers had no choice over moving to East
Manchester as they were housed in the area by the National Asylum Support Service
(NASS).

Re-housing is one of the most common reasons offered by East Manchester residents,
irrespective of ethnicity, for choosing to move to East Manchester. According to the
2008 NEM resident perception survey, a fifth of all residents in East Manchester had no
choice over moving to East Manchester. It is thought that once granted asylum, asylum
seekers move elsewhere in Manchester or the UK to join friends and family. African
Francophone migrants without a family tend to move closer to co-ethnics and
particularly in areas with cultural and ethnic facilities and resources such as Cheetham,
an area of ‘choice’ for many Francophone Africans, according to a Congolese informant.

Following the 2004 EU enlargement, East Manchester experienced a growth in migrants
coming from Central and Eastern Europe. Polish community leaders suggested that the
size of the Polish community in Greater Manchester as a whole increased from an
estimated 3,000 in 2001 to between 20,000 and 60,000 in 2008 (SEVA, 2009). The
Polish Catholic Church in Moss Side has been reported to have experienced a forty-fold
increase in its congregation from under 50 a week in 2001 to around 2,000 in 2008 with
an extra service delivered at the Polish Circle club in Cheetham to meet increased
demand (ibid). According to the latest Census there were around 22,700 Polish migrants
in Greater Manchester in 2011, of which 6,836 were living in the Manchester district.
A Polish informant suggested that many Eastern Europeans who settled in Gorton were deprived, some left disillusioned by their experiences in the UK, after becoming unemployed and without being able to claim benefits, or return to their home countries. According to a representative of a local community organisation, a large number of Eastern Europeans in Gorton are in families with children, many living in private rented accommodation. Census figures show that the proportion of children under the age of eight from ethnic minorities other than White British in Gorton grew from around 15% to 21% between 2001 and 2011. In Gorton South the proportion of children under the age of eight in the White Other group doubled during the same period from 8% to 16%.

It is also thought that there are higher levels of homelessness among Eastern Europeans compared with other immigrant groups. According to a local informant, before the 2004 EU enlargement there were very few homeless Eastern Europeans in Manchester but after the enlargement nearly half of the homeless in a Manchester shelter, at the time of the interview, were Polish migrants.

A feature in 2010 by the Big Issue highlighted that there is an Eastern European Roma population of around 500 to 1,000 people living in Gorton comprised mainly of Czech Roma and Romani communities. In Gorton South, it is thought that there are around 50 mostly related nuclear families, each comprised on average of around 7 persons (Matras et al., 2009). They also tend to live in precarious conditions, with one or two members of the family working in part-time, temporary jobs in order to support the rest of the family and many rely on benefits (ibid).

Cheetham, on the other hand, has traditionally been an ethnically diverse area and has received the largest number of migrants in Manchester in recent years, both in absolute and relative terms compared to other wards. The majority of new migrant flows are accounted by Asian and Central and Eastern European migrants, and to a lesser extent, African migrants (Table 5.4). Nevertheless, there is a large Francophone African community in the area including a thriving African business community which has grown in recent years suggesting that many new migrants are entering self-employment. The new Eastern European community in Cheetham is thought to be well established with a growth in Eastern European community groups and Polish community resources.

such as a Polish church and shops available in the area. There is also a large number of asylum seekers and refugees. According to a representative from a local community group the majority are from Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia, the Congo, Iraq, Afghanistan and Nigeria, and are in families with small children living in social housing.

According to representatives from regeneration and housing agencies new migrants are dispersed across Cheetham in areas with established migrant and ethnic minority groups. It is thought that the main reasons migrants choose to live in Cheetham are the availability of services and cultural and religious facilities, employment and business opportunities as well as its proximity and good transport links to the city centre. There are a variety of services available in the area, with mainstream providers offering information on services in many languages. For instance, the Cheetham Hill medical centre alone offers information on services in 20 different languages on its website, including Polish, Lithuanian and French. There are also a large number of cultural and religious facilities including a Sikh Temple, Mosque, an Ukrainian Catholic Church, a Polish Club and an Ukrainian Club, and a range of community-based projects. According to a community worker there are over 70 active community groups providing community support and services in the area.

A representative from a community organisation highlighted that the immigrant population in Cheetham had a range of qualifications and skills but some new arrivals, particularly the Chinese, African, and Indian migrants, were highly qualified. These reports are in line with recent findings from the 2011 Census which showed that the immigrant population is better qualified than the UK born population, being more likely to be educated at degree level or above (Lymperopoulou and Parameshwaran, 2014). According to the same informant, even the highest qualified migrants tend to work in low skill occupations. Stories of African migrants with doctorate degrees working as taxi drivers in the area, for example, were not uncommon. The skills mismatch observed for migrants in his view, reflected the lack of UK based work experience and qualifications and the lack of awareness of requirements relating to the transfer of foreign qualifications to the UK. He suggested that one of the reasons migrants enter unsuitable employment was the lack of access to information on how to utilise their qualifications.
Representatives from local service providers suggested that poor housing conditions were widespread in both neighbourhoods with overcrowding being particularly pronounced in Cheetham. The large presence of ethnic minority households in Cheetham comprised of multiple families meant that there were particular pressures on local housing demand and structure. A local service provider suggested that the demand for larger accommodation was outstripping supply and steps were taken to address this through investments in new housing developments aimed at providing housing to larger families. Nevertheless, increased demand for social housing reflects a reduction in the supply of social housing stock. According to the latest Census figures, Cheetham saw a sharp decline in social rented housing households from 41% to 32% between 2001 and 2011, respectively.

5.3.2 Community aspects and the neighbourhood environment

According to the 2008 Place Survey (Table 5.5), perceived community cohesion is higher in Cheetham compared to Gorton and Manchester as a whole. More than three quarters (77%) of residents in Cheetham believe that people from different backgrounds get on well together in their area, compared to around two thirds of residents (62%) in Gorton. Sense of belonging in terms of the proportion of residents feeling they belong to their immediate neighbourhood is slightly lower in Cheetham (43%) and Gorton South (43%) than Manchester as a whole (47%) but slightly higher in Gorton North (51%). Cheetham residents also report higher levels of satisfaction with their local area as a place to live compared to Gorton, are more likely to feel they can influence decisions and are less likely to believe there is a problem with people not treating others with respect.

In Gorton community cohesion issues became evident in 2001 following the arrival of asylum seekers that were housed in East Manchester neighbourhoods by NASS. These neighbourhoods were predominantly white with high levels of unemployment and poor housing and environmental conditions. This created a lot of tensions in the community and hostility towards migrants, with resentment towards asylum seekers driven by the belief that they were receiving preferential treatment, particularly over housing. Part of this was due to the clustering of migrants housed by NASS in low demand housing that
was previously vacant. According to a representative from a local community organisation, asylum seekers were very vulnerable, some of them traumatised by the conditions that led them to flee their countries and subsequently by their experiences in the UK, including poor housing conditions, destitution and hostility from the local population. Many were also forced to live with other asylum seekers from different cultural backgrounds in poor and inadequate accommodation. The mix of asylum seekers created tensions with issues intensified as a result of a lack of support networks, and an inability to communicate with each other due to linguistic and cultural differences.

Table 5.5 Community cohesion, belonging and area satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cheetham</th>
<th>Gorton North</th>
<th>Gorton South</th>
<th>Manchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of people who believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of people who feel they can influence decisions in their locality</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of people who believe there is a problem of people not treating other people with respect and consideration</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of people who feel they belong to the neighbourhood</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of people satisfied with the area as a place to live</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2008 Place Survey, IPSOS/MORI49.

According to a representative from a local community organisation, the community in Gorton prior to the arrival of asylum seekers was isolated and inward looking with many residents having no contact outside their immediate neighbourhood. Contact with new migrants arriving in the area is thought to have helped bring down barriers and

---

49The Place Survey was a statutory survey carried out by local authorities in England that was abolished in 2010. The 2008 Place Survey is based on a sample of 4,544 Manchester residents, a response rate of 28% (out of a total of 16,178 questionnaires mailed out to a random sample of residents aged 18 or over ).
misconceptions about migrants and contributed to changing attitudes, particularly towards asylum seekers. It is thought that local residents are more sympathetic towards established immigrant groups including asylum seekers but less so towards new migrants such as Eastern Europeans who are seen to be ‘stealing’ local jobs. The local informant suggested that the media portrayal of immigrants had a great influence on local attitudes towards migrants. The informant described how stories in the Sun newspaper about Polish migrants taking jobs regularly found their way into discussions among people at a local community centre and created hostility and resentment towards new migrants.

The Czech Roma community in Gorton is thought to have weak links with other local communities including the Romani Roma and they typically comprise of large family units that tend to grow in size as they are joined by other family members (Matras et al., 2009). According to a representative from a local community organisation, the Czech Roma have poor education, poor language skills and low motivation to learn English and tend to work in low skilled jobs with a minimum requirement of English. The Roma community in Gorton has received a lot media attention in recent years. Tensions arose when local residents complained to the Council over allegations of littering, begging and anti-social behaviour associated with gatherings of Roma on the streets, children being out of school, gangsterism and trafficking, most of which were unsubstantiated. According to a report by the Big Issue

\[50\text{http://www.bigissueinthenorth.com/2010/10/minority-report/545.}\]

These tensions together with language barriers between communities added to an atmosphere of mistrust with many Roma becoming victims of verbal abuse. The report claimed that public meetings aimed at alleviating these tensions ‘often descended into shouting matches and at times weren’t far off being BNP rallies’. The Roma community cohesion project worked in partnership with local organisations, schools, Manchester University, Manchester City Council, and helped increase awareness and understanding about the Roma community in Gorton by working with both the Roma community and established residents. Following a series of interventions by statutory agencies and the community cohesion project, community relations have gradually improved in the area.

Local informants in Cheetham suggested that reported community cohesion issues relate to the relationships between the new migrant communities and established ethnic
minorities and tensions within migrant communities rather than with the White British. Tensions were reported, for example, between the new and old Polish community which led to the creation of new social groups and events by recent Polish migrants at the local Polish social club. The fragmentation within the Polish community according to a Polish community worker, has been associated with expectations regarding mutual support from new migrants that are not being met by the established community.

According to a representative from a local community organisation working with new immigrants, past community consultations in Cheetham have highlighted an overall lack of cohesion between different ethnic minority groups underpinned by a lack of mutual trust which is contributing to inter-community tensions. The lack of inter-ethnic activities, as well as community projects and overall opportunities for different communities to come together, was highlighted as a potential deterrent to improving relations. Despite the wide ranging community groups and projects operating in the area, there is no single space that acts as a community centre for the whole community. Another local informant suggested that the growing number of businesses owned by new migrants is creating resentment among members of established ethnic communities who feel they are being pushed out of the area by increased competition. The increasing number of young children (under the age of eight) living in the area is thought to have put pressure on local primary schools and nurseries as a result of over-subscription of places. Census figures suggest that the proportion of the population under the age of eight in the Black African and Black Other group for example, grew from 13% and 11% in 2001 to 19% and 36% in 2011.

The increasing number of new immigrants and a shortage of interpreters in Cheetham is thought to have created pressures on a range of health services including health visitors and nursery nurses. Demand for mental health services has also increased as a result of new migration with mental health issues according to a local service provider, thought to be more prevalent among Asian and African ethnic groups, as a result of experiences of racism, cultural conflicts in relation to identity and belonging and stresses relating to social conditions including marriage and divorce practices. These reports are in line with UK and European studies which have shown that asylum seekers and refugees suffer from higher rates of depression than other groups (Jayaweera, 2011).
Health issues such as depression and other mental health illnesses are thought to be particularly prevalent among African Francophone people in Manchester which are often attributed to witchcraft and spirits as a result of strong cultural beliefs (SEVA, 2009). A support group for Congolese migrants runs a GP based psychiatric drop-in service to tackle mental health issues associated with trauma from their prosecution, torture and violence, including women subjected to rape and other sexual abuse (ibid). Women and children migrants who have experienced physical and sexual abuse in the past have been shown to suffer from severe physical and mental health problems including depression and anxiety (Jayaweera, 2011).

5.4 Migrant journeys and motives

The majority of Eastern Europeans participating in the study arrived in the UK in the first three years following the 2004 EU enlargement while most Africans arrived in the UK between 1995 and 2003. Migration motives varied significantly by country of origin reflecting, to a large extent, differences in migration routes and migration restrictions applicable to different nationalities.

Several African migrants in the study stated that they came to the UK to claim asylum while the main motivation of Eastern European migrants for coming to the UK was to find work. Overall, half of the migrants interviewed stated that they came to the UK for economic reasons and primarily to work with the other half stating that they came to join family (mainly a spouse or partner) or to claim asylum. Interviewees often stated more than one reason for coming to the UK—for example some of those who came to the UK to work, predominantly younger migrants, also stated they came to improve foreign language skills and to gain new experiences.

Migration motives were linked to the desire for a new or better life. The decision to migrate for many Eastern European interviewees was linked to perceptions that the UK offered opportunities for employment and wages that were absent in their own countries. Several migrants also chose to move to the UK as a result of the presence of friends or family in the UK who provided information about employment opportunities often short-term or temporary in nature.
I didn’t have a plan...I was without a job so I came here…my intentions were to make some money and go back, but go back to what? It’s easy life if you have a job (in the UK)...you can pay bills, you can save money… in Poland you have money just for bills and food…I was working in Poland for 16 hours, 7 days a week and my wage was about £300 (Bolek).

My husband arrived first in 2007 and a month after that I came with my children. The reason was to look for a better life, a better paid job (Kasia).

We just decided to (move) since we could come here with no problems, no visa for work. I thought why not? my English is not bad, I might find a better life and get some skills and qualifications ...I came here on my own but my brother was already here. It was a long time ago. There weren’t that many Polish people here (Feliks).

The motives for migration among the Czech Roma migrants were a combination of lack of employment opportunities and discrimination in their home countries. Most joined relatives in the UK and were joined by others, and Roma family reunion often involved a range of relatives, including sisters, brothers, cousins, aunts, uncles and grandparents. The decision to migrate was influenced by reports by other Roma about the better employment prospects and quality of life in the UK compared to the Czech Republic.

The people in our town in the Czech Republic were saying that it was better in England for work, for money, that they earn more here (Ana).

The ability to secure a better life and future for their children was also a main concern among Roma migrants who suffered discrimination in education and exclusion from mainstream schools in the Czech Republic.

They wanted to place her (daughter) in a school for children with special needs because we had lived in Germany...saying that she would not cope with the Czech language. She had just finished school, so I told her now what? She wanted to become a hairdresser. But they did not admit her to the school to become a hairdresser. She had one year postponement for school...so she said let’s go to England (Ana).
Some Eastern European interviewees were returning migrants suggesting patterns of cyclical migration. The lack of employment opportunities in Poland triggered multiple moves between Poland and the UK for Dita who first came to the UK in 2004 to take up temporary employment. When she moved back to Poland she met her partner and they moved together to the UK for a year to work, then moved back to Poland before returning again to the UK.

We didn’t like it here. We wanted to get married and have children. I didn’t want our children to live here… different people, different culture, so we decided to live in Poland…. I tried to find work but I couldn’t so I came back (Dita).

Migrant women and other family members played an active role in family migration strategies joining men who had initially migrated alone and subsequently secured employment and accommodation for the whole family. Several Polish women who came to the UK to join their spouses who moved to the UK to take up temporary work, were initially reluctant to migrate hoping their husband’s stay in the UK would be temporary.

I don’t speak English and I knew it would be difficult for me and my whole family is in Poland. I have no one close here, no relatives. That’s why it took me a while to make that decision to come here. In the end, I felt I was on my own, left on my own with the children and a big house (Lidia).

We came here for financial reasons, to live more comfortably, so that we don’t have to worry surviving from one month to the other, just to have enough money for living. I decided that being married and living separately was not working and the children were without their father (Berta).

My partner lost his job in Poland and it got worse and worse. Literally we didn’t have enough money from one month to another…. my partner’s brother came to England and told my partner that he could join him…he would send money for me. …I think it was about two years that we lived like that, he was here, I was in Poland (Ewa).

In many occasions the decision to migrate was motivated by the need to find work following long spells of unemployment. Polish women described how their partners
moved to the UK to support the family in Poland and how it became more and more
difficult for them to return to Poland and leave the financial security they found in the
UK.

The main reason for coming here was to make some money to pay off our debts...he (husband) couldn’t imagine going back home, back to Poland and starting again, looking for a job there and the difference in what you can afford when you work here and what you can afford when you live in Poland, the standard of living in Poland scared him (Luiza).

Family reunion was more often unplanned with the presence of children being an
important factor in migration decisions and the decision to settle in the UK on a long-
term basis.

I was always imagining that once he (husband) has made some money here he
would be back and we can start from the beginning. My husband is always
saying I should be looking after my children and thinking about their future,
thinking about where they would be better off living and he thinks England
promises more for the children. I was thinking about my parents as well,
because my sister also lives away. I didn’t really want to leave my parents
without anyone being there.... My mum was telling me to join my husband
because it didn’t feel right that he was living on his own here and we were in
Poland. It wouldn’t work. We would probably end up divorcing if we were
living like that for longer (Luiza).

Decisions to migrate for several African interviewees reflected economic hardship,
political unrest and persecution in their home countries. Most African migrants in the
study had come to the UK on a student visa or as asylum seekers and had some choice
over which country to move to. The choice of the UK as a destination country was often
determined, and the move facilitated, by distant relatives or acquaintances and fictive
kin ties.

Back home it is too difficult and you have a lot of problems there. It is not easy
in Africa. Your life is in danger, you don’t have security and it is very poor
(Carine).
I travelled from the Congo to the UK because of the war and the fighting in the East of Congo…. somebody helped me with the documents to come here. He was living in France but I could choose where to go (Trésor).

There was somebody who knew my father and who helped me to come here. It was somebody who my father had helped, so he helped me. First I went to Nairobi, then South Africa and then came to the UK. He (the family friend) said that I will be able to claim asylum in England (Lisette).

For asylum seekers, links between the home country and the destination country, for instance in terms of common culture and language are often seen as important determinants of the choice of where to migrate—for those who have a choice. The interviews with French-speaking Africans suggested that this is not necessarily the case. The UK was often seen as more accessible than France and Belgium, as a country that is more welcoming of refugees, with the majority of African interviewees choosing to move to the UK despite having closer links to France. Interviewees had more positive perceptions of the UK linked to better chances of acceptance and support for asylum seekers and these perceptions seemed to be more important in choosing the destination country than language and cultural links.

I didn’t even think I can come to England because I didn’t speak English. At the time I didn’t know anybody living here... I applied for asylum when I arrived (Serge).

I heard about the UK, people are friendly. When you apply for asylum you can be welcomed (Jean-Claude).

The UK was also seen as a country with a tradition of welcoming migrants, where immigrants face better prospects and face less discrimination than other European countries. Charles, who lived in France prior to moving to the UK, cited racial segregation, poverty and lack of opportunities for social mobility as barriers to integration in France and the main reasons behind his choice to move to the UK.

I was eight years old when I left Congo. My mum was already in France and I moved with my brother there, and my other sisters. I didn’t like France…. I did not like it because doors were closed to me all the time. I think it’s the way
the French society is...lack of opportunity...In France you live where foreigners live...It means you won’t like the other side... They (French) have a better life, you have a poor standard of life. Here, everyone is the same. Here you have an English neighbour. There you won’t have a French neighbour. That’s what I like about here, everything is for everyone (Charles).

Among African migrants who came to the UK to study the UK was also seen as a country with a superior higher education sector with British qualifications recognised and valued more than French qualifications.

My reason for coming to the UK was to obtain a masters degree because back home they believe in international qualifications. People with degrees or certificates from abroad are privileged compared to those with degrees from our home country. I could go to France (but) UK degrees are valued more than French degrees by the employers in Cameroon (Cyrille).

The residential trajectories of the migrants in the study suggested that some relied on kinship and friendship networks less than others. Eastern European migrants had two main trajectories. Some migrants, particularly women moved to Manchester directly from their home country to join family members while others had moved to Manchester from other parts of the UK having lived in smaller towns and rural areas and these moves were not associated with the presence of kinship and friendship networks. African migrants who came to the UK as asylum seekers moved to Manchester to join friends and this move frequently followed a relocation by NASS. For students and more skilled workers the decision to migrate and location choice was also less likely to be influenced by social networks. For example, Cyrille who came to the UK to study for a higher degree chose Manchester because of the reputation of the university and the lower cost of living compared to London, despite having relatives in other parts of the UK.

The reality of life in the UK for asylum seekers was often very different to the image of the UK portrayed to them by those who assisted the move and many had to move to different parts of the UK before arriving to Manchester. The majority of asylum seekers arrived in London, some were relocated to Manchester by NASS, others moved to
Manchester to stay with friends after NASS withdrew the support they received, or by chance, after meeting somebody who mediated the move.

I stayed in London for two days and then came to Manchester. I met somebody at the National Express and I explained that I didn’t have anybody (Carine).

NASS sent me to Leeds...in that house there were nearly 7 people...I had a friend from London who was living here in Manchester so I said at least if I go to Manchester I will have some friends because in Leeds I didn’t have any friends, people I knew. In Leeds they just paid for the room...and then they stopped that as well...I lost the last appeal. I decided to come here to Manchester (Serge).

The support stopped...I lost a lot of things...After that I came to Manchester and stayed with friends from the same country. My friend then told me I had to leave that house because I was not working and I could not support them so I had to look for my own house (Paola).

Several Eastern European migrants moved to Manchester after obtaining information about employment opportunities from other Eastern European migrants already living in Manchester. Among younger migrants, location considerations included not just employment but also cultural attributes so for example, the pull to cities was related equally to the diversity of cultural and employment resources on offer.

In Nottingham there were no jobs and he (uncle) told me you should come here (Manchester), it’s a big city and maybe there is a job for you here (Dominika).

Manchester is much bigger. It is easier to find different kind of jobs, not just in the farm. We used to go to different cities with my friends over the weekend. Manchester wasn’t very far from Southport. I liked it. I didn’t know anyone (Krystyna).

My son was the first person to arrive here...He just wanted to live in a bigger city, that’s what made him come here. Of course he’s young and he wanted something else, a change (Aleksy).

Those who came to the UK to work were also more likely to have located in other towns and cities in the UK prior to moving to Manchester, and each move was typically
linked to a change in employment. In contrast, most migrants who came to the UK to join a spouse or partner had only lived in Manchester.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter examined the nature of settlement of new immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe and Francophone Africa, across the UK and in two deprived neighbourhoods in Manchester. The two neighbourhoods—Cheetham in north Manchester and Gorton in East Manchester—have experienced increased immigrant settlement in recent years. Cheetham has been a traditional immigrant receiving area with high ethnic diversity levels while Gorton until recently has had lower levels of ethnic diversity compared with the rest of Manchester.

The chapter outlined the methods used to explore the neighbourhood experiences of new immigrants and discussed the characteristics of the study participants and the two study localities. Interviews with local informants suggest that the growth in immigration has created challenges for local service providers and for social cohesion.

The migrants’ journeys suggest that the presence of social networks is strongly linked to migration decisions and motivations to move to the study localities. This was not the case for all migrants, with the impact of networks on migration and location decisions varying across different types of migrants. For EU Accession nationals, the decision to migrate was associated with economic reasons and was determined by the presence of friends and family in the UK. Family reunion played a big role in the decision to settle long-term in the UK. For some asylum seekers who arrived to the UK from Africa, there was little evidence of pre-existing social networks in the UK.

Migrant journeys in some cases involved multiple countries including European countries, prior to settlement in the UK. Asylum seekers based their migration decisions on perceptions about their chances of acceptance as asylum seekers although the interview accounts provided evidence that subsequent location decisions were influenced by the presence of co-ethnics, usually other asylum seekers. The next chapter presents the findings from the qualitative interviews on the experiences of new immigrants in relation to the neighbourhood environment, social networks and support and experiences of deprivation.
6. The neighbourhood environment, social networks and experiences of deprivation among new immigrants

6.1 Introduction

As shown in the previous chapter, the presence of social networks plays a central role in the migration decisions of new immigrants although the presence of friends and family determines the location decisions of different migrants to varying degrees. This chapter explores the nature of immigrant networks, how and why immigrants form their networks and the types of support they draw from them.

As discussed in chapter 2, understanding how immigrants form their social networks and the utility of these networks is crucial in understanding experiences of integration and cohesion. The experiences of new immigrants can also be better understood in the context of the places in which they live and therefore perceptions and experiences regarding the local neighbourhood environment are also explored.

The analysis presented in this chapter draws on qualitative interviews with new immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe and Africa. The main research objective is to examine the neighbourhood experiences of immigrants living in deprived areas and the role of social networks and the neighbourhood environment in shaping these experiences (Objective 3).

The experiences and perceptions of new immigrants are discussed in relation to the main interview topics: employment, education and skills; housing and neighbourhood conditions; neighbourhood ethnic diversity, social networks and belonging; and sense of belonging and future intentions. The main themes emerging from the qualitative interviews are discussed in the concluding section of the chapter alongside some preliminary policy recommendations. The policy implications of the main findings of the qualitative study are discussed in more detail in the final chapter of the thesis.
6.2 Employment, education and skills

The economic situation of migrants varied within and between the two groups, although asylum seekers and migrant women with small children were less likely to be employed. Eastern European migrants had worked many different jobs in the UK and in many cases had short-term, temporary contracts. Aleksy who is currently unemployed arrived in the UK in 2004 to work as a picker in a farm. He worked at the farm for a year, then worked at a bakery, a building site and a factory, for just a few months at a time.

Most Eastern European migrants tended to be employed in low skilled jobs, for example, as cleaners, sales assistants, factory workers and their ability to obtain jobs that matched their skills or experience was hampered by poor language skills or lack of information about how to transfer their qualifications and experience. Hanzi worked as a builder and a plasterer for over ten years prior to coming to the UK but could not find similar work in the UK since he did not have any proof of qualifications or training and could not afford the fees to train and gain new qualifications in the UK.

They asked me if I could decorate walls, about layers of colour, if I could build and plaster a wall, but they didn’t let me do the tests... they told me I had to enquire somewhere, but I wasn’t sure where...they were asking for a certificate to prove that I was doing this work before and I couldn’t show it to them because it’s over there in the Czech Republic (Hanzi).

Those who expressed satisfaction with work conditions and pay compared their economic situation in the UK with their situation in Eastern Europe which was often characterised by very poor working conditions and pay or long spells of unemployment. This meant that the opportunity to work and earn a higher wage brought job satisfaction, even if that involved working in less skilled occupations than before.

It was just a typical job, it wasn’t too hard, it wasn’t easy.. In terms of pay, I was happy with it...It was enough to live a pretty much comfortable life, average, but comfortable enough (Aleksy).
It is better than nothing...because back home you can’t have something like this so I don’t have any problem. It is ok because I can use it to eat and look after myself so it is better for me (Carine).

He (husband) now works in a warehouse. He hasn’t had a lack of work or difficulty in finding a position. Frankly he never applied for a job as a mechanic. He looked around but he got employed and was working full-time so he didn’t have the time to look for employment in his field (Kasia).

When asked about the aspects they were most satisfied with, and least satisfied with, in their current jobs, the majority of migrants expressed dissatisfaction with the pay and hours. Several migrants viewed their current employment as a means to obtain financial security and meet other responsibilities such as childcare, studies and family obligations.

I cannot say I am satisfied (with the job). It is something that I am doing to kind of pay bills, to pay the rent but to be honest I am not happy (Charles).

There is nothing I am that much happy about, or aspect of the job that appeals to me. It is mainly financial need that made me choose this. It is not a dream job (Kasia).

The situation of Roma interviewees was different and many described how their efforts to find work in the Czech Republic were unsuccessful as a result of employer discrimination.

In the Czech Republic, I call them on the phone and they say they need staff. But when I go there and they see me, they say, we have already filled the vacancy. There is discrimination (Ana).

I was looking for a job and they told me they have a job for me...(but)when they see you and you are Gypsy they don’t give you a job (Dominika).

African migrants on the other hand, expressed dissatisfaction with living and working conditions in the UK. Those who arrived to the UK as asylum seekers described how they were left destitute by restrictions to work and entitlements in the UK while several employed refugees were trapped in low pay and low skill jobs. The most qualified
African migrants in terms of educational attainment reported problems of underemployment and were overqualified for their jobs often working in junior administrative or clerical positions despite having higher degrees and felt that their skills were not fully utilised.

African migrants, particularly those with high qualifications also reported experiences of racial discrimination in the workplace. Francine, a university graduate, described how her experience working at a call centre undermined her self-esteem and confidence and was forced to resign after repeatedly being harassed by her team leader about her accent.

He said I am not too sure customers will understand your accent…He said I would suggest you resign…I was really uncomfortable when he told me because I knew it had nothing to do with the work. I was quite upset… It made me feel like I was never going to succeed here, even if I went to university (Francine).

Cyrille, a highly qualified professional from Cameroon who was unable to secure permanent employment that matched his skills, attributed his limited career progression at work partly to the lack of insider information on job openings available to British employees.

I have never had a full-time job here. All of them have been part-time. I have three month and six month contracts. It is very difficult to find a full-time job… I graduated in 2009 and since then I have had just three contracts… there are job openings in the company but If you don’t get the information online or through the agency that sent you there you would not be aware of it. They (work colleagues) wouldn’t tell you about it… I think they prefer to work with people from the same background, people who are British (Cyrille).

The study provides support that ‘strong ties’ are important for finding employment. Most migrants had to rely on relatives and friends to find employment in the UK. Polish women explained that their spouses came to the UK to work in pre-arranged employment or found work through family and social networks shortly after coming to the UK. Some migrants were employed by an employment agency often run or staffed
by Polish people, joining friends and family who had already been working for the same agency.

My husband’s manager is a subcontractor of a bigger building company which is actually English but everyone who works for him is Polish, mostly Polish, and they are all self-employed... The friend who helped him to get the job was actually already working here in Manchester and he managed to get a job for him (Lidia).

He (husband) didn’t have a pre-arranged job. He was actively seeking employment and he worked at different places. He worked at building sites, painting and decorating and these types of jobs. A lot of the time he found these jobs through Polish friends already working at the company. For some time he also worked for an agency (Kasia).

Several interviewees stated that they were mainly looking for jobs online, through private recruitment agencies and the Jobcentre. Migrants with poor language skills were less likely to rely on employment agencies to find work instead relying on friends and family to find out about employment opportunities. The Czech Roma interviewees were the most reliant on their social networks to find work. Hanzi, who was unemployed, earned income playing music at local community events, including weddings and Christenings. Ana, who came to the UK from the Czech Republic in 2009 also heavily relied on friends to find work and would not consider approaching any employment agencies.

I don’t dare to go anywhere alone. I don’t speak English (Ana).

Some Eastern European interviewees had worked many different jobs in the UK and found themselves in precarious work and conditions of exploitation and deception. In most cases, they were deceived by other Eastern European migrants after they obtained employment through informal recruitment practices in construction and other manual labour jobs.

There have been so many stories in the press and everywhere in Poland that Polish people who arrived here at the very beginning when we joined the EU would then start inviting and bringing other people here offering them and promising lots of money, good jobs and then they would just leave them
without any help and it happened that a lot of people would just have nothing when they arrived here (Lidia).

Some of his (husband’s) friends who were already in Liverpool called him and said there was a job in Liverpool and he should come and join them. When he arrived here it turned out the job wasn’t there (Luiza).

Bolek described how when he arrived in the UK he was asked to work for a Polish employer without having the required qualifications or training. He eventually left the job because he wasn’t getting paid and subsequently found out that other Polish employees had not received any payment either. His next employer did not pay him overtime and when he complained he was laid off. Since then he had been working in the black market getting paid cash in hand.

Most interviewees expressed the need to improve their economic position but were faced with a number of obstacles that prevented them from meeting their aspirations. These included practical, financial and childcare constraints in pursuing further education and training to improve their skills although the main barrier was poor language ability. Asylum seekers felt that their migration status was the main obstacle in achieving a better economic position in the UK. Jean-Claude, a university graduate, explained that it took so long to be granted Indefinite Leave to Remain (ILR) that he didn’t feel he had a chance of going back to university to study. Serge felt he could not start a business prior to receiving refugee status. After he was granted ILR he faced financial constraints that prevented him from starting a business since he didn’t earn enough through his part-time job to cover the starting-up costs.

Dominika could not attend full-day courses to train in order to get a better job as she could not find affordable childcare. She relied on friends so she would volunteer in her local community centre. In most cases it was a combination of lack of language skills and childcare that prevented women from working.

It is not easy to have a job with the hours you want because you just had a baby. I am just waiting for them to grow up a little bit and then I can look for something else. But at the moment I don’t want to change (jobs) because they gave me a part-time position. And they are quite flexible regarding my family situation. (Francine)

If I had a chance to work I would probably go for it. If I was around English people more then I would learn the language…I can’t imagine sitting at home. Already it has been too long (Ksenia).
Trésor who worked as a teacher in his home country felt he was not able to attend university to obtain the qualifications needed to teach in the UK and worked in a factory in order to finance his family’s move to the UK.

Now I need to work. I need the money to pay the lawyers. It’s a lot of money. (Trésor).

A Cameroonian interviewee who came to the UK to study described how she became a victim of a bogus college. She paid £4000 to cover tuition fees to an agency in her country that handled the application process to secure a place in a college in Leicester. When she arrived in the UK she discovered that the college had closed down and was replaced by an English school. She was unable to get her money back and had to find another college that would accept her within 60 days otherwise she would have to leave the country.

They misled me...they told me I could come and work and pay for my studies and go to school at the same time. Pay for everything myself. It is easy to live here. But when I came I realised it was not the case (Clémentine).

Unable to receive support from any public agencies she moved to Manchester to stay with a relative, paid £2,500 for a six month course in a college in order to be allowed to stay in the UK before registering at a university and self-financing her studies.

Experiences of worklessness were common among migrant workers and refugees in the study and affected their lives in different ways, some were left destitute unable to find any sources of support while others relied on friends and family to overcome economic difficulties.

6.2.1 Experiences of worklessness

In line with the higher levels of unemployment in deprived areas, several migrants in the two neighbourhoods had experienced unemployment in the UK. The recession had also affected the economic prospects of migrants.
Several interviewees who were experiencing unemployment and financial hardship thought this was a result of the current economic climate.

So many English people are not working, I hear on the news, and that’s why it’s so difficult. I’m registered with a few agencies but I haven’t been working. I regularly go to the Jobcentre as well but it is very difficult at the moment...It wasn’t a problem to get a job until the recession started... big companies couldn’t get any loans from banks any more, big building projects had to be cancelled or were not even going ahead. I remember the difference with when I first came to Manchester. It looked like a big building site in some places. Now, nothing’s happening (Aleksy).

For one thing, it is the economic situation that we are in right now because there aren’t that many jobs out there. It is very difficult to find a job...I have childcare commitments and I cannot work any hours (Kasia).

Now is the worst time since I came to England, financially. The prices have increased so much. Everything is expensive…even I started looking for work. I thought I would start working after my child went to nursery but I am quite desperate (Krystyna).

The recession had also caused shifts in the roles at home for some men who became unemployed. Georges used to work as a supervisor in a warehouse until the company he worked for closed down. Initially he relied on employment agencies to find work but as work became scarce he started approaching employers directly. His efforts to find work continued to be unsuccessful and he had to stay at home to look after his children but struggled to change the way he thought about himself and his masculinity.

It is tough...I think it is the recession...I apply for maybe 2-3 jobs a day. I send CVs, application forms. I am looking for anything...you see your wife paying for everything and you don’t feel good about yourself. You should work as a man, you should go to work...but what can we do...it’s like living but not living…It is my wife who pays the rent now (Georges).

Several migrants attributed difficulties in securing employment to a lack of qualifications, poor language skills and low demand for jobs in sectors that have traditionally attracted migrants. The lack of jobs and experience of unemployment did not seem to act as a disincentive to stay in the UK. Aleksy, one of the older migrants participating in the study, had become unemployed but felt that he would not be able to improve his economic prospects by returning to Poland because of his age.
It’s just not easy at the moment. Whatever savings I had are slowly finishing... My son is helping me. The truth is that I would have to get this job sooner or later because I can’t be without it. I wouldn’t like to go back to Poland because I don’t think I have better prospects...in Poland, they look at your age a lot, so if you’re above a certain age it’s very difficult to find a job (Aleksy).

The experience of unemployment had affected migrants in different ways. Many migrants had to rely on benefits to make ends meet, particularly those in family households with one earner. Most Eastern European women participating in the study who were not working due to childcare commitments had been receiving benefits, such as working tax credit and child benefit, and had applied to receive housing benefit. Several migrants had found out about benefit entitlements and procedures from friends and family suggesting that migrant friendship and family networks played a key role in sharing information about access to benefits. Social networks played an important role in enabling migrants to access the benefits system to alleviate financial hardship. Failed asylum seekers and Eastern European migrant workers who were unemployed and not able to claim state benefits were most likely to state they had experienced serious financial difficulties since arriving in the UK. The experiences of asylum seekers who had their support withdrawn since arriving in the UK left them destitute, isolated, prone to depression and reluctant to form ties within their neighbourhood. Jean-Claude stated that being in employment did not only help him to get out of poverty, it also helped him to meet friends and to improve his emotional well-being.

Prior to May 2011, A8 nationals were required to register under the WRS to work in the UK and were only entitled to benefits if they had one year’s continuous employment. Some Polish migrants reported difficulties in claiming benefits when they became unemployed despite having completed a year of continuous employment. They thought their claims were unfairly dismissed on the basis of eligibility. Such incidents seem to be commonplace whereby benefits claims by EU nationals are being dismissed according to the "right to reside" benefits test, introduced by the Labour Government and adopted by the Conservatives. Bolek challenged the Jobcentre’s decision to refuse his claim after seeking advice at a local community organisation and managed to get the benefits he was entitled to, eight months after his claim was refused.

I have been there (Jobcentre) and I made an appointment for social benefits. They told me that I need a visa… they told me I haven’t got a right to any
benefits here because I am from Poland. I was without a job, without
jobseekers allowance, without nothing…I didn’t have money for rent so I went
to the Council (Housing Benefits Office) and they told me the same as the
Jobcentre, that I have no right to stay and work in the UK (Bolek).

Luiza’s family relied on benefits because she had to stay at home to look after her
children. The payments they received were stopped and they were asked to repay
£1,200 on the basis that they were not eligible to receive benefits any longer.

The advice centre was shocked at how low our income is and that we’re not
receiving anything…We are trying to find out why the benefits were stopped
and why we have to pay back this amount of money…that we were not entitled
to working tax credit because we weren’t here long enough, which is not true
because my husband has been here for five years (Luiza).

Other Eastern European migrants had similar experiences having been refused benefits
although they were discouraged from appealing because they had to reapply and wait
for long periods of time for a decision and find their way through the bureaucratic
processes involved in accessing the benefits system.

The documents we submitted to the Jobcentre went somewhere else and the
Jobcentre decided that because he (husband) wasn’t working continuously for
a three year period they returned all the documents and rejected his claim…I
submitted everything two years ago, but they’re rubbish, everything goes
missing. It’s constant, I have to bring signed documents, even today, I have
to go again to submit a letter that confirms that I’m working, that I sent 2
months ago, but I have to do it again, because they lost it (Ewa).

I went there (Jobcentre) and the person I was speaking to just showed me on
the computer screen that my claim was closed. I asked him why and he said he
did not know. He told me to claim again and that’s all…I didn’t have the nerves
to do it again (Hanzi).

Migrant women who came to the UK with their children to join their husbands were
disillusioned with life in the UK after experiencing unemployment and being unable to
obtain support to overcome financial difficulties.
We came here hoping it was going to be better but it turned out it was worse...The problems started with my insurance number which was sent to a wrong address...We couldn't get benefits straight away, and everything was delayed, we had to apply again, go through the whole process again. At that point I really felt like giving everything up. We had problems because my husband was working but I wasn’t...we were really struggling for money...We had to be careful even with food, with everything. That’s why I felt like that. His salary wasn’t enough to cover all our needs (Lidia).

The company went bankrupt and the company wouldn’t pay him (husband) the money...I was pregnant. I didn’t have a pram or anything, they bought one for us, the other friend would lend us the money, we were completely broke. Literally, there was nowhere to go. We were in a very difficult situation (Ewa).

Unemployment drove some migrants to seek work in the black market as a means of overcoming financial difficulties. Bolek worked as a builder getting paid cash in hand and felt he didn’t have a choice as the only way he could earn an income whilst being unemployed was to offer ‘cheap labour’. He suggested that other builders were doing the same in order to get small projects by charging customers lower prices and not paying taxes and National Insurance contributions. This, however, reflects the nature of employment in the construction industry where illegal self-employment and cash in hand payment has been commonplace (Harvey and Behling, 2008).

Employment experiences related to education, language and skills and there was evidence that migrants in the two neighbourhoods, particularly the unemployed, had poorer language skills and lower qualifications and faced barriers towards improving their education and skills.

6.2.2 English language ability, education and skills

Education and English language ability were important factors in the experiences of migrants not just in the labour market but also of daily life in the neighbourhood. The education and skills of migrants varied significantly. Several study participants had high school or college level qualifications but African migrants were more likely to either hold a university degree or to have no qualifications compared to Eastern European interviewees who had below degree level qualifications. Roma migrants were the least qualified having attended just elementary school. English language ability levels also
varied among migrants; only a few said they did not speak English and most stated they spoke better than they wrote in English. African migrants were more likely to state that they had good language skills compared with Eastern European migrants. Many migrants had attended a language course since arriving in the UK to improve their English and a small number had studied English at school prior to coming to the UK.

There was wider recognition about the importance of language for integration but some migrants, particularly women, encountered obstacles including lack of provision of courses in the local area and childcare commitments, that prevented them from attending a language course to improve their language skills.

I was studying at Longsight College as they had childcare facilities so it wasn’t a problem at the time... Without that I wouldn’t have been able to study there because I wouldn’t have anyone to help with looking after the children (Michalina).

Many migrant women felt that they were unable to improve their English language ability as there were long waiting lists for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) courses and many courses were over-subscribed or they were unable to afford the course fees. The financial cost of language courses was a main concern among Polish women. Luiza had attended English courses at her local learning centre and explained she couldn’t continue learning English because she could not afford to pay the fees after the changes in the provision of ESOL and the abolition of entitlement for many migrants to access ESOL free of charge came into effect.

Abraham Moss Centre, they’re running one year courses, but it’s very difficult to be admitted...there are a lot of applicants. I’ve been waiting for two years now (Ewa).

There is an online petition on a Polish website for people in England called ‘MojaWyspa’ about EU migrants having to pay for language courses...it seems a bit unfair, that even people who are on benefits, and I am on benefits, are not entitled to do those courses for free.. There are four of us, four Polish women and we were all doing the previous course. We all stopped because we can’t afford to pay for it (Luiza).
Some migrants experienced difficulties in finding suitable courses, for instance evening or weekend courses they could attend when they were not at work. Those who worked, particularly men, were less likely to state they needed formal classes and more likely to cite time constraints as the main reason for not attending classes. Some Eastern European men in particular, felt they just needed to learn enough English to get by. Aleksy who spoke little English explained that he felt his English was adequate as he was able to communicate with colleagues at work.

The desire to improve English language skills was also influenced by intentions about length of stay in the UK. Dita first came to the UK in 2004 to work in a temporary position as a cleaner. She decided to move back to Poland a year later after meeting her partner and lived there for six years. Following the break-up of her relationship she decided to return to the UK. When she first came to the UK she attended an English course but didn’t carry on studying English as she knew she would return to Poland. She thought that this time she would stay in the UK longer and felt that she had to learn English.

In contrast, the ability of asylum seekers’ to attend courses was influenced by changes in their asylum status, asylum procedures and entitlements.

I had a problem with immigration…I stopped studying. I was refused asylum by the Home Office. I stopped everything, the school…ESOL and IT (Trésor).

Community learning centres and local projects and initiatives for migrants played an important role in engaging those with poor language ability in learning and training activities through offering free courses. The provision of ESOL was instrumental in bringing migrant women in contact with other women and build up their connections and friendships in the local area. Nearly all interviewees who had attended ESOL since arriving in the UK went to a community learning centre to learn English. Community centres also hosted a variety of other courses that some migrants, particularly women had attended such as literacy, numeracy, health and safety and sewing courses. Some interviewees had also attended courses such as painting and decorating, food preparation and cookery at local colleges.
Migrants’ accounts about the reasons they had moved into the neighbourhoods related to features of the local environment such as the quality of facilities and services but the most important factors for choosing to live in Gorton and Cheetham related to the quality of housing.

### 6.3 Neighbourhood and housing conditions

#### 6.3.1 Housing circumstances

The most important factors in choosing a home and neighbourhood were housing affordability, housing condition and quality including size, and having ‘good’ neighbours, particularly for those in families. Among asylum seekers there was a strong desire to live in a quiet neighbourhood and this was one of the most important factors in choosing to live in Gorton. Asylum Seekers living in Cheetham were more likely to state that the area’s ethnic diversity and cultural facilities including ethnic shops were the main reasons for choosing to live in the neighbourhood. On the other hand, Polish migrants, particularly those living in Cheetham, were more likely to state that proximity to work was important in choosing where to live.

The majority of Africans in the study lived in social housing accommodation or assisted housing while most Eastern European migrants in the study lived in private accommodation. However, several Eastern European families had applied for social housing accommodation and had been waiting to be allocated a house for more than a year. Apart from affordability, the main reason for applying for social housing was the need to move to larger family accommodation. Some migrants lived in two or three bedroom properties with their spouses and children and were satisfied with their accommodation, although those who lived in smaller properties wanted to move to a larger property so that their children would not have to share the same bedroom. Most existing social housing tenants had applied for larger accommodation to meet their housing needs although for some, moving to a larger property even in the social housing
sector, was not an option they could afford as they were low-income one-earner households.

If we rented from a private landlord it would be much more difficult for us. It would be another £200 a month... my partner doesn’t work full time now (Krystyna).

Unemployed migrants were more likely to state they were experiencing poor housing conditions that they were unable to overcome. Hanzi lived temporarily with his friend in a one bedroom flat using the living room as a bedroom until he was able to find employment.

I don’t have my privacy. I would like to have something of my own, something better, but there’s no work, so there’s no money for it (Hanzi).

Most interviewees had moved to the two neighbourhoods shortly after arriving in Manchester or had moved there from another deprived area. Migrants relied on friends and family to find accommodation, used listings on the Manchester City Council housing allocation scheme— Home Finder—and obtained housing information through leaflets at their local library. Social networks facilitated the sharing of information about access to social housing with several migrants following the same procedures as family and friends who were already living in social housing accommodation. Some migrants who moved from private rented housing to social housing accommodation had lived in poor quality housing owned by private landlords and social housing offered improved housing conditions and long-term tenancy agreements.

The presence of social housing in the neighbourhood was seen as a positive neighbourhood feature by several Polish migrants who viewed social housing as an opportunity to improve their housing situation, for instance to obtain better quality or larger accommodation. The option of moving into larger private rented accommodation was not available for Polish interviewees who planned to move to social housing properties as they tended to be in one earner households and the household income would not permit such a move. These Polish families also viewed social housing as the
main route to home ownership and there were indications that home ownership was a medium term goal.

From what I know, because my friend lives in council accommodation, and I’m not sure whether they have changed the rules, but so far, the way it has worked is that you could get the house and they would be watching you for about a year to see whether you’re paying the bills regularly, whether you look after the house and then they would give you the opportunity, after five years of living there, you could buy it for a much lower price (Luiza).

Asylum seekers and refugees had different motivations, often expressing a desire to live in ‘a quiet area’ with safety and security being a primary concern in choosing an area to live. Most asylum seekers and refugees had lower aspirations for home ownership compared to migrant workers as they faced more constraints on housing choice which limited their housing situation. Carine who came to the UK in 2005 and had been living in shared accommodation wanted to move but she didn’t have much choice because she could not afford to live on her own. Similarly, when Serge who rented from a social housing landlord was asked about his future plans he felt that he didn’t have a choice over where to live. This view was not shared by other participants in the study who lived in social or assisted housing. Most felt they had some degree of choice over where to live, stating they had requested to be housed in the two neighbourhoods, in some instances to be close to family and friends, although they had less choice over the type of accommodation they received and often had to wait for long-periods of time before they were allocated new accommodation.

African migrants were also more likely to state they moved to Cheetham and Gorton to be close to co-ethnics and choose an area because it was ethnically diverse compared to Eastern European migrants. There was evidence however, that several migrants and asylum seekers had little choice over housing and the neighbourhoods they lived when they first moved to the UK. Male migrants’ accounts suggested improved housing conditions over time involving a move from temporary shared accommodation associated with poor living conditions to more permanent family accommodation. Eastern European women described similar housing experiences involving men moving to the UK alone in temporary shared housing accommodation before they could secure family accommodation so that their families could join them.
When he (husband) first arrived to the UK all the people who were employed by the person who got him the job, who owns the company lived in shared accommodation. They would share a house. It would very often be seven people or more, that’s how he gets them to come to England. They know that they have a job and they have a house that they share (Lidia).

They found this flat, where they were living with all his friends until one summer I arrived with my kids and we decided to stay here for good and it coincided with the fact that most of their friends also moved out because their families arrived and joined them so they found separate accommodation somewhere else (Luiza).

Ewa’s husband was living in a shared house while he was working in the UK but moved in a flat in Cheetham when she came to join him but conditions were poor and overcrowded.

It was a different flat, very small, lots of mice and all sorts of things...horrible, one bedroom, tiny. A tiny bathroom, only one person could go in at a time (Ewa)

Berta and Ksenia had similar experiences renting in the private sector when they first moved to the UK.

The flat in Whalley Range was very dirty cold and dump (Ksenia).

The flat where I lived before was horrible. The kitchen was covered in mould. The landlord never bothered with anything. My daughter’s asthma got worse. He (landlord) kept saying that we had to renovate it ourselves (Berta).

Aleksy lived with seven people including his wife’s cousin and his wife’s brother in law in a four bed house in Cheetham when he first moved to Manchester. He didn’t know the others living in the house who were all Polish working for different employers.

There were too many people, it was basically like living in a camp...overcrowded, with only one kitchen, one bathroom, too many people (Aleksy).

African migrants’ experiences of social housing often related to poor housing and poor living conditions. Georges lived with his wife and two children in inadequate
accommodation with two bedrooms. He had been waiting for three years to be re-housed.

The house is in poor condition... when it is raining, the water just comes through my bedroom and down in the sitting room. There is a leak and its dump...I have complained about it and have even applied for another house. I just want to move... every time someone comes to repair it...the water starts dripping again (Georges).

Jean-Claude suffered from mental health problems as a result of trauma, violence, and displacement from the war in the Republic of Congo. As an asylum seeker he had to live in a hostel in London for nine months and in poor quality private accommodation ever since. Poor housing and living conditions in the UK had a negative impact on his mental health and as a consequence his condition worsened.

When I came to Manchester I went to social services in Moss Side. I showed them all my papers and they gave me shared accommodation and it badly affected me...my mental problems got worse (Jean-Claude).

Some migrants also reported lack of tenancy agreements and exploitation from private landlords. For instance, a Roma family had to move out of their house when it caught fire from faulty electric wiring and had to live in a hostel until they found a new home. Cyrille who came to the UK from Cameroon in 2008 to study had less than a month’s notice to leave his accommodation so that another tenant could move in.

He told me you could stay as long as you want as far as your bills are paid and my bills were always paid …When I asked for a contract he told me you don’t need it. He said that I won’t have any problems with him.... the one other thing with private landlords is that they don’t return your deposit. They always find issues in order to keep your deposit (Cyrille).

In sum, most migrants in the study had experienced poor housing conditions in the UK. Residential location decisions were primarily determined by housing affordability, housing condition and quality including size. Several of the study participants lived in
social housing accommodation or had applied for social housing accommodation. These migrants tended to be in family units unable to afford private sector accommodation that met their requirements as they were low income one-earner couples with small children. Having good neighbours, neighbourhood facilities and shops, and good transport links were also important neighbourhood attributes although they were secondary considerations in decisions to move.

6.3.2 Neighbourhood conditions and satisfaction

Neighbourhood characteristics such as access to public transport, shopping and community facilities and services including health services and schools, had an influence on neighbourhood satisfaction and the experiences of where migrants live.

Most migrants expressed satisfaction with their neighbourhood as a place to live in both localities. Good transport links and amenities including shops were amongst the most common reasons for choosing to live in an area. Children’s facilities, including parks and playgrounds, were important neighbourhood aspects for migrants with children. Parents also discussed the importance of having good neighbours, feeling safe and the availability and quality of schools.

It was my choice (the neighbourhood)...I just looked at Catholic schools like St Anne’s and this one, and when I mentioned St Anne’s in Crumpsall my friends said that it’s not a good school, that I shouldn’t send my daughter there, so I decided to go for St Thomas’s (Ewa).

We’ve got friends here, also the children’s school, so I’m happy here (Luiza).

When I was alone I was thinking about me but now I have kids...I don’t want my son to mix with kids who maybe use bad language or do stupid things so I need good neighbours. When I know my son is in their house I know there is no danger (Georges).

When asked about the aspects they liked and disliked about their neighbourhood, most migrants living in Cheetham commented about the good transport links and proximity to the city centre and highlighted street cleanliness and litter as negative features of the area.
My town is very clean. Here you can see rubbish everywhere, people don’t care if it is clean or not (Bolek).

Littered streets, lots of rubbish everywhere, peoples’ front gardens are full of rubbish as well. That’s what I spotted here when I first arrived (Lidia).

It’s not only the safety but also the area and how dirty it is...Very often you see rats around, just running around. It’s all because of the food laying around, from the stores, all the leftovers attracting rats (Ewa).

When I came to visit my husband and he picked me up from the airport and I looked at the area I thought, oh my God it’s so dirty, so much rubbish everywhere and I think it’s mainly the streets because of the stalls (Luiza).

Crime and anti-social behaviour was another main aspect of neighbourhood satisfaction. There were differences in perceptions of crime across the two neighbourhoods with Gorton generally seen as a low crime area and Cheetham as a high crime area. Although both neighbourhoods suffered from poor reputation, Cheetham’s reputation as a high crime area did not match experiences of crime. Several migrants felt that Cheetham was a safe place to live and most stated they had not experienced crime within the neighbourhood. Most also felt comfortable walking in their area after dark although women were less likely to feel safe often stating they wouldn’t feel safe walking after dark in any area.

I have been hearing stories that this area wasn’t safe before or it is not safe but I have never had any problems...I walked at least four times around midnight going back home without any problem so I think it is more safe than what people think (Cyrille).

I don’t exactly know much in terms of crime in this area but I have heard that it’s a very dangerous part of Manchester (Lidia).

There were some references to incidents relating to youth nuisance and anti-social behaviour and parts of the neighbourhoods with pockets of deprivation that suffered from high crime.

There was one situation on the playground where children, English children from White British families, maybe 10 or 11 year olds, started throwing stones
at my children...they were laughing at me when I was speaking in Polish, trying to pretend they were saying what I was saying, and just making fun of me (Lidia).

Kids are kind of rough. Do you know the post office on Waterloo Road?... when they (friends) moved there he had his car broken into mostly every day (Francine).

I don’t know if I can call it crime, just kids throwing eggs at my car… playing around (Georges).

There are drug dealers everywhere...I can see them from my window, dealing drugs, exchanging stuff. Sometimes it is a little bit scary (Clémentine).

Ewa described her experience living in a deprived part of Cheetham in a building that was due to be demolished.

More and more people started moving out. There were only us who stayed and our neighbours who were also Polish and horrible things started happening there, because most of it was vacant. Basically drug users started coming there, groups of young, misbehaving kids were breaking windows; they broke my Polish neighbour's windows once..I was scared of living there because of the children...the front door was so easy to open, it was just one kick. Literally enough to kick and the door would open (Ewa).

Proximity to ethnic shops was desirable for some migrants, particularly Africans in Cheetham although several Polish interviewees highlighted the contribution of Asian businesses in terms of enriching retail services in the area. Most Polish interviewees for example, shopped regularly in Asian owned supermarkets attracted by the quality and prices of the fruit and vegetables. In contrast, most Polish migrants visited Polish shops on an occasional basis and the presence of Polish shops in the neighbourhood didn’t seem to be important for those who were living in the UK for a longer time.

In Polish shops I can buy products which I can’t find in other shops, like Polish bread. It is not very important (though) to have the Polish shop nearby. If it wasn’t nearby and on the way I would probably not go to another Polish shop. (Krystyna).

I could live without it (Polish shop). I’ve got used to English food now (Luiza).
Nevertheless, interviewees acknowledged the role of such shops in passing on important information to the Polish community and as places where they met other Polish people in the area.

One aspect of having a Polish shop is you have advertisements and information and you talk to the sales assistant or the shop owner (Ewa).

Migrants in Cheetham were more likely to state they would move to a quieter area in the future, although in some cases this meant moving away from the busy shopping area on Cheetham Hill road and the area around Waterloo Road perceived by some as a crime ‘hotspot’. In both areas some migrants aspired to move in the future to one of the more affluent neighbourhoods of Manchester.

I have applied for another house in Sale, Altringham, Chorlton. I have lived here for five years and I just want to get out. It is still a nice place because I started my life here but I want to think of my kids’ future, where they can grow up (Georges).

The majority of interviewees in Gorton had no aspirations to live elsewhere. Gorton was seen as a family friendly and quiet neighbourhood with open spaces and access to parks, good neighbours, providing a sense of safety and security, particularly to families and asylum seekers and refugees.

The area is nice and quiet, nice neighbours...I let the kids play outside (Berta).

I feel safe here (Ksenia).

The availability of affordable family housing was a main preoccupation for families living in Gorton.

I am very satisfied (with the house)... because it is very spacious. Also I have very good neighbours. Sincerely, I didn’t know much about the area but in
terms of houses and the types of houses I wanted it was the cheapest area (Cyrille).

There was also some evidence that area regeneration programs were successful in changing the reputation of the neighbourhoods which in turn influenced place attachment and migrants’ willingness to stay in the neighbourhoods. Those who had lived in the neighbourhoods for longer thought that they were improving over time and that economic regeneration and investment had made a difference not just in terms of making them better places to live but also in terms of improving neighbourhood reputation.

They are building nice houses and it is making the area looking good. It used to be rough but they decided to do something completely new...the Tesco and the shopping centre... it is looking nice, so yes, it is changing and the perception of Cheetham is changing as well (Francine).

Features of the neighbourhood environment such as the quality of local facilities, the housing mix, transport links and cleanliness were associated with increased neighbourhood satisfaction which in turn influenced long-term intentions to stay in the neighbourhood. Aspects of the neighbourhood environment also influenced the development of social networks within the neighbourhood.

6.4 Neighbourhood ethnic diversity, social networks and belonging

6.4.1 Diversity and social cohesion in the neighbourhood

Migrants in both neighbourhoods viewed their neighbourhood as ethnically diverse cohesive places, stating that people from different ethnic backgrounds got on well together, although there were some differences in perceptions of ethnic diversity and social cohesion. Eastern European migrants for example, had experienced ethnic diversity in the UK for the first time. Their perceptions were based on exaggerated
views about levels of ethnic diversity drawn from neighbourhood experiences as demonstrated by Aleksy’s comment below.

I think England is the country where you can see that people are quite used to different nationalities and of course it was due to colonies in the past and there’s always been people from different backgrounds. I’m not sure exactly how much (diverse it is) but I think it would probably mean more than half of the population of Great Britain is not actually English. (Aleksy)

Understandings of diversity based on personal experiences and encounters within their local area were also common among African migrants.

I think it is a mixed place because I see many black people around, white, Asian (Georges).

Distorted perceptions about the scale of immigration however are not uncommon. On average, people think that three in ten of the population are immigrants against the actual of one in ten (Duffy and Frere-Smith, 2014).

Eastern European migrants were more likely to state that their social networks consisted mainly of co-ethnics. In fact, only one Eastern European interviewee had friendship networks comprised of predominantly non-ethnics. Aleksy who was in his fifties when he first arrived to the UK from Poland explained that this was due to a ‘combination of the language issue and cultural differences’ and this echoed other interviewees’ views.

In line with other studies Eastern European migrants’ experiences with other nationalities and ethnic groups varied significantly. Many migrants felt there was a lack of trust and exclusion from the ‘established’ communities particularly the white English community towards immigrants.

I am here all these years and I don’t have any English friends which is quite strange. I was living in France for 6 months and had three French friends in such a short period of time... British ethnic minorities are friendlier (Krystyna).

There are not many English people that want to socialise with Polish here... The lower class English, that’s who most hates us... They probably don’t like anyone other than English people... When I first came over here there were
some tensions probably because they were not used to us. Then so many Eastern European people started coming over here so I think they got used to it (Feliks).

Sincerely when you are with British people you don’t know their true faces...It is easier to socialise with people from other nationalities, for instance from Eastern Europe, than people from the UK. People from other nationalities are more open. (Cyrille).

Several migrants reported rivalries within and between ethnic minority communities, particularly in Cheetham, and pointed to barriers to interactions with people from other ethnicities due to cultural factors and practices. The lack of contact with people from other nationalities and ethnicities was often attributed to preferences to socialise with people from similar cultural backgrounds.

Indian people don’t like black people. I even see at times in shops they are not nice to each other. And black people talk about Indian people (Krystyna).

I think ethnic minorities tend to help each other within their group. I don’t think people from the Arab world would be helping Polish people a lot, I think it depends on the situation, but I think it definitely works more within the ethnic minority group...it’s different with Polish people. I have heard stories where instead of helping they did something rather opposite, they would cause more trouble than actually helping, and it’s usually with young Polish people (Aleksy).

They (different ethnic groups) stay within their own community. We just respect each other. We respect others. We don’t mix (Charles).

I would talk to anyone. I’m not trying to keep myself to myself and the Polish community. I don’t mind having friends from other backgrounds, especially as I find it fascinating and interesting, you can find out a lot of things from other people of different backgrounds, but I think it’s only natural that you mix with people from the same background, so I do have lots of Polish friends (Ewa).

There were also perceptions of preferential treatment and competition over limited resources within and beyond the neighbourhood such as jobs and ESOL between and within migrant communities. This suggests that resentment over perceptions of preferential treatment in the allocation of resources in the neighbourhood are not just confined to British groups but also exist within migrant communities.
We think we should be entitled to free courses but unfortunately we are on the waiting list. We can’t start until they decide that we can do it for free (pause) but other communities from Asia can do it for free. We don’t know why that is (Luiza).

Polish, Czech come here for the summer holiday and they take many jobs. I have childcare commitments and I cannot work any hours (Kasia).

On the other hand, some Polish interviewees expressed positive attitudes towards ethnic diversity. Some interviewees viewed successful relationships between Poles and Asians as indicative of community cohesion and good inter-ethnic relations between Poles and other ethnic groups.

I feel my life is better here than in Poland. Poland hasn’t got that much tolerance for different nationalities, it isn’t used to it. For example, you don’t meet African people very often in Poland, and if you do it’s an attraction for Polish people because it’s so rare to see someone with a different skin colour, in smaller towns I think (Ewa).

I love the variety and the fact that there’s so many different people. I’m interested in other cultures...I find it (here) really interesting and fascinating (Aleksy).

We have neighbours of different nationalities and we get on well with them and I think it’s much more interesting than having just one nationality on the whole street (Luiza).

Other interviewees commented about the degree of ethnic solidarity, sense of community and mutual support within their ethnic communities. Recently arrived migrants suggested that the Polish community was more fragmented than other ethnic communities in Britain and lacked solidarity.

The Pakistani community in this area is very close, people help each other, the same with the African community, people are very supportive and help each other...I really like how the Pakistani community is not embarrassed to wear their traditional clothes and they have their own identity.. I really like how for example, the Jewish community lives here. They would stick up for each other, protect each other… but the same thing cannot be said about the Polish community (Lidia).
Some migrants thought that in ethnically diverse areas there were more opportunities for interaction between people from different backgrounds. There was evidence to support contact as the main mechanism for social integration and cohesion. The shared use of spaces in the immediate neighbourhood facilitated increased social contact according to one interviewee, and the development of inter-ethnic relationships.

I think people get on easily because they have the chance to meet unlike some other areas where you don’t meet with the other races you don’t know how they are but when you live next to someone especially if you are open minded and you want to know how the person is, then obviously, I mean sometimes you don’t have to, but the circumstances are that make you be close to each other (Francine).

Krystyna who was attracted to Cheetham by the low cost of housing and proximity to the city centre commented about the area’s ethnic diversity.

I don’t mind so many people from so many different countries, maybe it is better for me because I am a foreigner. I don’t feel as strange (Krystyna).

Some migrants’ expectations about mutual support revealed individualistic attitudes while others expressed support and mutual cooperation and solidarity to their co-ethnics.

People who didn’t have much money in Poland or who were struggling in Poland, who had a very difficult situation when they come here and realize they can live comfortable lives and have everything they didn’t have back home they can’t get enough of it and it’s this Polish mentality that I noticed that makes them a bit selfish, that when they get a job and feel more established they feel superior and better than others and are not willing to help anyone (Lidia).

I don’t like the Polish people here...There are plenty of people here who came from Poland and left their problems with family or crime and start here a new life (Dita).

Most Polish respondents thought there was lack of trust and mutual support within the Polish community. Some respondents’ attitudes towards other Polish in the UK revealed
suspicion and wariness. Polish migrants in the study were more likely to express mistrust towards their co-ethnics than African migrants and felt there was lack of cohesion within the Polish community. Some felt the lack of links with people outside the Polish community reflected to some extent poor language skills and also the prevalence of individualistic over collectivist attitudes.

I think it is this Polish mentality, that we only stay together and support each other when there is a matter of urgency like World War II but we don’t see each other when we live outside Poland...I think if a Polish person does something it usually means they get something in return. They wouldn’t do it otherwise (Lidia).

They (Poles) don’t really look after each other. Sometimes they help each other but it is hard to find real friends here…I don’t know why (Dita).

I think it’s mainly to do with the language problem, that’s why so many people tend to socialise within the Polish community... I think most of my friends would like to mix with other nationalities and have friends with other nationalities, but I think the biggest problem is the language barrier (Ewa).

The accounts of relationships with co-ethnics given by Polish migrants suggested divisions between the new and old Polish community.

I have met some older Polish residents on the street but I didn’t speak with them. Sometimes on the bus I could hear the Polish language that was ‘old’ Polish language, even their accent was strange, so I knew they came here a long time ago (Krystyna).

Several Polish migrants also suggested that there were divisions between new arrivals and those who came to the UK soon after the EU enlargement, with recent migrants having a lot of animosity towards migrants who settled in the UK earlier.

When I came to the UK there weren’t many Polish people. Those who arrived after 2004 seem to be more reluctant to be close friends with each other compared to people who came here previously...There are a lot of tensions now (Michalina).
Jealousy has always been a problem...Polish people getting jealous of everyone else, mostly other Polish people, about getting better jobs, more money, better cars (Feliks).

Polish migrants were more likely to express views that revealed prejudice and suspicion towards other ethnic groups and negative attitudes and stereotyping on the basis of ethnicity, culture and religion, which might be the result of a lack of familiarity of ethnic diversity. When asked about relations between different ethnic communities in their neighbourhood and whether they thought people from different backgrounds got on well together some Polish interviewees alluded to racial divisions by emphasising their ‘whiteness’ and how this differentiated their experiences from those of other (non-white) minorities.

I am white and I don’t have these kinds of problems. Even if I see someone who is not nice I am not going to argue with them. Actually I didn’t have a situation where someone said something not nice to me because I am not English but I know even If I have this situation I would just ignore it (Krystyna).

I think Polish people would get on more with the English than the Pakistani... I don’t mind other communities living together, but I’m just saying what the common perception is and how people see the Pakistani community—that they’re dirty, that basically some people don’t trust them (Ewa).

There were negative perceptions of Asian people among Polish migrants and these were stronger in Cheetham. Specifically, members of the Asian community were associated with negative aspects of the neighbourhood, for instance, the Bangladeshi and Pakistani shop owners were often blamed for litter and rubbish problems in the neighbourhood.

I wouldn’t mind living around other nationalities, but sometimes it does make me think here it does look more dirty and whether it is because of those communities that have those stalls here...often you see rats around, just running around. It’s all because of the food lying around (Ewa).

The streets look really dirty all the time...It is because the streets are not cleaned and because of the businesses...the Pakistani businesses (Feliks).
In many cases, negative attitudes towards Asian minorities revealed anti-Muslim sentiments that were evident from negative remarks about the Islamic dress code and Islam’s alleged oppression of women. Several interviewees expressed disapproval of relationships between Polish women and Asian men based on beliefs that women were mistreated in Islam. These accounts seemed to be based on an assumption that all members of South Asian communities were Muslim and suggested that interviewees were not able to differentiate between Muslim and non-Muslim Asian minorities.

The family living next door, I think they were from Pakistan, I saw the mother hitting the baby lots of times... really badly, because he couldn’t count to 10... I’m not confident enough to tell her that I don’t like it and I don’t like what she’s doing because firstly my English isn’t good enough to tell her and also I don’t think she speaks English...I’m scared of what the husband would do if I got in the way and I’ve heard stories about the husbands being aggressive (Luiza).

There was also a tendency to blame Asian groups for what was seen as an unwillingness to mix with other groups and self-segregation.

I think it’s that people fear that kind of thing, that whenever a Pakistani family moves in suddenly there’s lots of Pakistani people living around and they create kind of small communities living close together and that’s what people are conscious about...But the same thing is with the Jewish community, Leicester Road for example, they would live in that one area, I don’t mind that at all...the African community and Caribbean are more kind of favourable, it’s a different attitude (Ewa).

Polish women had contact with women from other nationalities, particularly Asian women in local colleges and community centres at ESOL classes. Some felt that cultural practices prevented Asian women from developing social relationships with women outside their own communities. A local informant in Cheetham suggested that Asian women tended to attend classes that were confined to women and often just Asian women and suggested a need for inter-ethnic activities in the local area.
I have a good friend from Pakistan who is attending the course with me. A very nice girl. It’s really hard sometimes, because you can tell that someone has a problem and needs help but it’s so difficult to get involved because I sometimes don’t know how far I can go not to cross the line, when it comes to their religion and their husband (Ewa).

When we were attending the English course me and my friend made friends with girls from Pakistan...we invited them for coffee in Costa, we never did it and we thought that perhaps they’re not allowed to, maybe it’s their religion or their husbands won’t allow them to, that’s what we thought. We really wanted to make friends with them they were really nice girls (Luiza).

Some Polish interviewees claimed there were no tensions between the Polish and Asian communities although prejudices kept them apart and prevented meaningful interactions from taking place.

I don’t like Asian people because (pause) maybe I don’t understand them (Dita).

I don’t like the strict religion. It is very odd...It is very strict...I don’t like how in this religion a man treats women because a woman in his religion is his property so I don’t like it (Bolek).

We never had a problem with the Pakistani. We never had a problem with other nationalities...I don’t socialise with Pakistani people but my friends, girls have relationships with Pakistani people... People don’t like that. They just don’t socialise...with couples like that, Pakistani and Polish (Feliks).

Lack of understanding of other cultures was not just the result of limited contact with other ethnic groups but also seemed to reflect religious differences. The strict catholic values among Poles in the UK seemed to manifest in racial prejudice towards other ethnic groups with the religiosity and social conservatism of Asians seen as a barrier to integration.

You see people having friends from other cultures, I had one friend, it seems that these friendships are quite superficial not long-lasting as opposed to the links within the Polish community in the area so the links with other ethnic communities are not very well established. One of the main reasons why this is so is religion (Kasia).
Cultural expectations about mutual support differed between migrants. Several migrants expressed negative attitudes towards the white English who were seen as unfriendly.

People from Pakistan, people from Africa have always been very nice to me. I think I would be more reluctant to say this about English people living in this area (Lidia).

African migrants were more likely to state that they had experienced racism and discrimination from White English people who were generally seen as reserved, unfriendly and hostile towards immigrants.

It is easier to make friends with people with whom you share the same background...people look down on you because you obviously come from Africa and you feel that barrier... the other thing is because you have a culture. In Africa we have a culture of being open...in the classroom there were mostly English people, there were two black people so when I came in usually I said hi to everyone but nobody used to say hi back so I decided I am not going to say hi anymore (Francine).

African migrants were also more likely to state that ethnic diversity was desirable when choosing a neighbourhood and to associate the benefits of ethnic diversity with feelings of security, protection from discrimination and social inclusion.

The area is very diverse. My neighbour is British, opposite lives a Nigerian, next a Romanian. I don’t think we have issues like that (racial harassment), particularly in my street (Cyrille)

Several asylum seekers stressed how friendly neighbours in Cheetham and Gorton were compared to the areas to which they were dispersed by NASS. Such neighbourhoods were viewed as places characterized by hostility and racism with few opportunities to develop ties and be embedded in local networks and draw support from them.

The only thing I like about Cheetham is that there are so many races...it doesn’t matter if you are Indian or black or white… You don’t feel like, you know, you are being looked upon or treated differently...When I used to live in Whitefield, for example, we never used to talk (to neighbours)...It is a
different culture. It was all white...they don’t give you the opportunity to even say hi or even if they do it is just this fixed smile (Clémentine).

(In Wigan) The white people didn’t like me. When you tried saying hello to people they didn’t say hello back... Even the white people here are nice...the children get on well, they play well together (Lisette).

The study participants in Cheetham who were asylum seekers and refugees had far more extensive social networks comprised of ties to neighbours, friends, colleagues of different ethnicities and nationalities—both within and outside the neighbourhood—compared to asylum seekers in Gorton. Asylum seekers in Gorton on the other hand, wanted to keep to oneself and were reluctant to form ties within the neighbourhood. The main attraction of Gorton for several asylum seekers was that it was a quiet neighbourhood where they could keep a low profile. Asylum seekers in Gorton stated that they had no ties within the neighbourhood or their social networks were restricted to partners or spouses and other asylum seekers.

I have people who I say hello to but no friends. Just my boyfriend. He is my life (Paola).

There were also differences in the types of support received between migrants in the two neighbourhoods. Nearly all African study participants in Cheetham but less than half of African participants in Gorton stated they had someone to count on within their neighbourhood. In contrast, Eastern European interviewees were more likely to state they could count on people within the neighbourhood in Gorton compared to Cheetham. Eastern Europeans in Gorton however were less likely to have friends from different nationalities compared to those living in Cheetham, where half of Eastern European respondents stated they had friends from other nationalities.

6.4.2 Social interactions and support within and outside the neighbourhood

Migrants tended to socialise mainly with their co-ethnics, and social interactions tended to take place outside the neighbourhood. The majority of migrants also counted on
friends and relatives living elsewhere in Manchester, in the UK or even in their home countries. Interactions with Britons and other nationalities tended to be carried out within the neighbourhood or at work. Migrants reported employment as an important source of social contact impacting on identity, belonging and self-worth. Asylum seekers and women were more likely to lack ties with others in employment and as a result suffer from network disadvantage.

Interactions with other nationalities within the neighbourhood tended to take place within local community venues, libraries, learning centres, churches, shops and schools, children’s centres and playgrounds. The accounts on social interactions by Polish women suggested that they had met and befriended women from different nationalities while participating in adult learning courses including ESOL. Migrants with children tended to have more social interactions with other nationalities locally and even those with poor language skills and mainly co-ethnic networks had some contact with other parents irrespective of nationality as a result of visiting schools and children’s facilities attended by their children.

The accounts on levels of trust in the neighbourhood by migrants suggested that there were different types of trust among neighbours. Relations with neighbours tended to be weak and superficial restricted to casual encounters although there were also examples of close and trusting relationships within the neighbourhood. Some thought that they had not developed ties outside their kinship and co-ethnic networks because they had no time to develop wider social relations. Language barriers and norms about relations with neighbours tended to limit interactions.

It is important to have good relations with them (neighbours) because whenever they go away there is someone to watch the house...There is definitely some trust there but it is difficult to say whether it would be a trust...with everything. It depends. Neighbour trust is there but not deep trust (Ksenia).

All you can do is socialise with them because they are your neighbours. Good morning, good afternoon, how are you, how do you feel, if they have a problem maybe phone the police or an ambulance. That’s all. You can’t really trust them. I wouldn’t ask them to keep an eye on my house. The trust among
neighbours is quite low because they don’t really interact. It reflects the life in Manchester (Cyrille).

Some migrants had developed friendships with neighbours and socialised with them on a regular basis and felt they could turn to and count on their neighbours to look out for them. The presence of strong social networks within the neighbourhood was also associated with a higher sense of place attachment. Georges, for example, who had known his next door neighbour for five years explained that moving out of the area would mean losing a neighbour he could count on and trust but didn’t think this would prevent him from moving as his neighbour could also move out of the area at any time.

Polish migrants were more likely to report they had friends within their neighbourhood but friendships were mainly with other Polish migrants.

In terms of the closest neighbours there’s no relationship as such, only hi, bye and short talk, but because we work and they work we hardly get to see each other...Sometimes we meet up with Polish neighbours, they live a 3 minute walk away. Sometimes an evening for a beer (Ewa).

Several migrants stated they could trust their neighbours and there were examples of trust and reciprocity in both neighbourhoods such as exchanging favours with neighbours, looking after children, looking out for each other and feeling safe and secure at home.

When I go out I usually don’t take my car and I say to my neighbour to check my car...We go out, we go to the gym, we go swimming sometimes, we do loads of things together (Georges).

The little things that you see that someone cares for example, when you forget to put your bin out, she (neighbour) puts it out for you, when there is a parcel that comes, she comes and knocks on your door...if the window is open she will come and say be careful don’t leave your window open (Clémentine).
Relations within the neighbourhood between migrants and the White British tended to be limited and migrants were less likely to state they relied on White British neighbours for help.

I had a problem once and I needed someone to give me a lift. I knocked all the doors but the only person that would talk to me and help me was the Romanian (Cyrille).

Changes in migration patterns associated with family reunion and in particular the presence of children facilitated the integration of migrants in neighbourhoods. Migrants with children tended to have more extensive local social networks that were embedded in the local school and neighbourhood and had stronger place attachment than migrants without children. Parents were also more likely to participate in local community activities, usually in association with other parents living in the neighbourhood. Migrants with children had developed friendships with other parents from different nationalities as a result of their children playing together and children’s friends visiting each other’s homes.

We have an African family living next door and I can actually call them our friends now, because the little boy they have just absolutely loves playing with my son and they became really good friends and one day the father came round to our place to introduce himself because he saw the children playing together so he wanted to get to know us, and is making me speak English, which is good. They kind of became our good friends, so my husband goes fishing with them and we actually spend time with them (Luiza).

Where I live right now the people are quite nice, they are families which is maybe something which makes the understanding easier because in the summertime the children are playing together (Francine).

There’s an English family whose daughter is friends with my daughter and they one day, for example, pick up both of the girls from school and take my daughter round to theirs, they play together then they drop her off in the evenings. (Luiza).

Polish parents viewed English and Polish parents as less friendly than other parents.
It is the second year that she (daughter) is attending the school and every black parent when they see me they say hello, how are you, they are happy and warm but English people they don’t even look at me...I really don’t want to speak with these ladies (English) just say hello, good morning (Krystyna).

Polish people who take the kids to school they would quickly run away and no one ever stands and talks to anyone. Those African women would even say hello to me, because they recognise me now. They are really friendly (Lidia).

Outside the neighbourhood, workplaces were perceived as ethnically diverse places where migrants had positive encounters with people from different nationalities and British people. Several migrants stated they received practical (work-related) support from colleagues and some had contact with work colleagues outside the workplace on a regular basis. Some migrants relied on work colleagues for emotional support and most thought that it was important to have good relationships with work colleagues.

I wouldn’t go deep into talking about my personal problems at work, but we do support each other within the work environment. But I think that if I did need emotional support, I know I could count on the people who work with me (Ewa).

It’s great to have people you get on well with at work, because the atmosphere is completely different when you’re friends with people. Sometimes I feel I work better with people from other backgrounds rather than Polish people (Ewa).

It was actually the employer, the factory, organising some events for all of the employees, this would usually be then the opportunity to mix with other people. It was mainly Czech, Polish and English. Sometimes they would organise, for example, visiting the local brewery, and they would take everyone and taste some beers (Aleksy).

Those who did not work also emphasised the importance of the workplace for developing more extensive social contacts.

I mainly socialise with Polish people. I think this is because I don’t work. If I work and have a colleague, it doesn’t matter where from, I would probably be friends with them (Krystyna).
Most respondents talked about how they relied on friends and family for emotional and financial support and some stressed the importance of having a family member or close friend nearby they could turn to when they needed someone to talk to.

I don’t have much family here and I have been here for five years without seeing my parents…it helps to have someone…we talk about everything, we help each other, we support each other very much. We talk almost every day (Clémentine).

I have one friend. I can always count on her. She is Polish. She offers emotional support. I don’t like to borrow money. If I really have to I can ask any of my friends and I am sure they will try to help me (Krystyna).

Migrant men were less likely to seek support from others including family members choosing to deal with problems on their own.

I don’t talk about my problems…maybe my wife but I don’t really talk about my problems to people. I am a Christian guy, I pray, that is it…I don’t really show emotions to people. It is private (Georges).

Several respondents talked about turning to friends and family for financial support which sometimes involved asking for money at times of need but more often took other forms including help with childcare and staying with friends and family rent-free. For example, Clémentine, who had to work to pay university fees, explained that she would not have been able to continue with her studies when her parents were unable to support her morally and financially if she was not able to stay with a friend rent-free.

I don’t think if my parents didn’t pray for me I would have coped… I get support financially and morally from them. The moral is so big, that I can’t explain it. The prayers that people have for you, you know I think that’s so important (Clémentine).

The emotional support she received from her parents was also instrumental in her ability to deal with difficulties during times of hardship. Maintaining links with the home country was therefore important for emotional and financial support for some migrants, particularly those who had not been living in the UK for a long time.
I have my friend back in Poland, she is like my sister. We used to work together for a long time and I call my next door neighbour in Poland who is looking after our house at the moment and they are very trustworthy and nice people. (Lidia).

For several participants maintaining ties with their home country took the form of annual or more frequent visits.

We’d like to build a house back in Poland, we have land there. We don’t really want to move back there for good, I think it’s more for us to have somewhere to go when we go on holiday, a place for our children to feel like they have a place that’s like home when they go back (Ewa).

Some migrants also knew they could rely on family in Poland for help with childcare if the needed to do so.

If I got a job there is always the option of bringing my father in law from Poland and he would look after the kids (Ksenia).

Most African migrants on the other hand, were more likely to give support to friends and family in their home country, in the form of remittances, than to receive support. Most had either never visited their home country or had returned once since coming to the UK but maintained that keeping links to the home country were important.

I want my children to know my family. I want my children to know my home (Francine).

Social networks were used by migrants to access services. They enabled the transmission of information about access to services and the benefits system and provided advice and practical support. When asked whether she had experienced any difficulties accessing services Kasia explained that she was able to get by with help from others although she did not speak much English.
When I first arrived, I used to have to ask people for help or use post it notes. My husband’s sister was helping a bit. My husband speaks better English than me (Kasia).

Her experience was echoed by other Polish women. Lidia who came to the UK in 2010 to join her husband maintained ties exclusively with co-ethnics which she attributed to poor language skills and her inability to communicate in English. She lacked confidence and the ability to be independent and her poor language skills influenced her ability to get around on her own which meant she relied on Polish acquaintances and friends and family including her children for help on a day-to-day basis.

If I have to sort things out I usually ask my friend who speaks English and I would always go with her, I do go and sort things out, but I wouldn’t go on my own, I always ask her...The furthest I have been is probably the centre of Manchester... We’ve also been to Heaton Park, a few times. But I would only go there with my husband. I’m scared to go too far on my own. We haven’t got a car so far and that makes it quite difficult sometimes. You need to know which bus goes where and I don’t feel I know that yet (Lidia).

At school Lidia relied on another Polish parent to communicate with teachers and school staff while her children had to rely on other Polish children to interpret although the use of informal interpreters was often inadequate and led to frustration.

If my son doesn’t understand something there is another Polish boy in the group who would translate for him what the teacher is saying but my son is not always happy with what he is saying, he thinks the boy is adding things sometimes or changing them (Lidia).

In contrast, for emotional support she would rely on friends and family in Poland.

I don’t actually think I have anyone close enough that I would confide in. Whenever I don’t feel right I will call someone in Poland (Lidia).
There were more marked differences in expectations about support between African interviewees. Asylum seekers and refugees were more reliant on professionals and voluntary workers working in local charities and community centres for practical support, for instance in terms of finding work and securing accommodation, assisting with asylum applications and benefits claims. Czech Roma interviewees also relied on local agencies to obtain practical information and help with benefits claims and housing assistance. Ana for example, relied on a charity when the house she and her family lived in burned down, for food parcels and for help with applying for a new passport and to reapply for child and housing benefit.

Those who relied on help from outside their family and friends were less likely to draw support from mainstream agencies relying on community and voluntary organisations operating within their neighbourhoods. Asylum seekers and refugees frequently mentioned charity workers as a source of support for matters regarding their asylum applications or benefits claims. Trésor had to rely on a number of charities including the Red Cross to get help with food and transport costs when NASS support was withdrawn and stayed with a charity worker for six months when he became homeless.

Community and voluntary agencies also offered signposting to mainstream services. Migrants tended to find out about learning and training opportunities through speaking with staff and from information leaflets at community venues, for instance at the library, and through word of mouth. Migrant families for instance, received information from other parents or staff at their local school and Sure Start. Although there were mixed views about Jobcentre services, one interviewee had gained work experience as a result of attending a Jobcentre Plus work programme which was the catalyst for movement into paid work. After becoming unemployed he found out about a volunteering opportunity through a tutor he met at a Learn Direct centre while he was learning English who helped him gain work experience, improve his language skills and move into paid work. The same interviewee visited the local library on a regular basis to obtain information and advice and developed ties with a library worker who offered informational support and helped him overcome legal difficulties.

Several interviewees felt that schools, community centres and libraries were important in bringing people together and bringing about a sense of community and unity. Local
community centres and libraries were also places where migrants would access information about local services, for instance, about learning opportunities and housing.

You can find information through leaflets at the library. I find a lot of information through the library. It wasn’t difficult. I didn’t have to ask anyone. I just found it. It is difficult if you stay at home and don’t do anything (Krystyna)

Voluntary groups also run community events that provided opportunities for women to meet other women. Luiza attended a parenting workshop run in Polish aimed at providing support for Eastern European parents and those with poor language skills. She enjoyed the workshop because it provided an opportunity to meet other Polish women living in Manchester who were in a similar position. However, when a similar event was organised by the school which her children attended she did not attend because it was run in English.

Most Roma migrants’ social networks comprised of other Czech Roma, some living in the same neighbourhood. Ana’s only contact with people from other nationalities was at the local community centre where she went to socialise and get information and advice. At the community centre she joined a singing group and took part in other activities for instance, events organised as part of International Women’s Day where she met women from other nationalities, including several Asian women.

Some African migrants were attending a local Church frequently although others attended a Church outside their immediate neighbourhood because the service was in French. Some Polish migrants had also met people at their local church.

I found out about this meeting through the lady in the advice centre when I went there to speak about the benefits. I didn’t have an interpreter and she said that if I wanted one there are meetings in the church where I can meet people who are interpreting. I went there and ended up talking to quite a few English people and the priest (Luiza).

Most Eastern European interviewees living in Cheetham had heard about the local Polish social venue, the Polish Circle club, although they did not visit the club as they
thought it was frequented by the ‘old Polish community’ and was ‘smelly’, ‘in bad condition’, and generally a place that ‘wasn’t very nice’ where Polish people went, got drunk and caused trouble. Krystyna commented that the Polish Circle club didn’t look very nice and was outdated. Aleksy, one of the older interviewees, however suggested that the Polish club was one of the only places in Manchester where Poles could go to socialise and meet other Poles. He had not been elsewhere to socialise with other Poles since its closure.

I liked socialising with people there, you could go and, you know, socialise and have a dance sometimes and drink Polish beer...I met quite a few people, I didn’t actually make friendships that would last long, but people who I did meet on a few occasions after work. A large number of those people, or a part of those people, went back to Poland (Aleksy).

Migrants tended to find out about learning and training opportunities through their local social networks, with schools, children’s centres and facilities playing a central role in the integration of migrant parents and their children. Luiza commented about what she liked about her local school.

I really like the school because I think there is a very individual way of approaching everyone. Everyone knows my children, everyone knows me. I was very worried about my son starting the school and I felt that he was really looked after (Luiza).

Lidia found out about the English language course she was attending through an African man she met at the playground where she went with her children. She had also met other women at ESOL classes.

He was also at the playground, with the kids. Our kids were playing together and we started communicating in broken English, and that’s how I found out about the course... I also socialise in a way with people who are attending the same English course I am attending... There are different nationalities on the course, Pakistani, Ethiopian, Syrian, Sudanese (Lidia).

Some interviewees were involved with local groups and community activities or were in the process of setting up initiatives that aimed to help other migrants and provided links
to wider networks. Some African study participants in particular, had been involved in local groups and associations, community activities and volunteering although these took place outside the local neighbourhood. Cyrille for example, was involved in a project which aimed to encourage ethnic minority participation in sports through football. There were 36 people involved with the project which received funding from the local Council and from the Football Association (FA). In contrast, there were few instances of Polish interviewees stating they had volunteered or taken part in community activities either in their local area or elsewhere. Motivations for volunteering also tended to differ, with Eastern Europeans citing non-altruistic reasons such as gaining work experience as the primary reason for volunteering.

In sum, migrant social networks were highly diversified and migrants in the two neighbourhoods drew from them different types of support in the two neighbourhoods. The presence of community venues within the neighbourhood, children in the family, better English language ability, and access to employment all facilitated the development of inter-ethnic relationships. These factors also influenced a sense of belonging and long-term settlement intentions among migrants in the study.

6.5 Sense of belonging and future intentions

The presence of friendship and kinship networks in the UK were important in making migrants feeling at home and bringing about a sense of belonging. When asked about the factors that made her feel settled in the UK, Krystyna said that it was important to have Polish friends and that ‘without them it would probably be much worse’. Ana commented that after her mother joined her in the UK she felt more settled but meeting her partner was also instrumental in adapting to life in the UK. Another interviewee, Feliks, came to the UK in 2005 to join his brother who was working in Manchester. Following the break-up of his relationship, he had moved in with his parents who had also moved to the UK. He relied heavily on different types of support including practical, financial and emotional support on his family.

Dita who came to the UK from Poland in 2004 and again in 2011 commented that there were few resources and support services for Polish migrants when she first arrived in the UK. This was no longer the case, with Polish migrants in the UK having access to a
variety of resources including Polish satellite television, Polish shops, Polish newspapers and websites aimed at the Polish community in the UK. Samuel also described the changes in the Congolese population in Manchester since he first arrived commenting that encounters with African people were relatively rare and that there were few resources and shops catering for African populations.

The ability to speak English and access employment emerged as the most important factors to feeling settled in the UK and migrants had high expectations of themselves and of other migrants to improve their English language ability.

I know people who are here for about two years and it is not a problem for them to go to the Council and ask for anything. I know people who are living here for five years, and if they go to the shop they don’t know how to ask for bread (Bolek).

You definitely could say that I am in a way settled or rooted here, because of the 7 years I’ve been here. 7 years of work as well...I am aware that the language is the main issue and I would like to pick it up more (Aleksy).

The main fear was about the children, they came here without language, without anything but it looks that they adjusted better than the parents and they learned English (Berta).

English is important to feel at home. The language barrier is big. You can’t hide it when you come here (Berta).

The ability to secure employment also brought about a sense of pride and belonging to many migrants and for some it was instrumental in being able to fit in and feel accepted by the established community.

To me to feel like I am settled in this country I need to get a job...when you work you feel happy, you feel confident, you can do whatever you want. You have got some money, you can go out, you can mix with other people (Georges).

Many people think when you come from somewhere else you are here to claim benefits which is not really true because when you are a migrant your life is not as easy as people think so for me I really like the fact that I work and I earn my life and do what I really want to do (Francine).
For asylum seekers obtaining refugee status and British citizenship were the main factors towards settling in and feeling at home in the UK.

For African people when they come to Europe the biggest priority is to settle down, because you cannot work, you cannot go to school, you cannot do anything like register with a GP and you don’t know how to be stable. As soon as you get your papers you have peace of mind and you feel settled in the country where you are (Jean-Claude).

Some African migrants, particularly those who had lived in the UK for many years did not feel a sense of belonging to their home country.

I don’t behave like them because my mentality has changed...People are not polite...If you are used to living somewhere you behave like the people of where you live...You have another mentality... how to approach people, how to talk to them. It made me see there is a different culture...I feel very proud of my identity. I feel proud to live here because I learned many things (Jean-Claude).

I went back home last year in December, for the first time in five years... I didn’t feel that I was rooted in Africa. I felt that I was a passer by... Coming back in the UK you feel that you are still a passer by. It is a weird feeling (Clémentine).

Other migrants felt that acculturation was a necessary process to feel at home in the UK and achieve economic success emphasising cultural distance as a barrier to integration.

When you come from Africa with another culture and never have been to Europe before it takes a lot to adapt. You have to change deep down especially if you want to succeed... I have some friends who have been here for a while who didn’t want to adapt to the way of living and they haven’t really progressed so sometimes I think if you want to live somewhere you have to kill a little bit of your culture... I don’t want to change deep down but I want to behave in a way that I feel accepted...I found myself changing my accent because I thought if I am speaking with my African accent I am never going to go for an interview. You change your accent, you change your way of doing things...You greet people the same way they greet you and if they don’t smile at you do the same, and I think ever since I am like that it is quite easy (Francine).
Clémentine described how the restrictions attached to her student visa made it difficult for her to feel settled in the UK after her parents became unemployed and she couldn’t work to pay for her university fees or get help elsewhere to finish her degree.

I am comfortable right now compared to when I was studying. I am more settled...I don’t have any issues anymore with my visa. I used to be scared because I hadn’t finished my university, because I didn’t pay my fees on time. You know you are always worried about one thing after another. But now I am more settled because I am working (Clémentine).

The majority of Eastern Europeans in the study had no plans to return to their home countries as they found life to be easier in the UK compared to Poland. The long-term settlement intentions of Eastern European migrants in the study contradict previous accounts of temporary migration patterns among EU Accession nationals (Pollard et al., 2008) and influenced their willingness to adapt to life in the UK. Some interviewees emphasised that they had different motivations to those of earlier migrants who might have come to the UK as temporary migrants.

The Polish people who stayed in the UK they really want to stay here and organise their lives. They didn’t come just to earn some money and go back to Poland. The really want to stay...in the Polish shop, a few years ago you could only find adverts about jobs. Now they put adverts about everything...different kinds of courses, interests, about cars and things like that. I think this is a big change, because lots of people can now speak English, can find a better job and can organise themselves. In the beginning people used to go on holiday to Poland, now they want to spend a holiday in England (Krystyna).

Migrants with children were more likely to state that they would stay in the UK indefinitely. Moving back to Poland was sometimes a retirement aspiration with some stating that they were likely to move to Poland upon retirement or when their children had grown up. Aleksy, who first came to the UK to work on a farm, explained that his decision to settle in the UK and long-term intentions were determined by his family members. He moved to Manchester to be close to family members.
My family’s here so I don’t think I would consider going back...If we do decide to go back it’s probably when we are both retired...I have grandchildren here now, I just can’t imagine living without them and they probably can’t imagine living without their granddad (Aleksy).

Some Polish women said that they did not feel at home in the UK and were hoping to eventually return to Poland but they stated they would stay in the UK to secure a better future for their children.

This is not my dream work, dream place, dream home. So maybe this is why I don’t feel here at home...I would like to live in Poland. I have got a house there but I can’t find work. I am a single mother so here it is fine for me. I have got money for me and my child and a house. In Poland we don’t have this (Dita).

I would like to wait until the children finish school and see whether they want to study here. The children are so used to living here that it would be difficult for them to go back to school in Poland (Ksenia).

Other migrants also struggled with the idea of staying in the UK indefinitely. Less than half of the African migrants participating in the study felt that they would stay in the UK indefinitely and some did not feel they had a choice between returning home or settling in the UK.

I have been in Manchester for five years not because I love Manchester so much but I have no choice financially than to be here (Clémentine).

Future aspirations were often linked to the ability to speak English fluently, secure work and a better future for the children.

I definitely want to learn English, I’d love to speak the language to be more independent to be able to sort my things out. Employment in the future, I would think, but of course that would depend on how independent my children are (Lidia).

I want to work with people, be an advisor. I would like to help people...Of course, be rich, buy a nice house, send my children to good schools and at least once a year to go on a nice holiday and buy a better car. I don’t think I will go back to Poland. Maybe when I get old but for now I am sure I will stay here. There is no reason to go back (Krystyna).
I would like the children to graduate, finish their schools, good schools with good results. I have hopes for the children to maybe study in college (Ksenia).

Roma interviewees claimed they had no intention to return to the Czech Republic due to the high levels of discrimination they had experienced there and the overall better quality of life they have in the UK. They viewed their settlement as permanent and if their families had not joined them already in the UK, they thought other family members were likely to join them in the future. Some Africans on the other hand, expressed the desire to move in the future to their home countries or other countries—for example, in Africa and Canada—where they had relatives.

In sum, migrants’ accounts provided evidence of long-term settlement intentions which were reported by the majority of Eastern European migrants in the study. Employment stability, the ability to speak English and the presence of family were strongly associated with feelings of belonging and intentions to stay in the UK.

6.6 Conclusion

This part of the thesis set out to investigate experiences of deprivation, the neighbourhood environment and the social networks of new immigrants living in deprived neighbourhoods (Objective 3). It provides new data from two local neighbourhoods in Manchester that have attracted large numbers of new immigrants. The qualitative interviews provided evidence about the plurality of experiences of new immigrants living in deprived areas and the range of factors shaping these experiences that can help inform policy developments, particularly in relation of migrant integration and social cohesion. The main findings are presented below in relation to experiences of employment, housing, the neighbourhood environment and social networks. The policy implications of these findings are discussed in the final chapter of the thesis.
6.6.1 Employment

The qualitative interviews provided evidence that migrants living in deprived areas, regardless of differences in their socio-economic circumstances, shared experiences of poverty and poor standards of living. Underemployment, poor employment conditions and prospects and poor pay were common among the study participants. For example, several African migrants had degree level educational qualifications and despite having worked in skilled occupations prior to arriving in the UK and having good English language skills, they were employed in jobs that did not reflect their qualifications and skills. The interview accounts suggested that African migrants faced a number of barriers in the labour market relating to lack of recognition of qualifications, employer discrimination, and poor access to information about job openings through informal avenues such as job referrals. On the other hand, Eastern European migrants were typically employed in low skilled occupations prior to arriving in the UK and had below degree educational qualifications. Polish and Czech study participants felt that poor language skills and lack of qualifications held them back from improving their economic circumstances. Some study participants felt the recession had worsened their employment prospects as there were less employment opportunities and increased fear of unemployment. In line with other studies there were examples of exploitation and cheating of Polish migrants, particularly shortly after arrival in the UK associated with informal recruitment practices and precarious employment with poor working conditions.

Gender and immigration status had a strong influence on employment and economic prospects. Women were found to face multiple barriers in the labour market— their economic position was undermined by poor language and qualifications and childcare responsibilities. The majority of Polish women in the study, for example, were either not employed or were working part-time due to childcare commitments. Several women reported experiencing financial difficulties in the past and often depended on income support and housing benefit to get by, at least until they were able to return to work. Volunteering opportunities for asylum seekers and women with childcare responsibilities facilitated movement into paid work and these were typically accessed through voluntary, community and faith organizations.
Several of the study participants suggested that experiences of unemployment had left them and their families destitute after being unable to exercise their rights to access benefits to which they were legally entitled to. The destitution experienced by asylum seekers as a result of restrictions to work and the withdrawal of statutory support had left them isolated. In some cases, the lack of inter-ethnic ties among migrants in the study was associated with more limited employment prospects in terms of pay and skills but also lower education levels and language proficiency.

Migrants in employment typically had more extensive social networks and work colleagues were a source of practical, emotional and sometimes financial support. Local informants working in charities helping disadvantaged migrants suggested that many Eastern Europeans were left disillusioned by their experiences in the UK, after becoming unemployed and without being able to claim benefits and experienced homelessness as a result. There were several examples of migrants being refused benefits and being discouraged from appealing because they could not find their way through the bureaucratic processes involved in accessing the benefits system. Such incidents seem to be commonplace whereby benefits claims by EU nationals are being dismissed according to the "right to reside" benefits test, introduced by the Labour Government and adopted by the Conservatives. In May 2013, media reports 51 52 53 highlighted the "right to reside" benefits test as being in breach of EU law after the European Commission took Britain to court for denying EU immigrants their right to claim unemployment and family benefits. Lack of human capital resources and institutional discrimination associated with access to welfare emerged as the strongest determinants of economic disadvantage among Polish migrants.

6.6.2 Housing and the neighbourhood environment

The qualitative interviews indicated that housing and the neighbourhood environment impacted on migrants’ experiences in different ways (RQ6). Migrants reported mixed housing experiences and aspirations (RQ7)—some were satisfied with their housing

53http://uk.reuters.com/article/2013/05/30/uk-britain-europe-court-idUKBRE94T09R20130530.
conditions while others lived in poor housing conditions and were waiting to be re-housed. Those who expressed satisfaction with their current accommodation were more likely to state their housing conditions had improved since arriving in the UK. This sometimes involved a move from poor quality, unsuitable and insecure private housing to family accommodation in social housing. Several of the study participants including Polish migrants were in low income family households with one earner. In Polish households, women typically were not working due to childcare commitments. This meant that they could not afford family housing in the private rented sector. The housing trajectories of migrants suggested that family reunion was associated with improved housing conditions and aspirations, for instance, with a move from temporary shared accommodation characterised by poor conditions to more permanent accommodation after the arrival of family members in the UK. Migrants in families were motivated to improve their socio-economic circumstances to provide a better life for their family and a more secure future for their children. The role of family reunion for immigrant integration and cohesion suggests that immigrants living in the UK should be supported by the UK Government to be joined by family members.

The presence of social housing in the neighbourhood was attractive for some migrants wishing to improve their housing position. For example, for several Polish women, a move from the private sector to the social housing sector offered better housing prospects including housing options in terms of better housing quality and condition and a way of entering owner-occupation and the Right-to-Buy sector. This was more evident among those with long-term settlement intentions, particularly among Polish migrants who had no plans to return to their home country as they found life to be easier in the UK compared to Poland and because it offered a more secure future for their children. Access to better quality and larger accommodation was the main reason for a planned move among those who stated they were likely to move to a different area in the future. This suggests housing mix, in terms of good quality and affordable private and social housing including family housing, are attractive neighbourhood features for new migrants.

The neighbourhood experiences of migrants in the two neighbourhoods were influenced by the availability of community facilities and services in the wider neighbourhood although these mattered to some migrants more than others. The availability of services
and facilities in the local neighbourhood were not just linked to neighbourhood satisfaction, they offered opportunities for personal development and acted as a source of informational and practical support. For instance, several migrants, particularly women accessed language courses within their wider neighbourhood. Changes in the provision of ESOL offered in local community centres and colleges meant that there were fewer opportunities for women to develop their language skills to socialise and establish personal relationships. The local neighbourhood was typically more important for migrant women as most accessed information about education, training and employment opportunities within the neighbourhood. Asylum seekers and particularly those who had their asylum support withdrawn, relied heavily on charities and voluntary and community organisations for support, some within their local neighbourhood but more typically accessed these services city-wide.

Migrants’ accounts of experiences of crime and harassment in the neighbourhood alluded to intergenerational rather than ethnic divisions, with neighbourhood experiences and perceptions about crime shaped by factors relating to age, deprivation and neighbourhood reputation. Neighbourhood deprivation was seen as a localised phenomenon, restricted to certain parts of the neighbourhood that were characterised by dilapidated housing, environmental degradation and crime. Negative perceptions about crime in the two neighbourhoods were linked to fear of crime and poor neighbourhood reputation rather than experiences of crime. Overall, migrants living in Cheetham were more likely to express dissatisfaction with Cheetham and state that they were likely to move out to a quieter area. In contrast, study participants in Gorton had no aspirations to live elsewhere. Gorton was seen as a family friendly, quiet and safe neighbourhood having many positive neighbourhood features including schools, playgrounds, shops and neighbourhood facilities.

6.6.3 Social networks and perceptions of cohesion

The analysis presented in this chapter sought to examine the nature of migrants’ social networks and the types of support they draw from them (RQ5). The qualitative interviews suggested the presence of social networks had a strong influence on the experiences of migrants, from the decision to migrate, residential location decisions,
housing and employment outcomes. For most immigrants, the presence of social networks was strongly linked to migration decisions and motivations to move to the two neighbourhoods. Asylum seekers were the exception since they generally moved to the UK without having pre-existing social networks. Asylum seekers based their migration decisions on perceptions about their chances of acceptance as asylum seekers although the interview accounts provided evidence that subsequent location decisions were influenced by the presence of co-ethnics, usually other asylum seekers.

Social networks were important for all migrants in the study in terms of promoting the sharing of information about residential location, housing and employment opportunities and for place attachment, fostering a sense of belonging. The study participants relied heavily on their social networks to tackle problems related to deprivation, for example, to obtain financial and practical support including information on how to access services and the benefits system. More typically, migrants relied on their partners, other family members and friends for emotional support and these networks often extended beyond the local neighbourhood. Some migrants had few ties within and outside the neighbourhood than others and felt isolated, particularly some asylum seekers and women who had recently joined their partners and husbands in the UK. The interview accounts provided evidence about the role of bonding networks in transmitting information about employment that helped vulnerable migrants make the transition from unemployment to employment or secure better employment conditions.

Neighbours were a source of practical support. Despite relations with neighbours typically being weak and casual, most respondents thought that they could rely on neighbours for help if needed although they would turn to other migrants rather than English neighbours when they needed help. Men were more likely to use their social networks for practical support while women were more likely to use their networks for emotional support. Transnational networks were sometimes important for providing emotional support but less important for providing financial and practical support.

The interviews suggested that the social networks individual migrants were embedded in were highly heterogeneous and dynamic and that different migrants drew different types of support from their networks. The networks of migrants had changed over time. EU Accession migrants were embedded in co-ethnic social networks upon arrival in the UK but changes in employment were often associated with more mixed social networks.
Polish migrants relied on support from family members including spouses and parents who had joined them in the UK. Roma migrants who came to the UK to escape discrimination in the labour market and society in their home countries had also been joined by family members and relied heavily on close-knit family and friend networks for different types of support.

Migrants in the study reported mixed experiences and encounters with their co-ethnics, other migrants and British people. The accounts of asylum seekers without refugee status and of those who had waited to obtain refugee status for a long time, suggested that uncertainties regarding immigration status and poverty undermined their ability to form ties and their attachment to their local area. Experiences of deprivation and discrimination hindered the ability of migrants to form social relationships. Migrant social networks were less likely to include White British people and most migrants perceived English people as having negative attitudes towards migrants. Africans were also more likely to state that they had faced discrimination from White British people.

The qualitative interviews suggested that the development of social relationships within the neighbourhood was facilitated by the availability and accessibility of facilities and services within the neighbourhood and the presence of family. The presence of family and children was associated with stronger local ties, neighbourhood attachment and social integration. Migrants with children tended to have more social interactions with other nationalities locally, for example in schools, parks and children’s facilities and the presence of children had facilitated inter-ethnic friendships with neighbours. Similarly, the local community infrastructure provided opportunities for people to come together in the neighbourhood, to meet people from different backgrounds and develop friendships. Inter-ethnic links were developed within the neighbourhood at colleges and community centres where several migrants, particularly women accessed ESOL and other courses. Local community and voluntary organisations working with migrants were also instrumental in providing support to more vulnerable and isolated migrant groups such as asylum seekers, refugees and Roma migrants by creating opportunities to meet others. Voluntary sector and community workers offered support by providing important information and advice on immigration matters and life in the UK.

In both areas most immigrants had ties mainly with co-ethnics and contact with neighbours was limited and restricted to casual encounters. British neighbours were
generally perceived as unfriendly and unwilling to mix with migrants. Polish social networks comprised mainly other Polish migrants although Polish migrants were also found to have negative attitudes towards their own community that were fraught with suspicion and wariness. They were also more likely than other interviewees to view other ethnic groups with mistrust and suspicion particularly Asians, and particularly in Cheetham, where there were frequent expressions of anti-Muslim sentiment and negative attitudes towards Asians. At the same time, Polish migrants had more positive attitudes towards black groups suggesting stereotyping behaviour on the basis of culture and religion rather than race. The large presence and visibility of Asian ethnic minorities in Cheetham and the lack of social contact between Polish migrants and members of the Asian community may help explain feelings of resentment and prejudices expressed in the interviews. In Cheetham, the lack of contact between ethnic groups is likely to reflect the lack of opportunities for different communities to interact, with most services and activities targeting specific ethnic groups rather than the whole community.

Czech Roma migrants had the least contact with people outside the Czech Roma community suggesting a degree of network closure that can be attributed to past experiences of racism and hostility. African migrants had contact with other migrants not necessarily from the same countries of origin but on the basis of shared ethnicity, language or culture although there was evidence that experiences of discrimination limited interactions with white groups.

Migrant accounts of ethnic diversity in the immediate neighbourhood defined by the home suggested that migrants in Cheetham were less likely to have White British neighbours compared to migrants in Gorton. There was also some indication that the presence of other Polish migrants in the area may discourage contacts outside the Polish community and impose cultural norms and expectations, for instance about inter-ethnic relationships.

These findings suggest that patterns of interaction between different groups and behaviours and attitudes towards others vary significantly between different migrants and depend on a variety of factors including gender, ethnicity, migration status, life stage and the local community infrastructure.
The accounts of the experiences of the study participants also suggest that migrants draw on bonding (within-group) ties to get by and get ahead—the emotional, financial and informational support they received from friends and family enhanced employment and housing prospects and improved their socio-economic circumstances. Bridging (between-group) ties offered different sources of support to different migrants and were not always beneficial.

As highlighted by Ryan et al. (2009), migrants embedded in ethnic networks characterised by strong bonding ties who acquire language skills may be able to use these to develop weak ties that extend beyond ethnic networks. This study suggests that bonding and bridging ties are not mutually exclusive—strong bonding ties provide a springboard to develop bridging ties that help migrants get ahead (McCabe et al., 2013). Equally, ethnicity or nationality does not necessarily provide the basis for bonding ties—other factors such as the shared experience of immigration or seeking asylum were more important in building friendships and social connections (Atfield et al., 2007). Social trust took many different forms although it was mainly specific to individuals, rather than the local community. Interactions with neighbours suggested that ethnic diversity within the neighbourhood did not necessarily encourage inter-ethnic interactions.

The ethnic diversity of Cheetham was seen as a positive neighbourhood feature by several African participants, particularly asylum seekers who generally valued the diversity of the area and many migrants had ties within the area prior to living there. There were some examples of meaningful personal relationships in the neighbourhood beyond casual and superficial contact such as greeting neighbours although even simple greeting exchanges were seen as positive neighbourhood features linked to a better quality of life. These findings challenge the emphasis on the self-segregation of migrants and its role in limiting social cohesion in community cohesion discourses. The limited social contact migrants had with people from other nationalities within their neighbourhood was not an outcome of choice. It reflected the constraints they faced such as poor language skills, experiences of poverty, hostility and discrimination.
7. Discussion

This thesis has set out to explore the settlement patterns and experiences of new immigrants in England drawing on concepts of place, deprivation and social networks. The research highlights the diverse circumstances of new immigrants in terms of settlement patterns, the labour market and lived experiences and the ways these are shaped by place characteristics. The findings challenge some common perceptions about new immigrants and they have clear implications for both national and local policies, particularly in terms of the integration of immigrants and their impact on local neighbourhoods and communities.

7.1 Dimensions and determinants of integration

This section discusses the implications of the main study findings for the integration of new immigrants—the main factors underpinning integration experiences and how these are affected by the current policy context. The discussion focuses on three interrelated factors that facilitate integration—language, employment and social networks.

7.1.1 Language

As highlighted by other studies, language was the main ‘facilitator of integration’ for migrants (Ager and Strang, 2004; 2008). Study participants felt that poor language skills held them back from improving their economic circumstances and prevented them from establishing friendships outside their own community (chapter 6). Several study participants had degree level qualifications but were employed in jobs that did not match their qualifications. English language proficiency and lack of recognition of foreign qualifications by employers were the main barriers to successful integration in the labour market. The qualitative interviews suggested that recent changes in ESOL provision are creating barriers towards learning English and have hit hardest those in most need particularly those who are out of work. In both neighbourhoods, there was evidence of long waiting lists and competition for ESOL classes. Lack of adequate funding to meet increased demand for ESOL and long waiting lists for ESOL classes.
across the UK have been reported for some time (LSC, 2006). The interviews suggested that the withdrawal of automatic fee remission from ESOL courses has discouraged participation in English language learning. The insufficient provision of suitable and affordable ESOL classes associated with a shortage of funding hindered the development of language skills among migrants and also created some tensions over eligibility and resentment towards groups who had fee-free access to ESOL. Many migrant women were unable to access ESOL courses because courses were over-subscribed or they were unable to afford course fees and this hindered their ability to improve language skills which in turn affected their ability to secure jobs and make a place for themselves in the UK (chapter 6).

The provision of language courses in the local area also enabled women, particularly Eastern European women, to come into contact with other women from different nationalities and ethnic backgrounds and establish friendships in the neighbourhood (chapter 6). Language was the most frequently cited barrier towards inter-ethnic contact and social interaction between different groups in the two neighbourhoods. The absence of contact with people of different ethnic identities and nationalities is likely to have sustained prejudices among ethnic and religious groups (chapter 6). This highlights the importance of language in promoting social interaction and for fostering understanding and good relations between different groups. Eastern Europeans cited language as one of the main reasons not just for the absence of meaningful relationships with other groups but also for their low participation in voluntary and community activities. Work and family commitments including lack of access to affordable childcare was another main barrier to accessing ESOL, training and education. This needs to be reflected in funding allocation for ESOL classes to ensure new migrants can access low cost and flexible learning options that meet their needs including childcare responsibilities and working arrangements. The cuts in government funding for ESOL and the introduction of fees for migrant learners seems to be impacting negatively on access to language courses and to have created disincentives for English course providers towards improving and expanding current provision.

The provision for language support in schools has also been affected by government funding cuts. The changes in the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG) that has been used to support pupils with English as an Additional Language (EAL), including
Roma pupils in Gorton, mean that English language support in schools may not be available to ensure schools are responsive to the needs of new immigrants (Lever, 2012). In particular, the mainstreaming of EMAG and the removal of its ring-fencing means that schools are likely to reduce the provision of support services for pupils with English language difficulties and use their existing funding for different purposes.

The experience of schools in Gorton with Roma students suggests that there is a need for dedicated staff and resources to ensure the successful integration of Roma children and prevent the disruption of services for other children. Lack of provision for new immigrants and their children in learning English will undoubtedly impact on their educational achievement in the future and their socio-economic integration in the UK labour market and society. Some Polish respondents relied on family and social networks to communicate with teachers and school staff while their children had to rely on other Polish children to interpret although the use of informal interpreters was often inadequate and led to frustration.

The Coalition Government’s vision for a Big Society is committed to helping people to come together to improve their own lives (Cabinet Office, 2010). This can only be achieved if there is support for people and community organisations to meet the needs of their areas. The Government will need to ensure that there are structures and resources in place to enable community capacity building. Ensuring that the language needs of the increasingly diverse population including those of vulnerable groups are met should be a main priority if cultural differences which are creating tensions between communities are to be managed and negotiated. The interviews for example, highlighted tensions from competition for neighbourhood resources, for example ESOL courses, tensions over litter and cleanliness and even when there was no evidence about community tensions, prejudices seemed to be keeping different groups from mixing.

7.1.2 Employment

One of the main objectives of the research was to examine the experiences of new immigrants in the labour market, specifically whether new immigrants are economically disadvantaged due to poorer access to the labour market and whether their experiences
differ from other groups including those of migrants from more established ethnic
groups. The results of the multilevel modelling regression (chapter 4) showed
significant variation in the experiences of immigrants in the labour market by country of
origin and ethnicity. There were marked differences between white and non-white
groups, with non-white immigrants both from established and new immigrant groups
found to be the most disadvantaged in the labour market. The Bangladeshi and Pakistani
immigrant groups were the most disadvantaged facing the highest risk of worklessness
among groups although non-white immigrants originating in countries outside the
Commonwealth were equally disadvantaged in the labour market. The study therefore
provides strong evidence for the presence of ‘ethnic penalties’ in the labour market
which remain after controlling for other factors that affect employment outcomes
including age, sex and education (Heath and Cheung, 2006).

The higher incidence of worklessness among ethnic minorities and non-white
immigrants suggests that these groups continue to face barriers in the labour market that
may relate to employer discrimination. Experiences of unemployment among the study
participants were widespread even among the most highly qualified. Some respondents
were left disillusioned after they were not offered any interviews by prospective
employers despite rigorous job application efforts while others felt the recession had
impacted negatively on their ability to secure employment (chapter 6). There is some
support for the persistence of employer discrimination towards ethnic minorities in the
UK, with recent studies providing evidence of discriminatory practices among
employers including recruitment practices that are less favourable towards ethnic
minorities (Heath and Cheung, 2006; Wood et al., 2009).

The qualitative interviews provided some evidence of racial discrimination in the
workplace. African interviewees were employed in positions well below their skills, and
in their view, had few prospects of improving their employment situation as a result of
informal recruitment practices among white work colleagues and managers. The lack of
career progression opportunities reflected barriers towards accessing information about
job openings from British colleagues who shared information among each other. There
were also some examples of unequal treatment and discrimination by employers; for
example a Black African woman was harassed by a manager for her accent and, as a
result was forced to quit her employment (see chapter 6). The passing of information
about career progression opportunities was seen to give an advantage to White British
employees over non-white foreign born employees. This suggests that the implementation of anti-discrimination policies may not tackle effectively discrimination in the workplace. Positive action provisions under the Equality Act 2010 relating to recruitment and promotion can, however, be used to tackle discrimination and inequality in the workplace, increasing awareness of the value of positive action in the workplace. In a recent review on employer attitudes and behaviour, Hudson and Radu (2011) highlighted the need for increased awareness among employers about the existence of informal practices and their role in perpetuating racial discrimination. They also emphasised the need for further research into the role of informal processes in the promotion process and organisational cultures.

Volunteering among migrant groups facing increased barriers in the labour market, for instance asylum seekers and women with childcare responsibilities, was seen as a catalyst for movement into paid work. Through volunteering, study participants gained new skills and improved their language ability and gained work experience and confidence to move into paid work. This suggests that voluntary, community and faith organisations play an important role in the economic integration of migrants, particularly of those facing multiple barriers to entering employment, and should be supported to secure funding to offer volunteering opportunities that are accessible to migrants.

Despite evidence of high skills levels among some migrants—particularly African migrants—their occupational position and salary did not seem to reflect their qualifications and previous work experience. This may suggest that factors related to skills acquired abroad, for example differences in the quality of education received and lack of recognition of qualifications, as well as discrimination, may restrict the socio-economic mobility of skilled African migrants. Early evidence from the 2011 Census seems to support the proposition that members of the Black African ethnic minority group face poorer economic prospects than white groups (Nazroo and Kapadia, 2013) despite being more likely to hold university degrees (Lymperopoulou and Parameshwaran, 2014). The experiences of skilled migrants in the study suggest that there is a need for systems for the recognition of foreign academic qualifications to ensure that foreign qualifications are transferable and the skills of migrants are not underutilised.
The disadvantage of Black Africans may also reflect restrictions to employment imposed by their immigration status. Even though the majority of new immigrants enter the UK through the work and study route, the number of African migrants who claim asylum is higher than for other groups as asylum is one of the only legal routes of entry for Africans to the UK (Styan, 2003). The experiences of Black Africans who arrived in the UK as asylum seekers (chapter 6) were influenced by their immigration status in a profound way. Refugees faced multiple sources of disadvantage in the labour market including deprivation and mental health problems that were intensified after arriving in the UK as a result of the conditions they faced as asylum seekers (chapter 6). Many were also unable to transfer their qualifications and obtain jobs that matched their skills to improve their economic circumstances after they obtained refugee status. This is consistent with findings from other studies suggesting restrictions to work imposed on asylum seekers upon arrival often persist after they are granted refugee status as a result of discrimination (Bloch, 2000; Sanderson, 2006; CRESR, 2003, Phillimore and Goodson, 2006). As highlighted by studies of refugees, successful integration in the labour market will require reform to employment restrictions on asylum seekers alongside targeted employment programmes that are sensitive to the complex situations asylum seekers face (see Phillimore and Goodson, 2006).

This study provided mixed evidence about the experiences of EU Accession migrants in the labour market—even though they were found to be more likely to be in employment than other migrant groups (chapter 4) they were at least as likely to experience poor pay, poor working conditions and economic hardship as other groups (chapter 6). Eastern Europeans participating in the study tended to be less well qualified and be employed in lower skilled occupations prior to arriving in the UK compared with Africans. The 2011 Census offers support for the variation in the educational attainment of new immigrants with the proportion of EU Accession migrants with degree level qualifications shown to be well below that of African migrants who are among the highest qualified groups in the UK (Lymperopoulou and Parameshwaran, 2014). The accounts of the Czech Roma study participants suggested that they were particularly disadvantaged in the labour market, unable to break out of temporary, part-time, low skilled and low pay employment. Employment brought about a sense of identity, belonging and self-worth to several migrants participating in the study. It also facilitated
interaction between ethnic groups but experiences of deprivation and destitution—even among migrant workers—had left many disillusioned with their employment prospects in the UK.

The accounts of women migrants participating in the study suggested that they faced barriers in accessing employment as a result of lack of affordable childcare which meant that they could either not work or only work part-time. This placed a strain on their household income and left them depending on government assistance to get by, at least until they were able to return to work. The qualitative interviews provided evidence of institutional discrimination associated with Eastern European migrants’ access to welfare which intensified their disadvantage further. There were, for instance, examples of migrants being refused benefits and being discouraged from appealing because they could not find their way through the bureaucratic processes involved in accessing the benefits system (Chapter 6).

The migrants’ accounts in this study challenge common perceptions about migrant ‘benefits tourists’—there was no evidence that migrants were motivated to settle in Britain by the prospect of state largesse, or that those receiving benefits had stayed on benefits for a long time. On the contrary, restrictions imposed migrants accessing benefits at times of unemployment threatened to leave migrants and their families in poverty and created barriers to returning to work.

7.1.3 Social networks, family formation and reunion

As shown by previous studies (for example, Ryan et al., 2008), the nature of social networks and types of support available to migrants depend on a variety of factors including gender, ethnicity, migration status and life stage. Social networks were important for all the study participants in terms of promoting the sharing of information about residential location, housing and employment opportunities, for place attachment, and in terms of fostering a sense of belonging. There was also evidence that migrants relied on different people for different types of support—both within and outside their immediate neighbourhood (chapter 6). There was variation in the way the study participants utilised transnational networks and the nature of these networks differed
from those of migrants from established groups in a number of respects. South Asian migrants are generally embedded in tight knit kinship networks characterised by feelings of obligation and loyalty to family members in their home countries (Ballard, 2000). These obligations are maintained through a number of practices including transnational marriages and migration is seen as a vehicle for improving the position of the immediate and extended family, not just the lives of migrants themselves (Shaw, 2001, p.328). The accounts of migrants in the study did not suggest that they had maintained strong links with their home country and the presence of transnational networks played a very different role. The findings from the qualitative interviews suggested that these networks were sometimes important for providing emotional support but less important for providing financial and practical support. The study respondents relied heavily on kinship networks within the UK for all types of support including informational, emotional and financial support. Emotional support drawn from kinship networks was instrumental for coping during periods of economic hardship or at times of uncertainty over their legal status and provided motivation for day to day survival and for wanting to succeed in Britain, for example to obtain employment and study for degree level qualifications.

The lower importance of transnational networks as a source of social support is not surprising given that many participants in the study had been joined by their families in the UK. As shown by previous studies, migrants rely heavily on transnational networks at the early stages of migration but with time these networks shift and become predominantly localized (Ryan, 2007; Ryan et al., 2009). The kinship networks of African migrants were generally more extensive—perhaps reflecting the different household structure of African migrants in the study, absence of family in the UK and fictive kin ties— and often transcended many countries including Africa, Europe and the Americas. Some Africans in the study had come to the UK from Belgium and France and had maintained links with relatives in these countries through frequent visits. The nature of transnational networks sometimes influenced future intentions; for instance, some African migrants expressed the desire to move in the future to other countries such as Canada or South Africa, to take advantage of family and friendship ties.
Over the last decade or so, there has been growing interest in new immigration to the UK—particularly from the EU Accession countries which accounts for 15% of the foreign born population in England and Wales according to the 2011 Census. A large study by IPPR found that the majority of post-Accession immigrants were young, without dependents, and drawn to Britain for economic reasons on a temporary or seasonal basis (Pollard et al., 2008). More recent evidence suggested more diversified migration strategies among EU Accession migrants than before that include both temporary and permanent settlement patterns (Spencer et al., 2007; Eade et al., 2006; Ryan et al., 2008; Burrell, 2009).

The evidence from the qualitative interviews in the two neighbourhoods in Manchester provided examples of changing migration motivations and settlement patterns over time with family formation and reunion being the main factor behind long-term settlement. Polish migrants in the study were mainly in family units, with migrants either arriving in the UK to join family members or being joined by family members following their arrival. The migration histories of Polish migrants in the study provide evidence of secondary migration processes—women, children and parents joined men who initially migrated alone to take up temporary employment in the UK.

As shown by literature on previous migrants, the formation of kinship networks enabled the passing of information about employment and housing and served to attract new migrants who chose to live in proximity with each other to help ease the transition process (Anwar, 1979). In the same way that the early post war immigrants from the Commonwealth countries were instrumental in providing assistance for family members which instigated a process of chain migration (Ballard, 2000) migration from Central and Eastern Europe has changed from primary migration defined by labour migration and temporary settlement patterns to secondary migration associated with family reunion and permanent settlement patterns. Secondary migrants would be expected to differ in terms of their socio-economic characteristics, for instance in terms of education, language ability and employment than primary labour migrants. This seems to be the case for some of the female respondents who joined their partners in the UK but were unable to work because of childcare commitments. This has implications for local areas in terms of demand for services, at least in the short–term —for example, in the absence of affordable childcare provision, welfare services are likely to increase as migrants are reunited by family members.
The prevalence of permanent settlement intentions among Polish migrants in this study contradicts expectations that new immigration, particularly from within Europe, is likely to be temporary or circular as a result of improvements in transport links and the declining cost of travel (Favell, 2008; Clark and Drinkwater, 2008; Finch et al., 2009). There was some evidence of circular migration but most migrants, particularly family migrants, reported long-term settlement intentions. Family reunion was also the main migration strategy among Czech Roma interviewees. This is in line with reported patterns of Roma settlement organised around kinship groups comprising of extended households and family networks (Matras et al., 2009). In contrast, the residential trajectories of African migrants suggested that initial location decisions were not determined by the presence of family and friends. Asylum seekers relocated and placed by NASS in assisted housing, subsequently moving to Manchester to be with friends and family after government assistance for most asylum seekers was withdrawn. However, once they were granted refugee status they were likely to be joined by family members.

The presence of family members and children in the UK was associated with long-term settlement intentions and these were influenced by considerations about children’s schooling and future opportunities. The presence of family in the neighbourhood facilitated stronger local ties, neighbourhood attachment and social integration. Migrants with children tended to have more social interactions with people from other nationalities locally—in schools, colleges, parks and children’s facilities—and the presence of children facilitated inter-ethnic friendships with neighbours (chapter 6).

Family reunion was also associated with improved living conditions and raised aspirations. Migrants in families were motivated to improve their socio-economic circumstances to provide a better life for their family and a more secure future for their children. This was often linked with improved housing conditions and entailed for instance, moving from temporary shared accommodation characterised by poor conditions to more permanent accommodation after the arrival of family members in the UK. The increasing role of family formation and reunion in Polish migration suggested by this study and the role played by children in integrating migrants into neighbourhoods suggests that the changes in migration dynamics have important implications for integration and cohesion in local neighbourhoods.
This study suggests that family reunion is a key determinant of the integration experiences of new immigrants living in deprived areas. It is therefore important that immigration policies consider the implications of conditions of entry, residence and rights relating to family reunion for the socio-economic integration of migrants. The tightening of restrictions for family migrants and the stricter eligibility criteria introduced by the Coalition Government in 2012 for the dependents of migrants living in the UK mean however, that it is increasingly difficult for migrants to be joined by their families (Gower, 2012).

7.2 Place, social networks and migrants’ experiences

This study provides new insights about the ways in which the experiences of new immigrants living in deprived areas relate to their social networks and how they are shaped by place (Objective 3).

Migrant networks tended to be geographically dispersed although they comprised predominantly of migrants sharing the same nationality. The immediate neighbourhood was more important for migrant women who generally had more extensive networks locally, and least important for asylum seekers compared to other migrant groups who were generally less likely to be embedded in local networks.

The findings of this study support the view that the neighbourhood context can influence economic outcomes (chapter 4). The multilevel modelling results showed that migrants living in the most deprived areas and areas with large ethnic minority concentrations were more likely to be workless. This may relate to the nature of social networks in deprived neighbourhoods as there are fewer employed people (including co-ethnics) in these areas that can pass on information about employment opportunities (see chapter 2 for a discussion). Most migrant groups (and non-migrants) by virtue of living in the most deprived areas are more likely to be out of work (chapter 4). The effect of living in a deprived area on employment prospects was shown to depend on ethnic and country of birth identity with the Bangladeshi and Pakistani and Indian groups found to be less disadvantaged than white British people if they live in deprived areas. This suggests that these groups may be living in deprived areas despite having various economic resources available, perhaps due to motives like proximity to ethnic
networks and cheap housing. The employment disadvantage of some immigrants living in ethnically diverse areas may be the result of limited contact with British people restricting their access to information about employment opportunities.

The analysis on the location choices of immigrants (chapter 3) showed that migrants originating in Asia were more likely to move to ethnically dense areas than other migrant groups. The concentration of Bangladeshi and Pakistani ethnic minorities, in ethnically diverse deprived areas is thought to be the outcome of persistent discrimination, deprivation and social exclusion although preference for living among co-ethnics and migration patterns have also played a role in reinforcing these patterns (Phillips and Harrison, 2010; Peach, 1998). Recent immigrants from Bangladesh and Pakistan may therefore move and stay in these areas not just to benefit from ethnic community resources and services but as a means of protection from discrimination. These propositions should be tested in future investigations of the outcomes of immigrants in the labour market—for example by providing alternative measurements of ethnic concentrations and networks that can better capture these effects. Qualitative studies focusing on the experiences of recent immigrants from both new and established groups can fill existing knowledge gaps about the causal pathways by which the neighbourhood context may shape economic outcomes. Despite the significant contextual effects found in this study (chapter 4), it is not possible to eliminate the influence of selection effects arising from the higher likelihood of economically disadvantaged immigrants concentrating in deprived areas.

Migrants’ accounts of relationships with neighbours (chapter 6) suggested that ethnic diversity within the immediate neighbourhood did not necessarily encourage inter-ethnic interactions. There were some examples of meaningful personal relationships between people from different ethnic groups in the neighbourhood but the accounts provided more evidence of casual and superficial contact between neighbours. Even though this type of contact often took the form of a simple exchange of greetings and favours between neighbours or support in an emergency—typically what constitutes neighbourliness (Bridge, 2002)—it was seen as a positive neighbourhood feature by most respondents, linked to a better quality of life in the neighbourhood. The qualitative interviews provided evidence about the ways the neighbourhood context influenced migrants’ experiences of integration in relation to their ability to form social networks.
In both areas, the immediate neighbourhood defined by the home was more important in terms of fostering attachment and belonging and making connections with others as suggested by previous studies (Kearns and Parkinson, 2001). The wider neighbourhood context, for instance the quality of services and facilities in the locality were less important in location decisions although this influenced neighbourhood satisfaction. For example, the availability of children’s facilities and playgrounds and parks were important neighbourhood aspects for migrants with children (chapter 6).

Cheetham was seen as an area of choice for African migrants, particularly asylum seekers who generally valued the diversity of the area and had ties within the area prior to living there. At the same time, migrants’ accounts suggested that there were lower levels of trust with neighbours in Cheetham compared to Gorton. Fear of crime in Cheetham was associated with neighbourhood dissatisfaction and this was linked to the area’s poor reputation rather than experiences of crime. Overall, migrants living in Cheetham were more likely to express neighbourhood dissatisfaction and state that they were likely to move out to a quieter area. Some Polish migrants in Cheetham explicitly stated they were likely to move to a less ethnically diverse area. In contrast, the majority of interviewees in Gorton had no aspirations to live elsewhere. Gorton was seen as a more family friendly and quiet neighbourhood and perceived to have attributes that enabled social interaction and integration, including safety and security (Ager and Strang, 2004; 2008; Forrest and Kearns, 1999).

Despite the high ethnic diversity levels in Cheetham there seemed to be fewer opportunities for contact between migrants and White British people. Migrants’ accounts of ethnic diversity in their immediate neighbourhood defined by the home suggested that those living in Cheetham were less likely to have any White British neighbours compared to those living in Gorton. There was also some indication that the presence of other Polish migrants in the area may discourage contacts outside the Polish community and impose cultural norms and expectations, for instance about inter-ethnic relationships. Several respondents for example, expressed disapproval of relationships between Polish women and Asian men based on beliefs that women were mistreated by Muslim men. This idea follows general collective socialization theories that are concerned with the influence of social groups on individuals’ attitudes, values and behaviours that would be expected to become a norm in areas with high concentrations
of migrants living in close proximity to each other (Smets and Den Uyl, 2008; Galster, 2012). In these areas, social pressure would discourage interethnic contact and the development of mixed relationships.

Neighbourhood deprivation also manifested in poor shared spaces such as parks and recreational facilities, particularly in Cheetham which are needed for the development of inter-ethnic social ties within the neighbourhood (Hickman et al., 2008). Local informants suggested that divisions in Cheetham along ethnic lines may be attributed to the lack of places and activities that promote social interaction between communities within the neighbourhood. Despite the large number of community based activities in Cheetham there were few examples of activities aimed at people from different ethnic backgrounds. Local community organizations can play an important role in facilitating greater interaction between groups by promoting myth busting, shared cultural learning and the building of positive relations. This has been done with good effect in the past in Gorton where community and voluntary organizations targeted efforts to create opportunities for positive encounters and encourage conversations between established residents and asylum seekers. In Gorton, cohesion issues were also identified as stemming from tensions between the Roma and established communities that were addressed through multi-agency partnership work directed by strategic and political leadership from Manchester City Council (Lever, 2012). Government funding cuts are likely to undermine the continuation of such activities in local areas that have the potential to contribute to improved relations between different community groups.

### 7.3 New immigration, housing and neighbourhood renewal

The study contributes to a better understanding of the settlement patterns of immigrants by identifying the factors that attract new immigrants to particular localities (Objective 1): this may help identify where immigrants are likely to have the largest economic and social impact, and assist the planning of services in these areas. The study is also likely to contribute towards better understanding of the role of the location choices of new immigrants in reinforcing residential segregation patterns that can help inform current debates about the integration of ethnic minorities in the UK.
In line with previous studies on immigrant location choice (Bartel, 1989; Borjas, 2001; Jaeger, 2000; Zavodny, 1997; 1999) new immigrants in this study were found to locate in areas where previous immigrants have settled. This study suggests that new immigrants in England overwhelmingly concentrate in the most deprived areas (chapter 3). The preponderance of immigrants locating in deprived areas suggests that these areas act as reception areas for new immigrants who move there to access affordable housing. Immigrants were found to be more likely to settle in areas with higher ethnic diversity levels with the effect of ethnic diversity found to be strongest for EU Accession nationals.

The qualitative interviews provided greater insight for understanding immigrant settlement patterns highlighting the complex motivations and constraints underlying location choices. The most important factors for choosing to live in the two neighbourhoods were housing affordability, condition and size and the presence of friends and family. EU Accession nationals based their location decisions on pre-existing networks which offered information about employment opportunities. This explains the finding from the regression analysis that labour market conditions were a significant predictor of location choice for EU Accession nationals but not to the other immigrant groups.

The presence of social housing seemed to be an important factor in the residential location decisions of new immigrants living in deprived areas – including EU Accession nationals. This contradicts the findings from the regression results which showed that EU Accession nationals base their location decisions on the availability of private rather than social housing. Since several study respondents were waiting to be allocated social housing accommodation, the very small take up of social housing among EU Accession migrants could be linked to the transitional restrictions to state income support and social housing benefits applicable to EU Accession nationals. The end of restrictions to housing benefit in 2011 meant that A8 migrants would be able to access social housing more easily and this was likely to result in a higher take-up of social housing.

The accounts of young Polish families highlighted motivations for moves from private to social housing that are in line with theories of residential mobility which link residential moves to household life course events and family formation (Dieleman,
The main motive for a planned move was the need for improved accommodation for growing households. The majority of Polish migrants in the study were in low income family households with one earner as most women were not working due to childcare responsibilities. This meant that they could not afford family housing accommodation in the private rented sector and their housing choices were restricted to neighbourhoods with affordable housing, in predominantly deprived areas. There was also evidence of poor housing conditions experienced by migrants in the private sector including, substandard conditions, overcrowding and exploitation by landlords. The negative perceptions of social housing seen by ethnic minorities and many White British as being in disrepair and in unpopular areas (Tomlins, 1999) was not shared by Polish migrants in the study. In fact, for some Polish migrants, moving into social housing was seen as a way of entering owner-occupation and the Right-to-Buy sector. For ethnic minority members entering the owner-occupied sector, this is likely to entail a move away from traditional immigration areas (Robinson and Reeve, 2006). The evidence from the qualitative interviews suggests that ethnically diverse deprived areas are attractive to some migrants because they offer the possibility of moving from insecure housing in the private rented sector to more secure social housing accommodation.

The long-term settlement intentions evident in migrants’ accounts in both localities and aspirations of home ownership suggest that new immigrants are bringing neighbourhood stability which in turn can foster social cohesion in deprived areas (Robinson and Reeve, 2006). This contradicts findings from previous studies which suggested that EU Accession nationals were moving into areas of cheap housing in order to lower their cost of living and hence to maximise their earnings during their stay in the UK (Pemberton and Stevens, 2007; Phillimore et al, 2008). Migrants in families were less likely to state they were planning to move in the short-term, motivated by reluctance to up-root their children. If new immigrants tend to concentrate in deprived areas, as suggested by this study, the effect of immigration can be to reverse population decline and provide the critical mass of people needed to support services, facilities, shops, and the revitalisation of these areas (Robinson and Reeve, 2006; Stenning et al., 2006).

The changing residential location preferences of new immigrants highlighted in this study have important implications for processes of integration and the links between
social and residential mobility. Understanding how residential preferences change over
time for different immigrant groups defined by county of origin, socio-economic and
legal status should be a priority for future research. The subsequent mobility patterns of
immigrants have potential implications for the future prospects of immigrants and the
prospects of the areas in which they initially settle.

The study findings suggest that greater consideration should be given to the mix of
housing in deprived areas not just in terms of tenure but also housing quality and size to
ensure the presence of families that can bring population stability in deprived areas. The
presence of families would also be expected to increase social interaction within the
immediate neighbourhood (Forest and Kearns, 1999). This study showed that families
are more likely to use neighbourhood facilities such as schools and playgrounds and
have relationships with their neighbours.

The shortage of social housing in the two neighbourhoods, particularly in Cheetham, is
thought to be the source of neighbourhood tensions associated with competition for
neighbourhood resources. Housing policies need to ensure that housing supply meets
demand for additional and suitable housing that meets the needs of existing and new
residents. The perceived preferential treatment towards migrants accessing social
housing is not borne out of evidence (chapter 2) but these perceptions persist as a result
of continued pressures on access to housing. The analysis presented in chapter 3 has the
implications that high levels of immigration experienced in local areas would be
expected to be self-reinforcing, as subsequent migrants flow to areas where previous
migrants have settled, and this is likely to lead to a steady increase in the share of
immigrants both from the same and from other countries of origin as recent immigrants.
This can create increased levels of residential turnover which may create problems by
eroding social capital and impacting on social cohesion (Forrest and Kearns, 1999), as
well as increasing competition for scarce housing resources. On the other hand, a more
balanced neighbourhood housing tenure of private and social housing can be expected
to be associated with more gradual immigrant settlement that can be managed more
effectively by local agencies.

The relative importance of employment and housing characteristics for different
immigrant groups indicated by this study (chapter 3) suggests that local policies need to
consider both housing and employment conditions in the planning of future services.
Neighbourhoods within districts with favourable economic conditions can expect to attract immigrants who are better integrated in the labour market, while neighbourhoods with high levels of social housing can expect to attract more disadvantaged groups. If the location choices of disadvantaged groups of migrants are restricted to deprived neighbourhoods this may reinforce existing inequalities between neighbourhoods, increasing the concentration of worklessness, increasing demand for services and impacting negatively upon cohesion. Given the current shift in urban policy from neighbourhoods and socio-economic disparities to cities and economic growth (Deas, 2013), where neighbourhoods are located within wider housing and labour markets becomes important for the fortunes of deprived areas.

Deprived neighbourhoods that sit within poor labour and housing markets are likely to experience further neighbourhood decline and this is likely to impact negatively on the prospects of those living in those areas including the most vulnerable migrants confined to social housing. The availability of social housing had a stronger effect on the settlement patterns of African immigrants compared with other groups of immigrants. This may well reflect the higher likelihood of African migrants being refugees than other groups, and therefore more likely to make use of social housing. The preponderance of African people in areas with a large concentration of social housing may also reflect other factors including deprivation, social exclusion and discrimination and this may suggest that this group may be among those most affected by reforms in social housing. Large inflows of African migrants into deprived areas with a concentration of social housing is also likely to trigger hostility from the established population and impact on community cohesion. Reforms in welfare and the provision and allocation of social housing, including the cap on housing benefit, are likely to have a significant impact on the settlement patterns of immigrants and the mobility of those in the social housing sector. For example, local authorities experiencing housing market pressures, particularly London and the South East, are expected to relocate social housing tenants to less popular and deprived local authorities5455.

54 http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2012/apr/24/london-exporting-council-tenants.
The high concentration of ethnic minorities in deprived inner city areas has been widely considered as problematic in public policy discourses (Phillips, 2007) and a barrier towards the integration of ethnic minorities in Britain. Tackling worklessness in deprived areas was one of the key aims of neighbourhood renewal policies under New Labour with many of the beneficiaries—particularly in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods being ethnic minority and immigrant groups. The multilevel modelling results suggested that some of the variation in employment outcomes can be attributed to differences between neighbourhoods. This may suggest that area-based policies targeted at the most deprived neighbourhoods may be effective in terms of reducing the risk of worklessness of immigrants although such policies are likely to be most effective when combined with people based policies (CLG 2010, Lupton et al., 2013).

7.4 New immigration and social cohesion

The nature of social networks of new immigrants, the types of support they draw from their networks and the ways they develop social ties with other migrant and non-migrant communities has important implications for social cohesion. Understanding the barriers to social interaction and migrants’ perceptions about the ways people from different communities associate with each other provides important insights for practices and policies that can improve social harmony and good inter-ethnic relations.

The qualitative interviews suggested that ethnicity or nationality did not necessarily provide the basis for within-group social ties, with other factors such as the shared experience of immigration and family circumstances being more important in building friendships and social connections (Atfield et al., 2007). African migrants had contact with other migrants, not necessarily from the same countries of origin, on the basis of shared ethnicity, language or culture. Interview accounts suggested the presence of social trust which took many different forms although it was mainly specific to individuals, for example neighbours and work colleagues, rather than the local community. African migrants were more likely however to associate the benefits of ethnic diversity in the local neighbourhood with feelings of security and protection from discrimination.
As highlighted by Hudson et al. (2007), factors limiting social interaction included language barriers, cultural identity, and racial and religious stereotyping and prejudices. The underlying reasons for the lack of inter-ethnic ties differed among migrants. Polish and Czech Roma migrants were more likely to cite language barriers as the main reason for the lack of social contact with other groups. For Africans, it was mainly the preferences of White British people to associate with members of their own group, and negative attitudes towards immigrants that prevented the development of inter-ethnic relationships. Czech Roma migrants had very little contact with people outside their own community suggesting a degree of network closure that is likely to reflect past experiences of discrimination and social exclusion.

The escalation of tensions between Roma and non-Roma communities in Gorton, much of which resulted from allegations about Roma anti-social behaviour and criminal activity (Lever, 2012), suggest that Roma people continue to face prejudice and social exclusion that impede their ability to develop social contact outside their own community. Polish migrants in the study had contact mainly with other Polish people but unlike other groups, had negative attitudes towards their co-ethnics, commenting on the fragmentation within the Polish community, particularly in Cheetham, where there were also reported divisions between ‘new’ and ‘old’ Poles. Jealousy, animosity and distrust seemed to underlie relations within the ‘new’ Polish community, particularly between the early post-Accession and more recently arrived Polish migrants. The lack of solidarity among Polish migrants and low levels of social trust related to stereotypes and perceptions about ‘immoral’ behaviour among Poles in the UK and has been associated with the legacy of Poland’s communist past (Pietka, 2011). This research suggests that conflict and competition between ‘new’ and ‘old’ Polish communities reflect expectations regarding mutual support from new migrants that are not being met by the more established migrants as well as divisions of class and social status.

Relationships within the neighbourhood were often superficial and restricted to simple exchanges of greetings between neighbours. While social ties with people from different nationalities tended to be weak, there was little evidence of conflict between ethnic groups and experiences of racism within the neighbourhood. The presence of friendly neighbours was seen as a positive neighbourhood feature by most respondents linked to neighbourhood satisfaction and better quality of life. There were examples of
positive encounters with people from different ethnic backgrounds in public spaces including libraries, schools and community centres within the immediate neighbourhood. Nevertheless, several Polish participants expressed mistrust, suspicion and prejudices towards other ethnic groups based on stereotypes and myths. Prejudices were expressed towards Asian communities without recognition of the heterogeneity that exists within the Asian ethnic group although negative views were also directed towards Pakistani and Muslim groups. Some interviewees expressed racist views and anti-Muslim sentiments and these were more prevalent in Cheetham, where South Asian and Muslim communities are the largest and most visible ethnic and religious communities, suggesting Polish migrants may have found them a threatening local presence.

In Cheetham, expressions of resentment towards different ethnic groups were associated with competition for neighbourhood resources and the quality of the local environment, for instance, neighbourhood problems such as litter and street cleanliness were blamed on Asian businesses and revealed feelings of relative deprivation as documented in other studies (see Hudson et al., 2007). Relative deprivation is one of the main mechanisms through which neighbourhood effects operate (Galster, 2012)—the success of Asian groups in Cheetham who own many of the local businesses is likely create resentment among new migrants who are economically disadvantaged.

Familiarity and social exchanges within the two neighbourhoods were inexorably linked with neighbourhood satisfaction. Efforts to improve neighbourhood satisfaction and safety by improving the local environment are equally important for creating stability in deprived neighbourhoods and improving social interaction (Forrest and Kearns, 1999).

Other studies suggest that negative perceptions of Asian groups are more widespread than observed in this study—public opinion polls suggest that members of the Pakistani ethnic group and Muslims are seen as keeping to their own and being less well integrated than other groups by British people.\(^{56}\) This suggests that there is a need for the development of both local and national policies to promote understanding between different ethnic groups and to tackle effectively cultural and religious prejudices. Media reports can have a powerful effect on public perception.

on immigration. Negative national media portrayals of immigrants have fuelled anxieties about immigration in the UK but the role of media in reducing racial prejudice and discrimination is less known (Sutton et al., 2007). Local media working with local authorities, however, have been shown to be effective in terms of conveying positive messages compared with national media, providing alternative narratives about immigration and influencing debates locally (Collett and Gidley, 2012).

The findings from the qualitative interviews show that strong ties in the form of family and kinship networks are more important than weak ties for the social and economic integration of new immigrants into British society. The qualitative interviews provided some evidence that migrants utilise kinship and ethnic social networks to ‘get ahead’. Strong ties embedded in ethnic communities of new immigrant groups provided opportunities for the development of skills and employment, particularly for those in low skilled occupations and those out of work. These skills which include English language ability were often acquired through employment and were perceived by the study participants as the main requirement for integration and the development of ties outside their own community. In line with other studies, migrants’ kinship networks provided financial and practical support that enabled them to access work and employment opportunities which in turn enabled the formation of between-group ties (McCabe et al., 2013; Ryan et al, 2009). In this sense within- and between-group ties were not mutually exclusive and within-group ties were not less valuable in helping migrants ‘get ahead’, which according to Putnam (2000) can be achieved through utilising bridging (between-group) ties. There was also evidence of transitions in employment which facilitated the development of weak ties. Polish males who had initially migrated alone were employed in workplaces which had predominantly Eastern European employees. Although there was little evidence that these migrants had moved up the occupational hierarchy, several had moved to more ethnically diverse workplaces. This facilitated contact with groups outside the Eastern European community, including British people and the development of inter-ethnic friendships which could be beneficial for socio-economic advancement.

Interviews with representatives from local agencies suggested that tensions between established and new communities stemmed to some extent, from perceived competition
for jobs. Migrant workers and Polish people in particular, in both neighbourhoods were seen as a threat—taking local jobs from local people and having more economic resources than long-term residents, echoing widespread public concerns about the negative impacts of immigration on local communities. This contrasts the experiences of deprivation and discrimination encountered by the study participants living in the two neighbourhoods (chapter 6).

Despite recognition that socio-economic deprivation was a key problem undermining neighbourhood community cohesion (Commission on Integration and Cohesion, 2007), government policies in the past have focused on improving inter-ethnic relations as a means of enhancing community cohesion. Attention focused on members of ethnic minorities, mainly Muslims from South Asia, who were seen as leading ‘parallel lives’ and to a much lesser extent on new immigrants (Finney and Simpson, 2009; Ratcliffe, 2012). Even though there is an absence of reference to community cohesion in current government policies, communities remain at the heart of the Government’s vision for a ‘Big Society’. There are echoes of ideas of communitarianism which were central to the community cohesion agenda in terms of solving social ills and the ‘broken society’ (Ratcliffe, 2012). Communities are expected to find solutions for the problems they face without the need for government and local interventions. Once again, addressing inequality and deprivation is not at the heart of government policy.

Local community and voluntary organisations were instrumental to the social and economic integration of migrants in the study—particularly those who were most vulnerable and at risk of exclusion. Local community organisations in both neighbourhoods provided support to asylum seekers, refugees and Czech Roma participants by creating opportunities to socialise within their local area, and access training and development opportunities and information on immigration matters and life in the UK. The support provided by community workers and staff in charities constituted a form of linking capital for migrants. These groups tended to lack awareness about their entitlements and rights, for example access to healthcare and welfare and without the support of local organisations they were left vulnerable. A local community centre in Gorton for example, was where Czech Roma people obtained help and support to access benefits to avoid destitution and the main source of inter-ethnic contact where they met people from other nationalities. Asylum seekers and refugees tended to have fewer local social networks and the presence of
community organisations in their local areas offered the potential to alleviate feelings of isolation, as well as insecurity and emotional vulnerability by offering opportunities for socialisation and social support (Spicer, 2008). Several African respondents who arrived to the UK as asylum seekers had developed relationships with staff at community based organisations who had acted as mentors offering regular support and advice. Community organisations that link together different communities can help manage existing tensions between established and new communities that relate to cultural differences and misunderstandings and create awareness about the larger community interest. Increasing the capacity of the voluntary and community sectors to provide support for vulnerable groups and develop activities that bring together people in the neighbourhood is likely to foster not just greater social interaction but also greater social cohesion.

Under the Conservative Government’s localism agenda and its plans for a ‘Big Society’ involving the transfer of power from government to people and communities, non-governmental bodies are expected to play a key role in the delivery of local services. In reality, the outsourcing of services has been dominated by the private sector with the voluntary sector having less influence as a result of state funding cuts, rising demand for services and falling income (Civil Exchange, 2012).

Small voluntary and community organisations, particularly those operating in deprived areas have been the hardest hit by funding cuts. Voluntary and community organisations in the study localities relied on statutory funding to different degrees but the uncertainty of funding streams both independent and statutory meant that activities had to be scaled down despite increasing need. Changes to the welfare system have already had an impact on voluntary and community sector organisations and have left services overstretched and under threat of closure. For example, demand for food parcels in 2014 increased tenfold in one community organisation in Gorton but funding cuts and the bureaucracy of funding application processes are threatening the provision of these services which destitute migrants and asylum seekers rely upon for their survival. A survey of Manchester voluntary sector organisations in 2013 suggested that over a third experienced reduced income in the previous year while two thirds depended on at least one source of public, including local government, funding making them particularly vulnerable if faced with reduced funds (Dayson et al., 2013).
Government cuts for legal aid and advice are also impacting on the ability of migrants and asylum seekers to obtain access to legal aid and makes them vulnerable to destitution and exploitation (Singh and Webber, 2010). Organisations offering advice and representation on welfare, immigration, housing and employment issues, such as Greater Manchester Immigration Aid Unit (GMIAU) which lost 70% of its funding for legal aid work in 2010, have been threatened with closure (ibid). The large scale public funding cuts which are likely to hit hardest those living in the most deprived areas are likely to worsen social disparities and pose a threat to cohesion (Ratcliffe, 2012).

This study suggested that experiences of worklessness, prejudices and discrimination undermined the ability of migrants to interact with other ethnic groups within the neighbourhood and the workplace. The main policy message is that tackling sources of deprivation, prejudices and discrimination is the main vehicle of social and economic integration of migrants and for improving social cohesion and harmonious relations in local neighbourhoods. Policy makers will need to ensure the removal of barriers towards the integration of migrants such as restrictions to family reunion, and access to language services by increasing the provision of affordable and flexible ESOL courses. The study also highlighted the need for investments in affordable and appropriate housing as well as neighbourhood resources such as community venues. This will ensure that the needs of new and diverse populations are met and help build inclusive and cohesive communities.

Future studies can add further insights about the experiences and consequences of new immigration on places and communities by examining the experiences of immigrants from established and new groups, and non-immigrants alike, in different localities. The elicitation of perceptions and experiences of people from new and established immigrant communities can be used to demonstrate the ways in which local experiences of cohesion are the outcome of complex interactions between individual factors, not least along the lines of ethnicity and country of origin, and the social and ecological context. One of the main limitations of the study was that it focused entirely on the experiences of EU Accession and African migrants. The inclusion of long-established residents would have enabled a better understanding of the nature of social networks within deprived neighbourhoods and the attributes that foster and hinder inter-ethnic relationships. For example, the literature review suggested that population turnover is one of the main factors contributing to the disruption
of social capital in deprived neighbourhoods. Given that the interviews in this study focused on recent migrants, most of who had lived in the neighbourhoods for a relative short period of time, population turnover did not emerge as a factor hindering the development of relationships within the neighbourhood. Similarly, the inclusion of participants from Asian ethnic groups in the study, viewed by Polish migrants as keeping to their own, is likely to have provided additional evidence on the role of hostility and racism in the development of inter-ethnic ties.

Equally, the role of place and the mechanisms through which place can affect new immigrants’ experiences could be better understood by examining deprived areas with contrasting migration histories in rural and urban settings—places that have attracted large numbers of recent immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe (chapter 3). Understanding how the experiences of new immigrants in rural areas, particularly in relation to family formation and reunion and settlement intentions, differ from those of immigrants in urban areas will also be important. New insights on the experiences of immigrants in rural areas can help with the development of policies aimed at retaining migrants in these areas to help population growth and economic development. At the same time it would be important to understand how changes in place attributes, in both urban and rural areas, affect the experiences of different migrants.
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## Appendix 1

### A1.1: Immigration data template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>Frequency/Geography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Census</td>
<td>Migrants are defined as those whose place of residence at time of the Census differed from their place of residence 12 months prior to the Census. The base is all people in England and Wales at the time of the Census and information is available at neighbourhood (Super Output Area) level. Coverage is around 90% of the population. The Census records country of birth and ethnicity as well as other socio-economic characteristics of migrants.</td>
<td>As the Census is carried out every ten years it quickly becomes dated and it is not suitable for measuring short term migration trends. Also it only captures immigrants living in the UK at time of the Census but not emigrants.</td>
<td>Updated every ten years. Available for national, regional, district, ward, LSOA and output area level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC)</td>
<td>PLASC collects data on individual pupil characteristics including place of residence for all pupils in maintained schools in England. Migration estimates can be derived by comparing place of residence at each academic year using information on ethnicity (detailed classification) and first language. Additional variables included are age, gender, free school meal eligibility and other contextual characteristics.</td>
<td>PLASC can be used to estimate family migration as it covers children in schools but excludes migrants of working age or above without children who account for the majority of migrants. PLASC does not provide any information on date of arrival in the UK and excludes pupils in independent schools.</td>
<td>Available at postcode level. Updated at regular intervals and available annually (academic years).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intl. Passenger Survey (IPS)</td>
<td>The IPS is a survey of passengers at major UK airports, Heathrow, Gatwick and Manchester and some other airports that have more than a million passenger numbers prior to the interview, ports and the channel tunnel. It records migration by asking intentions about their intending duration of stay. A person is classified as a migrant if they state that they intend to leave or stay for more than 12 months. The IPS is based on an annual sample of around 300,000 interviews of passengers passing through the main UK ports and airports. Country or origin and nationality is recorded.</td>
<td>The IPS excludes certain types of migrants such as asylum seekers and refugees and does not cover all migration routes, for instance land routes between Ireland and the UK. As interviews take place at larger airports many migrants travelling through smaller airports are not covered by the survey. TIM estimates are also subject to high sampling variation given the small numbers of interviewees that are classified as migrants (around 1.5%) and the overall small sample size of the survey. Sampling variation is higher the lower the geography. Migrants’ intentions to stay may not coincide with actual stay and therefore some interviewees</td>
<td>Available quarterly. TIM estimates based on IPS are available at Local Authority level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>Frequency/Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour Force Survey (LFS)</strong></td>
<td>The LFS is a national survey of households in Britain conducted at quarterly intervals. The LFS is based on a single stage sample of addresses with a random start and constant interval drawn from the Postcode Address File (PAF) with sampling frame covering around 97 percent of private addresses in Great Britain. The systematic random sample design is intended to be representative of the British population with each quarter comprising of a sample of around 60,000 households drawn from five waves. The LFS captures migrants by asking place of residence 12 months prior to the survey. The LFS collects information on country of origin, ethnicity, nationality, date of arrival to the UK as well as key socio-economic characteristics.</td>
<td>classified as migrants may not be actual migrants. Adjustments need to be made to correct for this effect.</td>
<td>Available quarterly. The smallest geography is LFS regions which are a combination of counties government office regions and countries. Special licence LFS data has smaller geography identifiers such as Local Authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration and Asylum Statistics</strong></td>
<td>Immigration and Asylum statistics cover immigrants subject to immigration controls, those who have applied for British citizenship or for asylum. The Home Office produces quarterly statistics reports that include aggregate information on immigration and asylum by nationality and work permits by age, gender, occupation and sector of work.</td>
<td>Information on work permits is released via a freedom of information request and only relates to migrants from the top 10 nationalities.</td>
<td>Data on Asylum Seekers and Work Permits is available at Local Authority level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Insurance Numbers (NINos)</strong></td>
<td>NINos issued to foreign nationals by nationality cover those who intend to work or claim benefits or tax credits in the UK. NINos can be used to monitor the level of immigration by location of Local Authority at time of application by country of nationality, age and gender.</td>
<td>NINos cover only immigrants who are entitled to work and claim benefits in the UK and therefore exclude undocumented immigrants and asylum seekers. A survey of migrant workers in Slough showed that three in ten of those who had worked in the UK did not have a NINo (Slough, 2006). Also, there is no requirement for a NINo to be obtained at time of arrival to the</td>
<td>Updated annually by calendar (or financial) year of registration and available for LAs and Parliamentary Consistencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>Frequency/Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Registration Scheme</td>
<td>The WRS records immigration from the eight Accession countries (A8) covering A8 nationals who intend to work as employees in the UK and who have registered with the scheme. The statistics are available by location of employer in Accession Monitoring Reports from May 2004 until May 2009 and include nationality, age, gender and selected labour market characteristics, information on dependents and intended duration of stay.</td>
<td>UK and therefore many immigrants may have lived in the UK in a number of locations prior to obtaining a NINo. There is no information about duration of stay or emigration. As migrants are recorded by nationality only, key characteristics of the identity of migrants such as ethnicity and language cannot be inferred.</td>
<td>Updated Quarterly for Local Authority districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria and Romania</td>
<td>Bulgaria and Romania Accession statistics are produced in quarterly intervals by the UK Border Accession Statistics directorate on Bulgarian and Romanian nationals applying for an Accession Workers Card or registration certificates.</td>
<td>The WRS only applies to A8 nationals and excludes those who are not required to register such as the self-employed and those migrants choosing not to register. As registration is upon a fee it has been suggested that many A8 migrants avoid registration. In Slough it is estimated that around 40% of migrant workers have not registered.</td>
<td>The data are only available between 2004 and 2009 and there are no plans for updates in 2010 onwards. As the WRS is workplace-based comparison with other administrative sources that are residency-based yields discrepancies. Also, areas with a large number of agencies are associated with larger numbers of WRS registrations that do not necessarily coincide with the number of workers working in that area. WRS also does not capture emigrants as there is no requirement to de-register upon departure from the UK. There are indications that there are large discrepancies between actual duration of stay and reported length of stay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>Frequency/Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flag 4 GP registrations</td>
<td>Flag 4’s derived from the Patient Register Data Service (PRDS) which holds records of all patients registered with a General Practitioner (GP) in England and Wales. Flag 4’s indicate people who have been born abroad and register with a GP for the first time or who have entered the UK and registered with a GP after living abroad for a period of more than three months. Information on gender and age is also collected.</td>
<td>Coverage of country of birth or nationality is poor. Covers immigrants but not emigrant and only immigrants who register with a GP are captured. The GP register undercounts certain groups such as young males and temporary or seasonal migrants. Immigrants may have lived in the UK in a number of locations prior to registering with a GP and the dataset does not provide any indication about length of stay. If an immigrant registers with a GP more than once within a year, Flag 4 status is lost and the person is not recorded as an international migrant.</td>
<td>Available annually (mid-year periods) by Local Authority district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Statistics Authority (HESA)</td>
<td>HESA covers all students in the UK and collects information on students whose usual residence is abroad. Information collected includes nationality, age, gender, type of study and place of study.</td>
<td>Coverage of nationality is poor. Release of sub-regional information is available through special commissioning services and carries a fee.</td>
<td>Available annually by location of institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral register</td>
<td>The electoral register records the nationality of members of households resident in the UK over the age of 17 to determine whether they are entitled to vote. It may be possible for the electoral register to be used to estimate immigrants by using flags indicating persons not entitled to vote and information on previous address or through a comparison with previous year’s registers.</td>
<td>The electoral register is unlikely to capture short term, temporary or seasonal migrants and those less likely to vote.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1.2: English local authorities
Table A2.1: Four level model with individual and ward predictors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age squared</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
<td>0.00†</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.97**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or cohabiting</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ Level 4</td>
<td>-2.11**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ Level 1-3</td>
<td>-1.32**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualifications</td>
<td>-1.17**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British non-white</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>-0.56**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Commonwealth</td>
<td>-0.38*</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi/Pakistani</td>
<td>1.33**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth African Black</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non Commonwealth non-white</td>
<td>1.26**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.85**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD1 (least deprived)</td>
<td>-0.53**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD2</td>
<td>-0.63**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD3</td>
<td>-0.46**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD4 (most deprived)</td>
<td>-0.41**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward ethnic pop&gt;20%</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma^2_j$</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma^2_v$</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma^2_u$</td>
<td>1.03**</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: 44890

† <0.005, *p<0.05, **p<0.01

Reference categories are female, non-married, without qualifications, White British, IMD Quintile 5 and ward ethnic pop<20%
Table A2.2: Four level model with individual, ward and district predictors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age squared</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
<td>0.00†</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.97**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or cohabiting</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ Level 4</td>
<td>-2.11**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ Level 1-3</td>
<td>-1.32**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualifications</td>
<td>-1.17**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British non-white</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>-0.56**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Commonwealth</td>
<td>-0.37*</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi/Pakistani</td>
<td>1.33**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth African Black</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non Commonwealth non-white</td>
<td>1.27**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.86**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD1 (least deprived)</td>
<td>-0.45**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD2</td>
<td>-0.57**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD3</td>
<td>-0.42**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD4 (most deprived)</td>
<td>-0.38**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward ethnic pop&gt;20%</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA unemployment</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA size of services</td>
<td>0.00†</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA immigrant pop</td>
<td>0.00†</td>
<td>0.00†</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_f^2 )</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_v^2 )</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_u^2 )</td>
<td>1.05**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>44890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference categories are female, non-married, without qualifications, White British, IMD Quintile 5 and ward ethnic pop<20%
Appendix 3

A3.1: List of organisations represented in the key informant interviews

Rainbow Haven
Europia
Zest
African Francophone Integration Project
Cheetham Hill Welcome Centre
SEVA
Northwards Housing
Oasis
North Manchester Regeneration Team
New East Manchester
## A3.2: List of Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Origin country</th>
<th>Year of arrival</th>
<th>Main Reason for Migration</th>
<th>Living Arrangements (Lives with)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyrille</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carine</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Asylum</td>
<td>Non family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidia</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Join family</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krystyna</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksy</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Non family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georges</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Join family</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanzí</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Non family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luiza</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Join family</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serge</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Asylum</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisette</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Asylum</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewa</td>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Join family</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolek</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Asylum</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominika</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francine</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Asylum</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Join family</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dita</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trésor</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Asylum</td>
<td>Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feliks</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clémentine</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berta</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Join family</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ksenia</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Join family</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasia</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michalina</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>EU Accession</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Asylum</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A3.3: Migrant interview guide

SECTION A: Background information

Name; Age; Sex; Postcode; Country of birth; Year of arrival.

SECTION B: Work and Skills

Would you rate your English language ability as very good, good, average or poor?

Are you participating on any language, skills development courses/training? If not why not? (Prompts: no need to/no time/cannot find a place).

What educational qualifications do you have? (Degree, college, high school, no qualification and whether any acquired in the UK)

Are you employed at the moment? Can you tell me a bit about your job (If not employed ask for most recent employment)

What is your job title? What business/organisation do you work for and where are they located? Do you work f/t or p/t and how many hours a week? Do you have temporary/permanent contract?

Do you earn: less than £100 pw, between £100-200 pw, between £200-300 pw, £300-400 pw, over £400 pw before tax and NI contribution?

How satisfied are you with your current job? Are there any aspects of your job you are not satisfied with? (Prompts: pay, hours, lack of career/personal development)

Do you think your skills are fully utilised? If not what are the factors that are stopping you from getting a job that reflects your skills? (Prompts: family responsibilities, motivation, confidence, language ability)

Prior to your current /most recent job where you employed elsewhere since coming to the UK? If so what were your previous jobs?

How did you find your first job in the UK? (Prompts: friends/relatives, pre-arranged employment prior to coming to UK/agency(mainstream JC, private)). What about your current/most recent job?

If not employed: Are you looking for work and if so for how long have been unemployed?
What methods are you using to look for work?

SECTION C: Migration History

Can you tell me how you came about to living in the UK and how you came to live in Manchester? (Reasons for coming to the UK and coming to Manchester (Prompts: to join family/partner/friends/ employment reasons/relocated by an agency. Ask whether arrived on a
worker Visa/permit including whether registered for WRS, student visa, asylum seeker, spouse/family visa)

SECTION D: Housing and neighbourhood

Can you tell me a bit about your accommodation? Do you own or part-own your property? Do you rent from a social housing landlord/Council/private landlord? Live rent free? How many people do you live with? What is your relationship with them?

How satisfied are you with your accommodation? What aspects of your accommodation do you like and what aspects don’t you like?

How did you find your current accommodation? (Prompts: friends/family, estate agent, newspaper advertisement, employer)

[If intend to stay for some time and is not an owner] Thinking about the future would you like to continue renting or would you like to own your own home?

How satisfied are you with the area in which you live? What aspects of your neighbourhood do you like? (Ask in turn family nearby/ neighbours friendly/ street cleanliness, shops/services, good transport/close to work). What do you think needs improving?

Are there any aspects of your neighbourhood that you don’t like? (Prompts: Anti-social behaviour/ poor local environment/lack of parks/poor transport/unfriendly neighbours)

Do you think this is an area where people from different backgrounds get on well together? Is this an area where people help each/go their own way?

Do you think this is a safe place to live? Have you personally experienced any crime including racial harassment in this area?

What do you think about the services? What types of services do you access in your local area? (Prompts: registered with a GP, education/schools/College, leisure/sports facilities, Church, shop locally, are there ethnic shops in area, if so are they important/how often visit)

Have you encountered any difficulties accessing public services in your neighbourhood or city-wide?

SECTION E: Social networks and belonging

Do you tend to socialise with people with your own nationality/other non-British people within your neighbourhood? What about outside your neighbourhood? If mainly co-nationals, why is that?

Are you involved in any local groups/associations, community activities in your local area or outside?

Do you use community venues, attend community events? What about Church? Do you meet people from different backgrounds/ethnicities through attending these? Are there any places/activities locally that bring people from different backgrounds together?

IF EMPLOYED: Do you have any friends at work? Is the relationship with work colleagues
important in a job? If so, do they tend to be with people for the same nationality, other non-British nationals or British people?

IF HAVE FRIENDS AT WORK: What type of support do you receive from friends at work? (Prompts: information about career development opportunities, emotional support, financial support)

Do you have family and friends that live nearby that you can count on? What help and support do they provide you with? (Prompts: emotional/financial/practical)

Since arriving did you ever have any serious problems such as financial difficulties due to loss of work, problems with your accommodation, had any bad experience with landlords, or experienced homelessness? If so, did you approach any agencies to get help and support (Prompts: Local community organisation, Homelessness shelter, Church/charity, Mainstream agency) or just rely on friends/family for support? If approached agency for support what help did they offer?

How important are your neighbours? Are there people in your neighbourhood that you can trust? (Prompts: Do you tend to keep an eye at each other’s houses when you are away? How do you feel about the amount of trust in the neighbourhood?)

Do you feel ‘settled’/ ‘rooted’ (feel that you fit in) in the UK? How easy has it been adapting to life the UK?

What factors (would) make you feel settled in the UK? What are the main obstacles to feeling settled in the UK? (Prompts: employment/education/housing/having friends in the UK). How important is having good language ability? Why?

How often do you go back home? How much support do you get from friends/family back home? Is it important for you to keep links with your home country?

SECTION F: Future Plans

What are your future plans and expectations from life in the UK?

How long do you think you will continue living in this neighbourhood/Manchester/the UK? Why do you think you would move out of this area/Manchester/UK (Prompts: employment opportunities, housing choice, improved services (schools) being close to friends/family).