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SUMMARY

This report explores how to support migrants and British people to live well together. We argue for a more coherent integration strategy in areas characterised by increasing diversity and ongoing, high inflows of immigration.

Background and context
The UK is now one of the most diverse countries in the developed world. Academics have produced compelling positive evidence to show that racial prejudice is declining and that segregation is decreasing in the UK. Nevertheless, many British people feel unsettled by the flux and change brought on by immigration. Public attitudes towards immigration are hardening and showing no signs of abating. Politicians and policymakers are faced with the formidable challenge of reconciling the effects of globalisation with an intangible sense of loss of identity across many communities in the UK.

Integration should be a major focus for policymaking; immigration has changed the UK irreversibly and will continue to do so in the future. But governments have repeatedly struggled to formulate effective policy in this area.

The previous Labour government introduced a practical community cohesion agenda and explored ways for newcomers to ‘earn’ their right to citizenship. But its shortcoming was to believe that it was possible to compel or force people to integrate, either by placing conditions on migrants seeking to settle (through a contractual approach to citizenship) or by engineering interaction through target-setting in public services. In reality, these approaches failed to mobilise and unify people.

In contrast to the Labour administration, the current Coalition government has tried (but failed) to substantially bring down overall immigration to the UK. Cuts to resources for integration policy (such as reductions in funding for English language provision and the scrapping of the Migration Impacts Fund) reflect not only the government’s choice to prioritise deficit reduction but also a clear shift in philosophy, one which discourages settlement and takes a hands-off, devolved approach, leaving integration and cohesion largely to individuals and local authorities with little direction or funding from central government.

Political theory and framing
It is more or less inevitable that the UK will continue to be a country of high immigration for the foreseeable future. Politicians and policymakers need to think deeply about how equality can be achieved in an era of high migration, greater diversity and increased mobility. This means striving not only for greater material equality – ensuring that immigration policy is fair and contributing to a prosperous economy – but also for greater social equality – enabling migrants and British people to contribute actively to society and to engage positively with one another.

A failure to seek social equality results in a political vacuum, which the far right is all too ready to exploit. In response, political theorists have argued for a shift away from target-setting and transactional, centralist policies and towards more relational, local and democratic approaches to integration, including the preservation of ‘public things’. There is a degree of subjective interpretation to what these ‘public things’ might be, but there are undoubtedly institutions and services that the British public cherishes, such as the public realm of town centres and parks, libraries...
and institutions such as children’s centres, schools and the NHS. Any sense that immigration is threatening or undermining these ‘things of value’ causes discontent and can lead to frustrations directed towards migrants, which creates intense challenges for integration.

In a time of austerity it is unrealistic to expect central government to invest heavily in migrant integration. Instead, our vision is for policymakers at the national and local level to build a society that promotes collective responsibility and mutual respect for ‘public things’ so that all citizens can live well together. We refer to this goal as achieving ‘shared ground’, and it is based on three key principles:

- managing the impacts of flux and churn from immigration
- building inclusivity in institutions and services
- instilling responsibility among all citizens.

What would shared ground look like? An area where people are living well together would have an engaged local authority with the power to respond to the impacts of flux and churn in the local population, and to ensure that local people feel secure. There would be inclusive settings for people to take part in British ways of life. Newcomers would be welcomed and supported to settle in the area. Where friction arises, local authorities would respond by listening to residents and alleviating tension (arising out of misunderstandings and incivilities, for example) through negotiation and mediation. Public spaces and institutions where local people spend time together would be well maintained. Active community groups, voluntary organisations and local enterprises would be appreciated and supported.

A framework for understanding communities

Our research set out to explore the extent to which this goal of ‘shared ground’ was being met in two diverse areas of the UK: Normanton in Derby and Forest Gate in the London Borough of Newham. We chose these areas because they have populations made up of British residents and migrants (both new and long-established) with a broad range of religions and ethnicities. Both areas have a young age profile and a high population turnover. They are economically poor but nevertheless socially thriving communities, boasting a range of civic institutions and community hubs and services – both governmental and non-governmental.

Our focus was on the everyday experiences of local citizens and migrants, and our approach was in-depth and qualitative. This allowed us to build up a comprehensive picture of how migrants and British people mix and interact in ethnically diverse areas – something that is often missed by large-scale quantitative analyses and opinion polls.

We group our research analysis and findings under three headings.

People and relationships

Many of our research participants chose to self-identify based on personal attributes and characteristics rather than religion or ethnicity. It is important to reconsider how we characterise and label people in our society. Simple ethnic or nationality labels ignore the messy complexity of human existence – they are important for some, but not for everyone.

Intense frictions can arise in the relations between ‘fixed residents’ and ‘transient residents’ (particularly in areas characterised by high inflows of immigration). This can make the integration of newcomers a deeply challenging process. Finding locally relevant ways to alleviate tension and encourage people to settle is important.

Vulnerability related to the degree to which a person is more or less transient (sometimes due to personal choice, sometimes due to external factors) can result
in exploitation, such as low wages or poor housing conditions. This can severely hamper the process of integration for migrants and their families, but it can also have knock-on effects on other residents – for example, through wages being undercut and residential overcrowding resulting in antisocial behaviour – which in turn generate animosity within the wider community.

Public spaces and civic institutions
Public places and civic institutions – especially nurseries, schools, libraries and parks – are where organic ‘everyday’ integration takes place. But pressure to make cuts to public places and services threatens the ‘public things’ which so many more-settled residents (many of whom will be British citizens) collectively hold dear. Anxieties are exacerbated when migrants settle in neighbourhoods where institutions are already under pressure and resources are scarce.

Services and support
Forecasting the movement of people is challenging and many local authorities are working in a void of data. This can make it difficult to plan local services and provide adequate support to newcomers, as well as to established residents.

Much support for newcomers is delivered well through mainstream services. But we also found that some specialist service provision is needed to support newcomers to settle and integrate, such as targeted English language provision and specialist support for vulnerable citizens.

Local authorities have been given devolved responsibility for community and integration policy, but no additional means to raise revenue to fund programmes and no consistent political leadership from central government. Some areas have developed strategies for dealing with the pressures of flux and diversity that have resulted in better integration outcomes. But others are stuck in firefighting mode, and so have limited scope to support integration and respond appropriately to the impacts of population flux and churn.

Strategies for building ‘shared ground’ in the UK
Our strategies have the shared ground principles at their heart and are shaped and informed by our research findings. Our recommendations do not target migrants; rather, we are seeking ways to strengthen relationships between all citizens.

Preparing for shared ground: practical initiatives to forecast population changes and cope with churn
1. A local data-registration scheme should be created to collect information about UK residents, both British citizens and migrants alike. We recommend collecting information about how many fixed or transient residents are living in the local area. This would be done by incorporating a few additional questions into existing council tax forms.

2. Local authorities with high levels of population churn should regulate the private rented housing sector through landlord licensing schemes to prevent overcrowding and poor living conditions, and should be given the power and responsibility to monitor local employers in order to enforce the minimum wage and, where necessary, impose and recoup fines where rules are flouted.

3. Local authority areas with high inflows of immigration should put in place strategies for mediation and negotiation aimed at alleviating community tensions that arise from population churn. These approaches will need to be responsive to each individual area, but we suggest measures such as anti-rumour campaigns in everyday settings and local area mediation schemes to encourage dialogue and compromise.
Facilitating shared ground: creating inclusive settings to deepen connections and promote interaction

4. Incentive and outreach schemes should be created to encourage more parents of all backgrounds to send their children from age two to inclusive preschool settings.

5. Funding should be provided for services and activities that encourage inclusivity, and should be allocated in a transparent manner. This is important in order to prevent segregation from setting in, and would provide a fair way of distributing funds at a time when resources are scarce.

6. Some community organisations provide support that is specific to one ethnic group, particularly for newcomers, which can aid integration. These groups should receive funding from local authorities, but only if they can demonstrate that they are providing a service that is in the public interest. We also recommend that local authorities should provide some time-limited subsidies and give recognition to ethnic or religious-specific organisations delivering valuable, specialised support services.

Cementing shared ground: supporting and promoting settlement

7. Central government should set up a Settlement Support Fund, paid for from citizenship fees and an increased levy on visa fees, to allocate money to local areas experiencing a high degree of population churn.

8. Incentives to carry out voluntary work should be introduced for people seeking British citizenship, alongside a more localised, inclusive application process.

The need to build shared ground is becoming ever more pressing in diverse areas characterised by high immigration. Areas that foster respect for people of all identities, maintain effective enforcement of law and order, put in place local strategies for mediation and negotiation when friction arises, prioritise well-maintained public spaces, and support a vibrant civil society will have better integration outcomes for migrants and greater social equality for all citizens. This approach is also likely to make immigration a less toxic issue politically, as anti-immigration views are often shaped by local experiences. Finding ways of increasing public acceptance of high inflows of immigration is important, because it is likely to be the reality for years to come.
INTRODUCTION

This report explores how to support migrants and British people to live well together. Immigration flows to the UK mean that an increasing number of communities are characterised by a high degree of mobility and greater diversity. Our aim is to set out practical, realistic responses to the social and cultural impacts of immigration in the UK, in order to create more inclusive and cohesive societies.

The report has three parts. Chapter 1 sets out the current picture in data terms and the political and theoretical context for debates around migration and its effects. We reflect on the policies of the previous and current governments, and review their successes and limitations. We then put forward our vision for living well together, built on the notion of ‘shared ground’.

Chapter 2 sets out a framework for understanding citizens and communities. We present an analysis of our detailed, ethnographic research, which explored the experiences of 50 residents, including both migrants and British citizens, in our two case study areas: Normanton, in Derby, and Forest Gate, in the London Borough of Newham. We draw on the richness of our data – comprising participant and stakeholder interviews, round-the-kitchen-table chats, community meetings, photo diaries and researcher observations – to illustrate the complexity and multiplicity of people’s identities and experiences. Our focus is on the local, ‘everyday’ settings where people spend their daily lives, such as schools and nurseries, libraries, shops, parks and workplaces.

We address the challenges and opportunities of integration from three different perspectives, focusing on people and relationships, local places and civic institutions, and services – both governmental and non-governmental. Lastly we draw conclusions from this analysis and review how this framework can help us to understand communities characterised by population flux and growing diversity.

Chapter 3 puts forward practical recommendations for building shared ground in the UK. We are a long way from migrant integration being a priority for central government to invest heavily in. The political climate is hostile and austerity is biting hard. A commitment to the issue of integration has long been lacking. But we maintain that in an era of high migration it is pressing that we put in place low-cost or self-financing strategies that support migrants and British people to live well together.

Our recommendations are grouped into three stages:

• **Preparing for shared ground**, through practical initiatives to forecast population changes and manage churn.

• **Facilitating shared ground**, by creating inclusive settings to deepen connections and promote interaction.

• **Cementing shared ground**, by supporting and promoting settlement.

Many of these recommendations are directed at local authorities and other local actors, but we also make broader recommendations for central government. It is our hope that in seeking to build shared ground our communities can become stronger and our society more adept at managing and benefiting from the ongoing migration flows we can expect in the future.
1. BACKGROUND, CONTEXT AND GOALS FOR THE INTEGRATION DEBATE

This chapter briefly sets out the picture drawn by the current data on diversity, integration\(^1\) and cohesion in the UK. We review the successes and limitations of the previous and current governments in responding to the changes experienced in recent years, and outline the theoretical basis for adapting to a world where immigration, and therefore population turnover and diversity, has become the norm. Finally we conclude with a set of principles that we believe will pave the way for better integration outcomes in diverse local areas.

1.1 Key trends

The UK has been enduringly shaped by globalisation. We are destined to become one of the most diverse countries in the world, with London already one of the most ethnically diverse conurbations on the planet. According to the 2011 census, one in five people (20 per cent) in the UK identified with an ethnic group other than white British (Jivraj 2012). Immigration, while not the sole cause, is a driver of both diversity and churn in the population. What’s more, the UK’s demographics indicate that it will continue to be increasingly diverse, regardless of the government’s approach to immigration in the future.

The immigrant population of the UK has become increasingly diverse and dispersed. Before 1997, immigrants originated mainly from the countries of the Commonwealth and were concentrated in London, the south east and urban centres in the midlands and north of England. Since 1997, the various waves of immigration – through asylum, economic migration and EU expansion – have seen large numbers of people arrive from central and eastern Europe, Africa, the far and Middle East, Latin America and the nations of the former Soviet Union. Ethnic minority populations continue to spread out beyond inner-city areas and live in increasingly mixed areas (Simpson 2012). Many places in Britain previously untouched by immigration, such as rural counties and market towns, now host significant migrant communities.

Polish is now the second language in England, after English. Census data released in 2013, recorded from a survey of 56.1 million residents of England and Wales, shows that 546,000 residents speak Polish. After English, Welsh and Polish, the most spoken languages in England and Wales were the Indian and Pakistani languages of Punjabi, Urdu, Bengali (including Sylheti and Chatgaya) and Gujarati, which taken together account for close to a million people (Booth 2013). Some urban areas, such as the London boroughs of Haringey and Newham, are home to residents from literally hundreds of different countries. Sociologists have branded this phenomenon ‘super-diversity’ (Vertovec 2007).

Increasingly, migrants are moving around more frequently and are maintaining stronger links with their countries of origin – this is largely due to the principle of freedom of movement within the EU, and has been referred to as ‘hypermigration’ (Bauböck 2011). EU migrants and migrants from more developed countries may be more likely to stay

\(^1\) The word ‘integration’ is defined in numerous ways by academics and commentators. We use it in this report because it is the term most widely employed by policymakers. For a comprehensive definition see the report of the Commission on Integration and Cohesion (CIC 2007), which describes integration as ‘principally the process that ensures new residents and existing residents adapt to one another’.
in the UK for shorter periods and to be firmer in their intention to return to their home country, whereas migrants from poorer countries are more likely to stay for longer, or to settle permanently (Finch et al 2009). ‘Super-mobility’, where migrants move multiple times back and forth between their home country and other countries, is an increasingly prominent feature of migration in our globalised world (ibid).

Academics have produced compelling evidence to show that racial prejudice is declining in the UK (Ford 2014), that there is greater ethnic group mixing between people and between places (Catney 2013), and that segregation is decreasing, particularly among the younger generation and in metropolitan areas (Sabater and Finney 2014). Influential research exploring the degree of trust between citizens in London shows that there is a positive correlation between ethnic diversity and social cohesion, after controlling for deprivation (Sturgis et al 2011) – although it is important to note that experiences in London may be atypical. Levels of interpersonal trust have remained stable throughout the most recent period of high migration to the UK (Clery and Stockdale 2009), and people living in diverse areas often feel a strong sense of belonging to their neighbourhood and to the UK (Duffy 2014). Many of these insights derive from a growing body of sociological literature that paints a picture of healthy social interactions going on in diverse settings.

But the increase in transience and population churn as a result of high inflows of immigration can also pose challenges. Areas of high migration experience the greatest population churn (Dennett and Stillwell 2008). There is some evidence to suggest that the speed of change in an area’s ethnic makeup is the most significant factor in the level of local opposition to immigration (Kauffman and Harris 2014). High levels of transience can undermine people’s sense of belonging (Coulthard et al 2002) and can cause anxiety among long-term residents, particularly those who are vulnerable or have found it harder to adapt to change (Beider 2012). Immigration is a ‘crunch issue’ for people who are unsettled by change and are concerned about the preservation of their culture and identity (Pecorelli 2013).

1.2 Political context
The current and previous governments have taken a variety of different approaches in response to the impacts of immigration.

Labour, 1997–2010
For its part, the Labour government sought to reassert British identity as inclusive, patriotic and forward-thinking, and introduced a more practical agenda of ‘community cohesion’. Initially, this was generic, involving initiatives such as school twinning and summer youth programmes, but it became progressively more muscular throughout Labour’s time in office, to include, for example, cuts in ethnic-specific funding and translation services and promotion of ethnically mixed housing policies.

There were two key reasons underpinning these policies: first, the promotion of intergroup interaction, backed up by contact theories demonstrating that interaction is a powerful way of tackling prejudice (Hewstone and Swart 2011); and second, concerns about ethnic segregation following the violent riots that took place in the towns of Oldham, Burnley and Bradford in 2001.

Community cohesion was an attempt to tackle segregation and promote good race relations in local areas and was certainly well intentioned. But there were two fundamental drawbacks. The first was that it came to be conflated with other efforts to prevent extremism following the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 in the US and 7 July 2005 in London. In many communities, particularly those with large Muslim populations, the agenda was seen to be dictated by security concerns and bound up with surveillance and state co-optation. The second was that community
cohesion began to be governed via an expanding set of targets, under a model known as ‘new public management’. This was the dominant mode of statecraft under the ‘new Labour’ government but was particularly unsuited to managing relationships (see Muir and Cooke 2012).

A policy of ‘earned citizenship’ was introduced by Labour and was due to come into force in July 2011, but was later overturned by the Coalition. Earned citizenship sought to encourage migrants to settle but required applicants to undergo a longer process in applying for citizenship, with regulated community volunteering required to prove a commitment to British values. The policy was criticised by the Conservative party as ‘complicated, bureaucratic and, in the end, ineffective’. The voluntary sector also objected on the basis that it would be ‘coercive, unreasonable and based on the misconception that introducing a tougher settlement and naturalisation process would result in migrants becoming better integrated in the UK’ (Grove-White 2010).

Labour’s underlying fault was to believe that it was possible to compel, or even force, people to mix and integrate. This overly ‘transactional’ approach to integration (that is, based on conditions on citizenship or targets for public services) failed to mobilise or unify people.

**Coalition government, 2010–**

By contrast, the Coalition government has focused overwhelmingly on trying to bring down overall immigration to the UK. The central focus for policy has been the net migration target: a pledge to bring net migration down ‘from the hundreds of thousands to the tens of thousands’. While this may be motivated by cultural and community concerns, in reality the response is focused on economic costs and benefits, and on managing flows, rather than on the social impacts of immigration. The extent of the ‘clamp down culture’ under the Coalition was made clear by the so-called ‘Go home’ vans, which hit the streets in the summer of 2013 and were subsequently banned by the advertising watchdog. As poll results attest, these approaches are failing to relieve public concern. Polling data over recent years demonstrates that public attitudes towards immigration are hardening, a trend which shows no signs of abating (Duffy and Frere-Smith 2014). More than three out of four people in the UK want a reduction in immigration, according to the 2014 British Social Attitudes survey (NatCen 2014).

In addition, the Coalition government has systematically dismantled the mechanisms put in place by the Labour government to promote integration.

- The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) was asked to cut £1.116 billion in 2010 and is set to lose half its resource budget by 2014/15. This has resulted in the termination of several community cohesion programs, such as Connecting Communities.
- The Migration Impacts Fund has been scrapped – this £50 million fund was raised through immigrant visa fees (which continue to be charged) and was used to fund nongovernmental and local projects.
- English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) faced budget cuts in 2011, including the loss of a £4.5 million learner support fund to help low-income migrants and a corresponding shift towards migrants paying for their own courses.
- The ethnic minority achievement grants (EMAG), used to support integration of new arrivals, has been mainstreamed into general education.

---

2 For example, the 2006 local government white paper, *Strong and prosperous communities*, established a performance framework based on 198 national indicators. Local authorities were compelled through the ‘duty’ to promote cohesion, to set up cohesion teams, and to ensure that schools adopted cohesion policies monitored by regular inspections from Ofsted.

3 Summary from Collett 2011
• The Refugee Integration and Employment Service was abolished in September 2011, along with the closure of many local, nongovernmental organisations and services providing activities, advice and support.

These cuts reflect not only the government’s choice to prioritise deficit reduction, but also a clear shift in philosophy, one which discourages settlement and takes a hands-off, devolved approach, leaving integration and cohesion largely to individuals and local authorities with little direction or funding from central government. DCLG’s latest strategy paper, Creating the conditions for integration, (2012) states that the national government’s role in promoting integration should only come into play ‘exceptionally’ (although this has been seriously tested by recent controversies over segregation in academies and free schools). DCLG is now choosing to fund faith-based groups and traditional, long-established civil society organisations in place of community cohesion programmes or resources such as the Migration Impacts Fund.

In the early days of the Coalition government this approach was articulated as building the ‘big society’. The aim of the big society was to encourage community networks to grow and flourish in local areas, but the reality has been that many areas need more direction than the big society has ever been able or prepared to offer. Local authorities are ideally positioned to provide support, but at present they are prevented from doing so adequately because of a lack of central funding and devolved powers.

Central government’s determination to promote integration only ‘exceptionally’ makes it much harder to respond to complex problems in local areas – how integration can be fostered through inclusive settings, for example, or how to tackle entrenched segregation and extremism. This hands-off approach to integration is also reflected in the growing evidence of disproportionate suffering faced by migrants, particularly in the growing incidence of homelessness and labour exploitation. The combined pressures of austerity and high inflows of immigration have been challenging for some areas and, as a result of a lack of direction from central government, they are struggling to cope.

1.3 Theoretical framing
Some commentators argue that human tolerance for diversity is intrinsically finite and that interaction with people who do not share British culture and history puts too much pressure on our communities (Goodhart 2013). We acknowledge that high inflows of immigration, increasing diversity and population churn can be challenging for local areas to respond to. Nevertheless, we maintain that it is possible to increase public acceptance of high inflows of immigration through an active integration policy. This is important because high immigration is likely to be the reality for years to come.

4 For example, ‘Near Neighbours’, a Church Urban Fund programme funded by DCLG, uses the parish infrastructure of the Church of England to bring people of different faiths together to take action on local issues.
5 DCLG has awarded a £10 million grant over two and a half years to increase the reach of youth organisations such as the Scouts Association, Girlguiding UK, Army Cadets, Volunteer Police Cadets and St John Ambulance.
6 The ‘big society’ agenda, though now largely abandoned, was an attempt to encourage people to come together and improve their society. It has been criticised for channelling money away from charities towards the Big Society Network (Milmo 2014).
7 The ‘Trojan horse’ scandal in Birmingham in summer 2014 embodies this very dilemma – see Easton 2014.
8 In Newham, east London, where there are high numbers of migrants, just under a fifth (18 per cent) of employed Newham residents were found to be working for less than the minimum wage of £6.19 per hour, while 48 per cent of residents were found to be working for less than the London living wage of £8.55 (Ipsos MORI 2013).
9 The Page Hall area of Sheffield is an illustrative example – see BBC News 2013.
Politicians and policymakers need to think deeply about how to achieve equality in an era of high migration, greater diversity and increased mobility. This means striving not only for greater material equality – ensuring that immigration policy is fair and contributing to a prosperous economy (see IPPR 2014) – but also for greater social equality – enabling migrants and British people to contribute actively to society and to engage positively with one another.

A failure to seek social equality results in a political vacuum which the far right is all too ready to exploit. Strong conservative impulses exist in contemporary electorates to preserve things of value, and these are taking on new and unexpected forms of political expression. Hostility to immigration is their most obvious manifestation; in the UK, the rise in English political identity is another. However, this is currently given voice in predominantly right-wing and Eurosceptic terms (Pearce 2013).

There is a degree of subjective interpretation to what we might term ‘things of value’. But there are undoubtedly ‘things of value’ that the British public cherishes. Examples might include places of value, such as the public realm in town centres, libraries and parks, protected green spaces,10 or institutions such as children’s centres, schools and the NHS.11 Any sense that immigration is threatening or undermining these things of value causes discontent and can lead to frustrations directed towards migrants.

The government needs to be able to find realistic ways of preserving these things of value. In seeking to reduce net migration, politicians are trying to quell an unstoppable force of our modern age in order to return to an arbitrary and likely unachievable historical level of net migration – it is a policy driven by nostalgia over reason. This creates unrealistic expectations and is damaging to longer-term public trust in the ability of political parties to effectively manage immigration policy.

Equally, aspiring to a utopian vision that is impractical and unachievable within our prevailing social, economic and political order is destined for failure. While it is positive and well-intentioned, the desire to achieve a harmonious, truly ‘multicultural’ society (for example, by introducing policies that support collective action and protect the rights of distinct ethnic groups) has largely fallen out of favour across Europe. Now, the term ‘multiculturalism’ itself has become much maligned (see Connolly 2010, BBC News 2011).

The result of predominantly nostalgic or utopian policies is increased public anxiety, largely because they fail to genuinely preserve the ‘things of value’ in our society. We need policies that have a healthy dose of realism – that accept immigration and diversity as facts of our contemporary lives – but without losing sight of the importance of the things that British people hold dear. A hands-off, devolved approach to state governance will not achieve this; neither will a transactional, centralist, target-driven approach that fails to recognise and preserve ‘public things’.

Political theorists have argued for a shift away from target-setting in order for policymakers to consider more ‘relational’, local and democratic approaches, an approach which embraces the preservation of ‘public things’. For example, Bonnie Honig, an ‘agonist’12 political theorist, writes persuasively about the need for social democrats to move beyond the ‘new public management’ model. She explains that when public things become ‘procedural values’, dictated by targets and indicators, they become shapeless and unrewarding. Instead, Honig says, we ought to value public things by situating them in the material life of citizens and residents together.

10 For example, the Coalition government’s proposal to sell off publicly owned forests provoked a loud public reaction and was eventually withdrawn. For many people, the objection was more than simply environmental: it also sprang from a sense that the forests signified English identity and traditions.
11 Polling shows that the NHS is even more cherished than the monarchy and the army (Katwala 2013).
12 Honig describes ‘agonism’ as ‘not per se always oppositional or inherently contestational. It just anticipates resistance to all efforts to institute and maintain equality or justice’ (Pearce and Honig 2013).
In her words, we should aspire to:

‘…life in common constellated around public things, in affectively charged ways that are both pleasurable and sometimes infuriating, built around finding, promoting and building shared public objects, engaged in some common cause.’

Pearce and Honig 2013

IPPR’s major report on the future of social justice, *The Condition of Britain* (Lawton et al 2014), was heavily influenced by the writings of the political theorist Elizabeth Anderson, who argues for social equality that is built by fostering strong relationships (Anderson 1999). IPPR’s report sets out three crucial keys to unlocking the resources and capacities required to tackle our shared problems together: spreading power and responsibility, fostering contribution across society, and strengthening the institutions that embody our collective aspirations and obligations.

Honig and Anderson are not seeking to be nostalgic or utopian, nor are they seeking to pursue a narrow focus on ‘equality’ in the distributional sense. Rather, they each put forward an optimistic and realistic vision for the future founded on those things that bring us together as a good society – shared public objects, common causes and strong relationships. Their interventions are worth remembering as we consider potential responses to the challenges raised by migration and integration in our communities.

1.4 Building ‘shared ground’ in the UK

Advocating for a centrally driven policy focus on migrant integration is impractical and unlikely to succeed for a number of reasons. First, the government’s current approach is narrowly focused on lowering immigration and, by default, willing issues of migrant integration to go away. Second, immigration is unpopular with the public and so spending directed at migrants is unlikely to garner support for any party. Finally, singling out migrants as policy ‘targets’ is a one-dimensional approach that fails to acknowledge how intertwined migrants are in Britain today, and will continue to be in the future.

Nevertheless, central government has a duty to strive for social equality among all citizens. It cannot expect to lower immigration and for the need to support integration simply to fade away. It also cannot just push the responsibility for integration to the local level without sufficient direction or transferred funding. Poor data on local populations, conflicting local needs and anxiety about immigration from settled residents makes integration policy a challenging area for local authorities to manage – particularly where there have been significant population increases and that trend looks set to continue.

Our vision is for policymakers (in both central and local government) to focus more on what we share than on what sets us apart. We refer to this goal as building ‘shared ground’. We understand ‘ground’ to mean the tangible and physical places that citizens share (such as civic institutions and public spaces) as well as the intangible and ideological ‘common ground’ where human beings connect with one another (incorporating values of fairness, inclusivity and reciprocity).

We believe there are three core principles that would help diverse areas to promote integration: manage the impacts of flux and churn from immigration; build inclusivity in institutions and services; and instil responsibility among all citizens:

An area that is not achieving ‘shared ground’ would have a local authority that is struggling to monitor and respond to the needs of a fluctuating population. The local authority would not have the power to prevent exploitation taking place, which would result in instability, undercutting of wages and residential overcrowding.
The negative effects of exploitation would result in deprivation for migrants as well as British people. Without resolution, friction and tension would escalate. The knock-on impact would be dissatisfied local residents who are upset and distressed by the churn all around them. There would be services that are open to some citizens but not all, leading to some people feeling excluded or sidelined. It would be an area where people were not supported to make changes in their area, and where local people’s efforts to make their environment a pleasant and safe place to live were not nurtured.

By contrast, an area where people are living well together and achieving ‘shared ground’ would have an engaged local authority with the power to respond to the impacts of flux and churn and to ensure that local people feel secure. There would be inclusive settings for people to take part in British ways of life. Newcomers would be welcomed and supported to settle in the area. When friction arises, local authorities would respond by listening to residents and alleviating tensions (arising out of misunderstandings and incivilities, for example) through negotiation and mediation. Public spaces and institutions where local people spend time together would be well maintained. Active community groups, voluntary organisations and local enterprises would be appreciated and supported.

The challenges of living in a diverse society are perceptively articulated by Bonnie Honig when she writes that ‘we can experience political engagement with pleasure and joy as well as the attending frustration that always comes with the friction of life in common’ (Pearce and Honig 2013). But to understand more about the pleasure and joy, as well as the friction, of life in common, we need to engage with what is happening in the lives of migrants and British citizens in everyday settings. The next chapter presents some of their stories.

**Figure 1.1**
Principles for building ‘Shared ground’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manage the impacts of flux and churn from immigration</th>
<th>Build inclusivity in institutions and services</th>
<th>Instil responsibility among all citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central government needs to set minimum standards but then devolve power, and pass on funding to local authorities so they can manage and respond to the impacts of flux and churn arising from high inflows of immigration. This will allow for better data collection to plan for services, as well as measures to tackle exploitation and incivility.</td>
<td>Migrants choosing to live and work in the UK need to have opportunities to meet and interact with British people. This means maintaining communal public spaces and ensuring that institutions and services are inclusive settings for all citizens.</td>
<td>We need to harness the energy of local residents and channel it towards their communities. This means providing opportunities for all residents – migrants and British people alike – to contribute to their community and develop a strong attachment to the area where they live.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. A FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING COMMUNITIES

This chapter explores the extent to which our vision of ‘shared ground’ is being achieved in two diverse pockets of the UK: Normanton in Derby and Forest Gate in the London Borough of Newham. These two neighbourhoods do not provide a representative sample of integration in the UK; indeed, it would be impossible to do so at such an individual, localised level. But our in-depth ethnographic and qualitative research allows us to build up a picture of how migrants and British people mix and interact in ethnically diverse areas with high levels of immigration.\(^\text{13}\)

We chose Normanton and Forest Gate because they both have mixed populations made up of British residents and migrants (both new and long-established) with a broad range of religions and ethnicities. Both areas have a young age profile and a high level of population turnover. They are predominantly economically poor but nevertheless socially thriving communities, boasting a range of civic institutions and community hubs and services – both governmental and non-governmental. Culturally each is unique, with distinctive challenges and opportunities arising from their history and demographics. Their distinctive features allow us to elaborate on the different strategies and approaches that are required in each locality, despite both being ‘super-diverse’ areas.

Since 2011 Newham council has been pursuing an agenda that focuses on building personal, economic and community resilience. The emphasis is on supporting and encouraging residents to build the skills, relationships and networks they need to thrive and be an active part of their community (see appendix 2.1).

Derby council has introduced some specific initiatives to integrate the most vulnerable new arrivals. In particular, it has created a ‘complex cases group for Roma’, which comprises partners from within the police, NHS, local probation trust and departments of the local authority and voluntary sector groups specifically engaged or commissioned to work with Roma families (see appendix 2.2).

In our research, we look at three thematic areas.

- **People and relationships:** We explore ways of characterising the individual experiences and values of our research participants. We review how bonds between local residents are formed and how relationships are strengthened. We reflect on why conflict and friction between British people and migrants sometimes arises, and how it can be diffused.

- **Public spaces and civic institutions:** We identify the places where residents meet and interact in everyday settings, and explore the significance of community spaces such as libraries, parks and workplace settings.

- **Services and support:** We assess the influence of the services that newcomers access and use in their integration experiences. These services range from ‘touching-in points’, providing advice and support, through to longer-term public services, such as education. We also take into account the views of those who provide and deliver services.

\(^{13}\) See appendix 1 for an overview of the methodology and appendix 2 for summary descriptions of our case study areas.
We end with conclusions from our analysis, review the approaches to integration in each of our study areas, and consider how this ‘framework’ can help us to understand communities characterised by ongoing and increasing population flux and diversity.

2.1 People and relationships

Ahmed has a slight accent but his English is good and he speaks in a quiet, assured way. He begins the interview by telling me that he grew up in Kenya. His Asian roots are hard to define as his grandparents moved from, what was then Hindustan (now Agra, in India), to Kenya. He tells me that he is a Muslim; then, with a grin, says his prayer cap also protects his bald head from the sun. He proudly informs me that he is well known on his street as someone who helps newcomers. He shares a story about some eastern European migrants on his street who recently knocked on his door to ask how they could recycle their juice cartons.

Researcher interview with Ahmed, Normanton

Ahmed has a complex identity, which unfolded during the course of the interview. It would be difficult to capture Ahmed’s identity with a single label. His place of birth was Kenya, but his heritage is Asian. He is a Muslim, a father and a grandfather. He is a friendly neighbour and passionate about helping others. His story is one of both migration and settlement. He moved away from Derby as an adult but has now returned and lives on the same street he lived on as a child. His connection and commitment to Normanton is a central part of his identity, as evidenced by the support he has given to the new generation of arrivals.

This complexity and impermanence in personal identity is at the heart of a more nuanced, less categorical approach to describing – and so to understanding – residents’ experiences of modern British communities.

Understanding the complexities of personal identity

We asked our research participants to describe their identity in up to five words. Some people chose to self-identify based on their nationality, ethnicity or religion. Hassan, for example, refers to his identity as ‘British, Pakistani, English, Asian-British and Muslim’. But many more of our participants referred to themselves based on their personal characteristics, their circumstances and their aspirations. They presented themselves in the light they wished to be viewed, choosing adjectives and descriptions that defined their ideals and ambitions.

‘I’m loving and caring, I like fashion and style, and I’m a mum and a grandmother, a socialiser’
Francine, Forest Gate

‘Alternative, environmentalist, female, single parent’
Beth, Normanton

‘I’m enthusiastic, confident, I like to try new things, I enjoy challenges’
David, Forest Gate

‘British, Pakistani, unemployed’
Habib, Forest Gate

‘A teacher, a psychotherapist, I care about nature, people, conservation and sustainability’
Tomas, Forest Gate

All names have been changed to protect the identity of our research participants.

Through this chapter, second-hand accounts of interviews have been drafted by the authors. Direct quotes from interviewees are indicated by quote marks.
‘I’m Roma, Slovakian and a Christian’
Maria, Normanton

‘I like to plan things and achieve progress, I like learning and training, and I am an intelligent, organised, strong person.’
Emmanuel, Forest Gate

‘British, Pakistani, English, Asian-British, Muslim’
Hassan, Normanton

‘Scottish, a musician, fortunate, British’
Rowan, Forest Gate

‘Republican, revolutionary, socialist, rebellious, anarchist’
Andrew, Forest Gate

Figure 2.1
Questionnaire responses to the question ‘Describe your own identity in up to five words’ at a community meeting in Normanton, Derby

Emmanuel (quoted above) went on to explain: ‘Angola is just the place I was born. It only defines where I came from; it’s not who I am.’ The quote below from Paulette illustrates how she expressly objected to filling out her nationality on a form at a council-run welfare-to-work centre in Forest Gate. She did not want to self-identify based on her nationality and was anxious for others not to either.

‘Workplace asked for my nationality on the form. I decided not to fill it out but the girl said that I had to fill it out, so I just walked out. I haven’t been back since.’
Paulette, Forest Gate

Despite the multitude of responses that come up when people identify themselves, academics and policymakers tend to group people in simple, categorical terms, by their nationality, religion, ethnicity or immigration status. Policies of ‘assimilative
integration’ and multicultural group rights fall into the trap of assuming that people have identities which are unified by group involvement (Cherti and McNeil 2012). This means that policy decisions (and service provision) are often predicated on expectations of the relatively uniform behaviour and identity of a particular group.

The varied forms of self-identification in the examples above, and represented in the word cloud above, illustrate how important it is for us to reconsider how we characterise and label people in our society. Simple ethnic or nationality labels ignore the messy complexity of human existence. They are important for some, but not for everyone.

In order to come closer to achieving shared ground in diverse communities, we need to explore ways of understanding personal experiences and identities that extend beyond simplistic labels. Our strategies, set out in chapter 3 below, are designed to respond to specific needs and issues, rather than to target migrants generically or specific migrant groups.

The different facets of our human existence are complex: our practical circumstances (such as how rooted in our locality we are) are relevant, as well as the degree to which we feel attachment to a particular area. We elaborate on these two dimensions in the following sections.

**Understanding experiences of fixedness and transience**

Figure 2.2 illustrates the varying degree to which people feel anchored in their community, as a continuum between being more established or fixed and being more transient or mobile. This approach does not label people as ‘migrant’ or ‘non-migrant’, ‘white’ or ‘black and minority ethnic’ (BME). Instead it allows for the wider set of circumstances that, taken together, mean someone is more or less transient, which could include, for instance, housing tenure, how long someone has lived in the community, family status, immigration status and age.

---

**Figure 2.2**

Established or transient – a continuum of experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established residents</th>
<th>Transient residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>homeowners, long-time residents, long-term tenants, families with children at school</td>
<td>short-term migrants, students, short-term tenants, asylum-seekers, young professionals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nadiya is a more established resident:

‘I love Normanton. It feels like home because of its multicultural atmosphere and all its colourful fabrics, food outlets. I came on a spousal visa. My husband was very supportive when I arrived. He helps me a lot and his family are there to support me. I’ve learnt a lot of things and now I’m beginning to settle down.’

Nadiya, Normanton

Tomas is a more transient resident:

‘I came to the UK a year ago. Basically I use this area to sleep in because I work in the centre of London. I went to East Ham when I first arrived but the accommodation was messy and dirty so I moved on. I’ll probably stay in Forest Gate for the next few months but after that I’ll look for another job and it’s likely I’ll move to another place.’

Tomas, Forest Gate

---

16 This mirrors the dual meaning of ‘shared ground’, as noted in chapter 1 – that is, that it includes both the places and institutions that citizens share and the abstract ‘common ground’ where human beings connect.
People’s experiences change over the course of their lives. Some people choose to put down roots or remain transient; for others, moving (or not) is driven by factors outside their own control. Timotej, for example, describes the reasons why he moved his family to the UK:

‘In the town where I was living in Slovakia there were no jobs, that’s why I came to the UK. There was racism because I’m Roma, and our house was demolished. There was never any hot water and our energy would be cut off. Life is better here but it’s very difficult to find a job.’

Timotej, Normanton

Significant life events such as getting married or starting a family can have a big impact on physical circumstances and priorities. Emilija is a young woman who was a ‘transient resident’ on arrival in the UK: she moved from one house to another, sleeping on friends’ sofas. Now she is married to a Polish man she met in Derby, they have had a baby, and she is looking to regularise her status. Like many new parents, her balance of priorities has shifted towards a greater need for security and stability.

‘I would like to become a British citizen but the problem is I don’t have official proof to show how long I’ve been living here. I stayed with my friends to begin with, so I don’t have an official record of living in the UK for the first few years. I’ve read in the paper they are going to kick us out, so I would do it [gain British citizenship] for security. It won’t change a lot, but I would feel more comfortable.’

Emilija, Normanton

By contrast, Andrew is a ‘fixed resident’ in Forest Gate because he wants to be near his teenage son while he is growing up, but he yearns to travel and explore the world.

‘My dream is to go somewhere in Asia – I’ve got some money and I’ll eek it out and I’ll live reasonably and then I’ll go. But I’m not doing anything until my son is grown up and doing his own thing.’

Andrew, Forest Gate

Globalisation means that transience is increasingly a facet of our lives. Cheap flights make travel easier, and internet communication and social networking help to keep bonds with home alive. Those who migrate can still enjoy freedom of movement, unlike previous generations, who once they had made the decision to relocate were more rooted in their new places.

Understanding values and community attachment

In this section, we consider the varying degree to which our research participants felt attached to their local community. This helps us to understand the degree to which someone is integrated, and can highlight why people feel anxious or unsettled by people who have very different experiences and values to their own.

Residents with a strong attachment to the local community

Fardous came to the UK as a child and was awarded refugee status as a young girl. She smiled when I asked how she would describe her own identity: ‘I was born in Somalia but I’m about as British as I can be.’ She works long hours in her job as a support worker and supervisor. She shared with me her hopes and dreams of becoming a foster carer in the future, and described how settled and contented she felt in the UK. ‘There’s nowhere I would rather be; this is where I started my life; hopefully this is where I will end my life.’

Fardous, Forest Gate

Fardous is a young woman who is settled in her area. Her fixed status is perhaps what compels her to consider becoming a foster carer in the future. People with strong attachments to their community tend to have a strong stake in their area and
often play a critical role in maintaining community stability. They are more likely to be the ones who attend community consultations and engage with their local authority, for example.

But we also found that some residents with a strong attachment to their community are more prone to maintain exclusive social networks – they have a tendency to ‘cluster’ and, if they are older, are more likely to be dependent on the fixed population of local residents for support. Francine, for example, chooses to socialise within her own network and is not seeking to widen her circle of acquaintances.

‘I see lots of Asians, but they are not my friends. I spend my time with other Dominicans. We go to pubs and have barbecues together. I also sometimes meet with people from St Lucia who speak our Creole language.’

Francine, Forest Gate

Some fixed residents with a deeply held attachment to their area can feel intensely fearful or anxious about instability, and can be unsettled by the presence of transient residents (whether they are British citizens or migrants). For some people, this can be a simmering, low-level concern; for others it can become overwhelming.

‘I’m not racist, I don’t have a problem with blacks and Pakistanis. It’s the Poles who are the problem. A British woman was killed by a Pole here. Crime has gone up since they’ve come here. They should send them all back.’

Local resident in a pub in Normanton

Residents with a temporary attachment to the local community

Mohammed Abdul-Razaq is the co-owner of Pak Foods – a supermarket set up 18 years ago on the Normanton high street. 20 years ago the Normanton high street was clapped out, boarded up and notorious for drug-dealing but Mr Abdul-Razaq saw the potential in the area. After being refused by several banks, he turned to his family and borrowed £70,000 to develop Pak Foods. The store was an instant success. The banks that had refused credit said the store might make £8,000 in a week; it made that in its first day.

Pak Foods has always been generous with its wealth: ‘We have supported all sorts of projects, putting money into schools, churches and business in Derby. We work with the local mosques and the police, helping victims of domestic abuse, giving them food packages.’ The company is planning to open even more stores. Mr Abdul-Razaq said: ‘This is very much a family business. And Derby has become that family’s home.’

Excerpts from the Derby Telegraph, January 2011

The brothers who set up Pak Foods in Normanton have been instrumental in generating wealth and prosperity in the area. The bustling, entrepreneurial high streets in Normanton and Forest Gate are testament to the many people who have invested in these areas. Polski skleps, Thai nail bars and Bangladeshi curry houses have played a critical role in revitalising many British high streets – areas that would have otherwise decayed (Saunders 2011).

Some of those entrepreneurial people who have invested in an area will stay and put down roots, and become attached to their area. But others may choose to move on from the areas where they first settle. Sunil, for example, moved out of Normanton to live in a more affluent, safer area, but he and his wife still miss the community feel of Normanton and often return to be with friends and family.

‘I have recently moved to the next door area. It’s safer and predominantly white. But although I feel safe there is no community spirit. The neighbours never remarked that my wife was pregnant – in Normanton,
everyone would. There the streets are full of kids playing and old ladies gossiping. There are Indians, Africans and Polish all living together."
Sunil, Normanton

The neighbours who attended our ‘round the kitchen table’ chat in Normanton were intensely frustrated by the private landlords who had moved out of the area but had kept their old houses to rent out at overinflated rents, which was now resulting in overcrowding and antisocial behaviour. These landlords had grown up in the Normanton area, but had moved on and were now failing to care for the area, or indeed follow the rule of law.

‘The private landlords are at the heart of our animosity … and what makes it worse is that these are the people who used to be our neighbours – I remember their kids.’

‘The bins are a big problem: the landlords tell them just to leave stuff on the street because the council will pick it up. The culture is now that “the council will come and get it”.’

Local residents at kitchen chat, Normanton

Residents with a loose attachment to the local community
Lucia has an infectious smile and a cheerful demeanour. She describes her own identity as ‘compassionate, deep, easy-going, charismatic and fun’. She is South African but her mum is Portuguese, which means she has a European passport. She has been in the UK for two years and is enjoying living in Forest Gate. Living in South Africa felt ‘like living in a bubble or a box’. She found a flat online using Gumtree, and now has a job working in a bar. She has a British boyfriend and is making more British friends. She is disparaging about obtaining British citizenship: ‘The test is not relevant to me; I would rather learn through a person and their experiences than from a book.’ She spends much of her free time hanging out in Camden and is interested in moving to Hackney in the future.
Researcher interview with Lucia, Forest Gate

Lucia is young, adaptable, tolerant, curious and open to new experiences. Her desire to explore the world means that she actively seeks to interact with new people and to find opportunities to experience British culture and social life. She is open about the fact that this might lead her away from the area she is living in now.

While many of our interview participants with loose attachments to their community were migrants, we also talked to British people who espoused these traits. Hannah, for example, is a young woman who moved to Forest Gate in order to be near a more ethnically diverse set of people: ‘It bothers me that I’m a diverse person but my friendship circles don’t reflect my ideals.’

People with loose attachments to their community may be more adaptable, and will take action to ‘fit in’ and learn the language.

‘Sometimes when you have to do something, when you have no choice, you get used to it – you adapt. Like a child – when you get here you don’t have a choice, you’ve just got to catch up, get the language. You can’t go anywhere else, so you start to learn and adapt.’

Emmanuel, Forest Gate

However, those with loose attachments may also be less likely to forge relationships with their neighbours. Marcin, for example, explained how he worked nights in a granite factory and tended to spend most of his time socialising with other eastern European migrants. To an onlooker, it might appear that he and his flatmates
wanted to ‘keep themselves to themselves’, but he explained how he was fearful of spending time in the local pubs.

‘I don’t go to pubs, especially not in Normanton. We just drink at home. I’m a little bit scared to go to pubs. I don’t want to go somewhere where there could be conflicts or problems. I want to be somewhere where I can speak my own language.’

Marcin, Normanton

People with loose attachments may also be less aware of how their personal behaviour can impinge on others, which can challenge a community’s sense of unity. The quotes below are from our round-table kitchen chat in Normanton – the six neighbours involved were ‘fixed residents’, due to their housing or family status. We talked about their experience of living alongside transient residents, and their perceptions of them.

‘We used to have some neighbours from the Congo, they were lovely. They did everything they were supposed to. They used to walk a long way to go to English classes with their baby. I would have loved to carry on having them as neighbours, but they moved away. Instead we’ve had three or four different families, with cars coming and going, and shouting up until 11pm.

‘Once I was up crying at 3.30am because the family next door were being so loud. It’s too much to expect the street to cope with what has been going on.’

Local resident at kitchen chat, Normanton

These settled residents felt aggrieved by the behaviour of their transient neighbours, but they also showed an insight into their neighbours’ behaviour. Their frustrations were directed less towards the individuals who were causing the friction, and more towards the council, private landlords and housing association for failing to provide the correct information to tenants or to prevent exploitation.

‘Deep down they probably do want to fit in but just don’t know how things work. I’ve had a neighbour ask me “what is council tax?” Every country has a different system.’

‘There’s a hierarchy of needs – people who can’t get food on the table won’t really care if there is rubbish on the street.’

Local residents at kitchen chat, Normanton

People with a loose attachment to their community often lack networks of support and, as a result, are more likely to be at risk of exploitation by unscrupulous landlords or rogue employers. Openness to new experiences can lead to people accepting poor living or work conditions in order to save money or just to get by in an unknown environment. Tomas, for example, wanted an employment contract but could not get one from his boss. For him, this culture of illegal working was unsettling and in stark contrast to that of his home country.

‘It’s shocking: my employer is not afraid of the government, that they will find him and close his business because he employs people illegally. It’s better in Slovakia – people are afraid to be employed or employ people illegally. Here I cannot see such fear.’

Tomas, Forest Gate

Tomas also commented on his unstable housing situation.

‘The first time I went for a viewing I was shocked. The room was in such bad condition, if someone from the government came or if there was an inspection they would close the house – it was so dirty. Now I pay
about £370 per month, but I’m negotiating with the householder. The householder doesn’t want to make a contract. I didn’t know that there must be an official contract. He gave me a paper, his name, my name, our address, it seemed like a deal and I thought it was official. I asked him if I was going to pay him via a bank account but he didn’t want me to pay like that – he wanted cash.’

Tomas, Forest Gate

He had also struggled to find reliable information when he first arrived.

‘When I first arrived I had no idea what the council was. My main source of information was the internet and some online forums. It would have been useful if when I’d first arrived I had been told about important websites where I could get some basic information about healthcare, jobs, working and living.’

Tomas, Forest Gate

In Normanton, residential overcrowding is a serious problem. The conversation at our kitchen-table chat centred on residents’ concerns about large numbers of families living in small residential houses.

‘Last summer holidays, stacks of people just appeared. One house apparently had 24 people in it – four of them were just living in a shed. There was a group that lived in two houses: the kids lived in one and the adults in the other. We saw them walking down the street to get their nappies changed. Some of them still had dummies and we’d just watch them wandering down the street alone. There was an 18-year-old girl who took care of them and the parents just worked.’

Local resident at kitchen chat, Normanton

Responding to questions of community attachment

Community tensions often arise when people with different degrees of attachment to community live alongside one another. These dynamics can pose serious challenges for local areas.

In some parts of Normanton, for example, this is reaching breaking point, with established residents feeling helpless and frustrated in the face of so much flux and change in their community. In Newham there are lots of people with a temporary attachment to their area – which can be double-edged, as the area is undergoing lots of regeneration but there are also many people moving up and out.

Policymakers face a range of varying challenges. We need to find ways of alleviating and preventing the friction that can arise between highly transient and more settled residents, as well as encouraging people to settle and put down roots. At the same time, policies are needed to respond to the concerns of fixed residents who feel threatened or troubled by the arrival or turnover of transient residents in their neighbourhood.

Vulnerability related to transience can result in exploitation, for example in the form of low wages or poor housing conditions. This can severely hamper the process of integration for migrants and their families, but it can also have knock-on effects on other residents – for example, through wages being undercut and residential overcrowding resulting in antisocial behaviour – which in turn generate animosity within the wider community.

Our strategies, set out in chapter 3, explore ways to diffuse the tensions that can arise when people with different degrees of attachment to their community live alongside one another.
2.2 Public places and civic institutions

‘Every Sunday I go up to the Wanstead Flats to play football. There’s a group from lots of different backgrounds: Pakistani, Bangladesh, Indian, Spanish, French and Nigerian. It started out with just a group of friends but ended up turning into something much bigger. We are all doing something we enjoy – if anyone is interested they can come along. It’s not for people of a particular background – anyone is welcome. You don’t have to speak English. One time last summer we had 45 people turn up. Everyone contributed £5 from their own pockets so we could get bibs, goals etcetera. If you interact then you understand each other a bit more. Otherwise there’s stereotyping – you just need to break down the barriers.’

Habib, Forest Gate

Habib is a young man living in Forest Gate. He spoke enthusiastically about a football league that he set up at Wanstead Flats in Forest Gate. The league provides an opportunity to connect with people from a range of backgrounds and is an example of how ‘passive tolerance’ happens where people come together to ‘share ground’ in a local park.

Sharing places and institutions is important in diverse areas where there is a high degree of population churn. Understandably, pride in public places and civic institutions is felt deeply by fixed residents who have a strong attachment to their community. But public spaces are important to transient people too: locations such as libraries and parks are anchor points that provide stability and opportunities for meeting new people, learning about British ways of life and finding support.

The pictures below were taken by Abdi and Zain, in Normanton. Abdi explains his strong connection to the park where his children play with their friends. He described to us how important it was for his children to feel settled in their area, and the knock-on impact it had on him: as a result of his children mixing with a wider group of peers, he now has friends from other ethnic groups.

‘I feel connected to this place, as its one of the places where my children spend hours of their summer holidays playing, eating ice-cream, running around with their friends and singing nursery rhymes. It’s the place my children and I will remember when we grow old.’

Abdi, Normanton

---

17 See Professor Miles Hewstone, quoted in University of Oxford 2014.
Similarly, Zain articulates why going to the park helps him to feel connected to his community.

‘I enjoy going to the local park and taking part in sports activities, including football and cricket. When I go to the local park most people would join in the game that’s taking place without hesitating. I like the fact that people randomly join in – as a community I feel connected, as this helps my social skills and I can easily make friends. Once the game is over we all sit and have a chat.’

Zain, Normanton

Ernesto has only been in Forest Gate for two months, but he has already recognised the library as an important source of information and a safe place for his children.

‘I’ve been taking my two kids to the Forest Gate library – there’s a great area for them to play and read. They have internet too. It’s a good place if you want to research or read something. In Venezuela the library is just a place for books; here it’s part of the council – it was more than I expected.’

Ernesto, Forest Gate

Well-kept public places provide the opportunity for residents to live well together. Parks and other green spaces are particularly important for the social and economic wellbeing of citizens, providing benefits in terms of both physical and mental health (Drayson 2014). Public places and civic institutions that are badly maintained, disrespected or threatened with closure are a source of huge discontent for local
residents. Councils have an important role to play in maintaining these sites of organic, ‘everyday’ integration, as well as supporting local citizens who take the initiative to set up inclusive, informal ‘get-togethers’ in these areas. Where problems arise, as the quotes below illustrate, it can become challenging for people to settle and for voluntary community organisations to deliver services effectively.

‘Increasingly public spaces are seen as no-go areas in Normanton. They are perceived to be unsafe, including the Arboretum – there have been face-cuttings, robberies and people dealing drugs. There was a plan to get volunteers in to clean up the park – but then they did a risk assessment and decided it was too dangerous.’
Local resident at kitchen chat, Normanton

‘They knocked down the library and built a new building. Now you have to jump through hoops, then they charge you because you’re not a council organisation. Other community organisations stopped using it, but they’ve cut their prices so that organisations use the space again. I wish they had a level playing-field with their costs.’
Stakeholder from a voluntary community organisation, Forest Gate

Newham borough council has introduced schemes to actively encourage local citizens to meet and engage with one another in public places. For instance, small grants for inclusive street parties and festivals encourage local residents to meet and connect with their neighbours. These were viewed in a very positive light by people of all ages who we met in Forest Gate.

‘The Forest Gate Festival is fantastic, I cannot overstate it enough – that’s when Forest Gate comes alive. It’s genuinely really good. It’s got a good combination – you can put stall up and make a few pounds – so that’s always good. But it’s also where I meet the neighbours – talk to people that I wouldn’t usually. Whoever does it creates a nice atmosphere. People make home-cooked food. It’s not commercial, which is fantastic – it should stay on that level. It’s just local people doing nice, simple things. If the sun shines, it’s a perfect day. It’s something I look forward to.’
Andrew, Forest Gate

Workplaces are also key sites of integration. Maria, for example, began to make connections at work and was practising English with her colleague.

‘I have an Indian friend who I met at work. When we’re working at the flower factory we work together in the line. We speak in English but sometimes I speak a bit of Roma language, because there are some similarities between Roma and Indian languages.’
Maria, Normanton

The process of applying for and gaining British citizenship provides a potentially valuable opportunity to build ‘shared ground’. However, at present, it is conceived as a rote learning exercise, and it does very little to support those who are ‘becoming British’ to become more closely integrated. Generating respect and care for local places is important, but a contractual approach is unlikely to secure lasting behavioural change. Nadiya, for example, explained why she thinks that the citizenship process should have a focus on local places and daily interactions.

‘The citizenship test was not difficult for me. If you’re educated you can do it – I studied for one month and then passed it. It’s more about having a good memory. But it should be more about day-to-day living. It would be useful for people to learn about their local area and about British manners and etiquette – such as how to greet people.’
Nadiya, Normanton
2.3 Services and support

‘The Forest Gate Community School EAL [English as an additional language] room is packed with students during lunch and morning break. Young people of different ages and different backgrounds mingle. Yuri (a Russian 11-year-old) and Ravi (an Italian/Bengali 10-year-old) sit playing chess. They explain to me that the game was a lifeline when they first arrived – a way to communicate and engage before they had the words to do so. I chat with Maija (a Latvian 12-year-old) who has been in the UK for seven months and already speaks fluent, eloquent English. She enjoys hip-hop dancing, and so the EAL staff had initially designed English-language support around her interest – by watching hip-hop videos and then discussing and writing about them. In the corner, Mihal sits at a computer typing up a poem he has written, first in Polish and then translated into English.’

Researcher observations at Forest Gate Community School

In diverse areas, universal services such as early-years and education settings are crucial sites of integration and should provide inclusive, personalised care and support for migrant children and their families. Many schools and nurseries in such areas have adapted in response to the needs of migrant children, and recognise the importance of their role as inclusive service providers.

The personalised care given to each child at Forest Gate Community School is intensely beneficial, as demonstrated by children, like Maija, who can speak fluent English less than a year after arriving. The school also runs well-attended English language classes for parents of migrant children.

A youth worker at the Forest Gate Youth Learning Zone described the importance of encouraging young migrants to interact with one another and speak English together.

‘At the moment there are Afghan and Portuguese kids, but they often stay in their groups – they like to stick with their own kind. Our policy is to speak English. If they don’t speak English they get told to leave. They are learning now – from the moment they arrive, shake hands and say “hello”.’

Youth worker, Forest Gate

'I’ve been here nine months, but I only came across the free English lessons funded by the government one month ago. If I had known there were free courses I would definitely have taken them. I’m going to start attending English lessons at the learning zone from tomorrow.’

Tomas, Forest Gate
Normanton and Forest Gate both benefit from a strong network of community organisations delivering effective services to local people. Our community partners in Normanton – the St James Centre and Jobs Education and Training (JET) – both provide inclusive community support projects for local people. They were praised by our research participants for providing much-needed support to newcomers, through English language learning, job support and orientation assistance.

Similarly, religious groups often play an important role in supporting new arrivals and aiding the early stages of integration. In Normanton, for example, we heard about the Sikh community providing meals to local destitute people, with high take-up by Roma families. We also came across a Christian group that provides support to young people, with its take-up dominated by eastern European young people.

‘The Club is run by the church. Any young people can come but it’s mostly eastern Europeans. I hope that can broaden. We have 500 young people registered on the books. They come for two hours in the evening to do sports, indoor football, crafts, music sessions, cooking – or just for a place to chill. We teach them about English customs and ways of life in the UK. They learn about where they are living, what’s normal, and about Derby. On a practical level we explain about voltages, fire safety and hazards, what to do in an emergency, different careers, physical fitness and health, and if young people come from difficult backgrounds we give them training and mentoring.’

Faith representative, Normanton

Newham council’s resilience agenda has resulted in a strong emphasis on inclusive migrant integration, but some providers stressed the importance of arrival services aimed at certain groups, rather than pushing migrants straight into inclusive service provision.

‘For true integration you need to improve skills and language. Then they will go on to integrate with other communities. People need confidence and motivation. Often that’s overlooked. The service I run is for women from India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. I can’t do a group for people who are in the early stages of learning English with 20 different languages being spoken in the class.’

ESOL teacher, Forest Gate

For some migrants, particularly those who are more vulnerable (such as migrant women at risk of domestic violence), a more specialised service is required. There is a role to play for specialist services, particularly where they are run by community activists and volunteers. Often, these people donate their time and energy for very little financial reward. Subsidies for volunteers and recognition of the role they play were highlighted by providers.

‘The council wants everyone to volunteer, but they don’t appreciate or recognise the voluntary work that we do. I just want to be appreciated. I really have to fight for my volunteers. The Disclosure and Barring Service is expensive for small organisations.’

Service provider at community meeting, Forest Gate

Local councils need to find ways of acknowledging and supporting the work of community organisations. Inclusive service provision is important, but our research also highlights the significance of early integration support directed at specific groups, particularly where vulnerabilities exist due to discrimination or deprivation.18

Inspired by the stories we heard during our time in Forest Gate and Normanton, we have published a comic of short stories, called Be here now – it is available from the IPPR website, at http://www.ippr.org/publications/shared-ground
2.4 Our framework for understanding local places

The places where migrants choose to settle are often thriving commercial hubs. Our case study areas are prime examples: both are highly entrepreneurial and resilient. Normanton’s high street, once in seemingly perpetual decline, is now a buzzing thoroughfare, with new businesses serving a diverse local clientele. But where tensions arise this diversity can make the integration of newcomers a challenging process. In this section we draw conclusions from our findings in our two case study areas.

Life and change in Normanton, Derby

Derby council is struggling both to prevent exploitation and to alleviate local tensions between established and transient residents in Normanton.

The prevalence of private landlords in the area is one of the deepest problems. Inflated rents result in overcrowding, which is challenging for tenants (and can lead to exploitative living conditions) as well as being unsettling for established residents, who struggle to get to know their neighbours and repeatedly see people come and go. We heard stories of transient residents dumping their rubbish or unwanted property on the street (often having been told to do so by their landlords). This is unpleasant and in some cases distressing – we heard one story about a pile of rubbish that was set alight outside an established older resident’s house, for example.

Cases of incivility – such as spitting, hanging out on street corners and playing music late at night – generated frustration, mistrust and animosity towards newcomers, as well as dissatisfaction with local and national politicians for failing to respond or prevent these incivilities from taking place. These perceptions and accusations provide only one side of the story – no doubt the newcomers would have a different experience to speak of – but they are nevertheless heartfelt concerns and increase unease between newcomers and the settled community.

Many of the migrants we spoke to in Normanton were keen to have the opportunity to meet and interact with British people. They described the significance of interactions in everyday locations, such as meeting other parents at school and engaging with different people in the workplace or local parks. Learning English is a key objective for many of the migrants we spoke to; English language provision run by local voluntary organisations is popular and well patronised among this group.

Many of the research participants who completed a photo diary chose to photograph their local park (usually the Arboretum Park in the centre of Normanton) and described it as an area where they felt they immediately belonged. This was particularly the case for young people and parents with children. Despite this, established residents were upset about the lack of upkeep of the local parks and there was a perception that the public parks were sometimes unsafe to be in because of drug use and vandalism.

Some innovative local projects exist to support newcomers to the area, including our community partners – the St James Centre and Jobs Education and Training. A local church group offers inclusive youth services to over 500 young people from a range of backgrounds (although predominantly eastern European) and the Sikh community provides food to people who are experiencing destitution (the Roma community in particular).

We came across many Normanton residents who are committed to ‘giving something back’ to their area, either through their employment or voluntary work, or through small acts of kindness (such as giving food parcels to neighbours). Despite this, we heard a number of people talk about how they would move out when they had the means to do so, in favour of a more affluent area. One particular issue noted by parents in the area was that there was no local secondary school. Finally, British citizenship does not seem to bear any particular significance to migrants in the area, beyond regularising status and providing a passport.
Life and change in Forest Gate, Newham

Since 2011, Newham council has been pursuing an agenda focused on building personal, economic and community resilience (see appendix 2.1 for more details). The emphasis is on supporting and encouraging residents to build the skills, relationships and networks they need to thrive and be an active part of their community.

We heard fewer complaints about antisocial behaviour (such as dumping rubbish) in Forest Gate. The council has taken concerted action to respond to flytipping, which explains why it was not mentioned as frequently as it was in Normanton. Residents did refer to their being aware of violence and crime – including drugs, gang violence, street crime and robberies – but our research participants did not link this to newcomers. Rather, it appears to be a more entrenched problem relating to disaffected young people in the area.

In Newham, which has a high migrant population, almost one in five residents (18 per cent) earn below the national minimum wage (Ipsos MORI 2013). We spoke to one migrant who had been employed by a rogue employer (who paid him a low wage and refused to give him a contract) and he described his feelings of instability, which were in turn compelling him to move on from the area.

Forest Gate Community School has around 1,200 students, with around half of those benefiting from extra ‘English as an additional language’ (EAL) support. It provides a deeply nurturing and supportive environment for new migrants and their families. The approach taken by the ESOL department is to provide targeted, personalised support for each migrant child on arrival, which in many cases involves their leaving other classes in order to receive specialist language support and individual tuition. Children are then encouraged to return to group classes as soon as they are able. In some cases the local authority has had to split up siblings, where only one school place is available; this has caused problems for migrant families and can be unsettling for the children concerned.

The children are encouraged to meet and mix with one another to play games and to take part in shared sporting and cultural activities. Students are supported to preserve their knowledge of their first language – for example, by providing foreign-language newspapers for children who are learning English as an additional language, and in some cases by having them write first in their mother tongue and then translating their work into English. The inclusive schemes that Newham has introduced for all children in the borough (such as ‘Every Child a Musician’ and ‘Every Child a Theatregoer’) are well regarded by local residents.

Newham council only provides funding to community groups that can demonstrate they are open to people of all backgrounds. This means that the council will fund ethnic-specific or religious groups if they can show that they are providing an inclusive service, and, in general, will not fund services that are only targeted at particular ethnic or religious groups. (Under exceptional circumstances, such as where services target a vital health issue or support an at-risk group – such as girls at risk of female genital mutilation – the council may provide funding support to such groups.)

We spoke to stakeholders (including faith leaders, nursery school teachers and members of local community organisations) who recognised the importance of inclusivity in services and acknowledged that Newham’s approach in this area is supporting migrant families to integrate and settle. The importance of this was particularly noted in nurseries and school settings.

Some of the representatives from smaller, ethnic-specific community organisations wanted to see greater transparency in Newham council’s decisions about funding. They also wanted greater acknowledgment and appreciation of the role they played in delivering services for specific groups of migrants, particularly if they were
supporting vulnerable or deprived ethnic-specific groups in the early stages of integrating in the UK, such as targeted language classes.

The decision to remove foreign-language newspapers from the libraries in Newham was seen by some of the stakeholders we spoke to as ‘a step too far’ in promoting inclusivity. Preservation of another culture and language does not preclude integration, as the approach of the Forest Gate Community School shows – indeed, it should be possible to achieve alongside a strong appreciation and awareness of British culture and English language.

For some new migrants, ‘The Gate’ (Newham’s neighbourhood venue – formerly the library) was their first port of call. It was seen as a safe space for taking children, a useful location for getting information, and a good place to access computers. None of our research participants had chosen to attend a neighbourhood meeting at The Gate, although these meetings have only been held over the past year or so. It is likely that these sorts of meetings will only attract residents who are settled with a strong degree of attachment to their place. Some local stakeholders criticised the high costs to hire a room at The Gate and chose other local venues to hold meetings instead.

Residents – both settled and transient – welcomed the information that is provided to local people in the area. The Newham Mag contains information about inclusive local services and activities and was read by many of our research participants.19

Football leagues in local parks are key incidents of ‘everyday integration’, particularly for younger people, and were mentioned by a number of our participants, both migrants and British citizens. They welcomed the opportunity to make friends in a relaxed, local setting and enjoyed socialising with people from a range of backgrounds. These appear to operate in an ad hoc way, but are nevertheless important sites of integration and have a key role to play in supporting people of all backgrounds to become settled.

Newham council’s approach of providing £200 for neighbours to run street parties was very popular, despite being a relatively small, low-cost initiative. We spoke to residents of all ages who liked the idea and welcomed the chance to meet with their neighbours. The Forest Gate Festival, organised by local residents, was also a very popular event – a number of our research participants talked about how welcome it had been to mix with local people from a range of backgrounds.

Conclusions: a framework for understanding communities

These summaries demonstrate how each individual area faces its own challenges and the degree to which an area is achieving “shared ground” will vary according to a range of factors. However, there are features that are common across economically poor, socially diverse areas characterised by high population churn and flux.

Fluctuating community demographics make it challenging for local authorities to forecast and plan services

Forecasting the movement of people is challenging. At present, many local authorities and local institutions are working in a void of data,20 forced to pull statistics from disparate sources. This is not just a challenge for planning: it also makes it much harder to reassure local people, bring perspective to areas of

---

19 See http://www.newham.gov.uk/Pages/Services/The-Newham-Mag.aspx

20 One example is provided by the Home Office report Social and public service impacts of international migration at the local level, published in July 2013. Conversations with local authority staff and immigration experts allowed the authors to make an ‘impressionistic assessment’ of the relative impacts of different types of migrants in a range of local areas. The report authors stated that ‘it was initially hoped that more data might be available to enable a clearer quantitative assessment of the impacts of different types of migrants, however it proved impossible to find data that was capable of being disaggregated in this way’ (Poppleton 2013).
concern, and dispel myths. Churn is also inherently costly (Gordon et al 2007) and can diminish civic engagement, trust and neighbourliness (Coulthard et al 2002).

**Tensions are to be expected between established residents and transient residents**

Problems can arise between ‘fixed residents’, particularly those with a strongly held attachment to their community, and ‘transient residents’, particularly those with a very loose attachment to the community. In some cases, this is due to specific disagreements or differences in attitudes or behaviour; in other cases, this is due to perceptions or assumptions about ‘the others’. Tension is to be expected in diverse areas, but it requires a response from the local authority to prevent matters escalating and anxiety increasing. Responses will need to be tailored to each individual area.

This is not about labelling British citizens as fixed residents and migrants as transient residents – our analysis shows that this is a false assumption. There are transient British citizens with a loose attachment to their community who cause tension, just there are some migrants who have established a strong attachment and commitment to their local area. Experiences and degrees of attachment vary, for British citizens as well as for migrants, and evolve over time.

**There is a serious risk of vulnerability arising out of transience**

Vulnerability related to the degree to which an individual is more or less transient (whether at their own choosing or due to factors outside their control) can result in exploitation. This is more likely to be the case for people who are transient residents and who have a loose attachment to their community – many of these people will be migrants, but is also true of young people and those experiencing extreme poverty, for example.

As well as severely affecting the individuals concerned, exploitation can have severe impacts on more established, settled residents. This can increase levels of animosity within the wider community, which in turn makes integration more challenging overall. These challenges are particularly associated with the thriving of ‘grey’ or informal economies and privately rented housing stock.

**What changes are needed to respond to these challenges?**

We know that public ‘things of value’ matter deeply to British people. There are strong conservative impulses within contemporary electorates to preserve them.

Supporters of Ukip list immigration as their primary concern, but ‘are driven towards Ukip by a deeper unease simply with the way life has changed in modern Britain’ (Ashcroft 2012). This unease is not necessarily evidenced in relation to work or the economy, but picks up on a whole host of everyday activities that emphasise the ways in which the ‘position of the majority’ within the nation is being challenged (Skey 2013).

Politicians will be more likely to gain the trust of the electorate, as well as supporting migrants to integrate, if they focus policies on respecting and protecting ‘things of value’. This means preserving tangible things of value, such as shared public spaces and institutions, but also intangible things of value, such as a sense of fairness (for example, by preventing undercutting of wages and ensuring that everyone contributes to society).

As shown by the testimony of Abdi in Normanton, for one, positive emotions can be evoked by protecting public places, and this is likely to have far greater resonance for many more people than promising to reduce net migration to an arbitrary level ever will.

In chapter 3, then, we set out the strategies that need to be put in place to build ‘shared ground’ in communities that are characterised by high migration levels and increasing diversity.
3.
STRATEGIES FOR BUILDING SHARED GROUND

Building ‘shared ground’ requires a commitment from central and local government to manage the effects of flux and churn arising from immigration, promote inclusive institutions and services, and instil responsibility among all citizens. Our strategies have these principles at their heart, and are shaped and informed by our research findings.

In this chapter we set out our recommendations as three steps in the process of achieving shared ground.

• **Preparing for shared ground**, through practical initiatives to forecast population change and manage churn.

• **Facilitating shared ground**, by creating inclusive settings to deepen connections and promote interaction.

• **Cementing shared ground**, by supporting and promoting settlement.

Our recommendations support new migrants, without singling them out or targeting them separately, and foster positive relationships between citizens who are more or less transient. The overarching goal is the pursuit of greater social equality for all.

3.1 Preparing for shared ground: practical initiatives to forecast population change and manage churn

Policymakers need to know more about the people living in local areas and to be able to access comprehensive, up-to-date figures on the numbers who are coming and going. At the national level, the best data we have currently is provided by the census, and the most recent dataset (from 2011) provides a rich and detailed picture. But migration patterns change at a much faster rate, and circumstances in 2014 differ markedly to those of even just three years ago.

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) has conducted a review of the census and the future provision of population statistics in England and Wales. Current suggestions are to carry out an online census or to use existing government data and compulsory annual surveys. We would encourage the ONS to develop a methodology that includes more data from local areas. There are areas where more detailed datasets would be relevant in order to reflect specific local circumstances (ONS 2014).

Pressure from changing demographics and budget cuts has had a direct impact on services in many local areas. As outlined in the previous chapter, high levels of mobility can also exacerbate tensions between established residents and more transient residents, but many local authorities struggle to record the level of flux they are seeing and experiencing.21

---

21 In the past, assessments of how different areas were coping with the impacts of immigration could be carried out by using national data sources such as the Place and Citizenship surveys. Both of these have now been discontinued and replaced with smaller databanks.
Recommendation 1: A **local data-registration scheme** should be created to collect information about UK residents, both British citizens and migrants alike. We recommend collecting information about how many fixed or transient residents are living in the local area. This would be done by incorporating a few additional questions into existing council tax forms.

We recommend that local authorities use council tax forms to gather this additional information, as all citizens are already required to complete these. The registration process would involve a few simple, compulsory questions for all households to complete. In the case of houses in multiple occupation (HMOs), the landlord or housing association would be required to supply the information for all tenants. Where council tax forms are filled out online, it could be made impossible to complete the process without providing responses to these additional questions. For example, failure to provide responses could prevent the council tax payment from being processed, which would in due course result in a liability order (as is the case if citizens refuse or fail to pay their council tax).

We recommend that councils include questions that capture the degree to which a person is more or less established in their area, rather than focusing exclusively on nationality, ethnicity or immigration status. To inform and reassure their respondents, councils should state that the questions are being asked to enable them to plan effectively to meet the needs of the citizens in the borough, in terms of school places, healthcare provision and so on. Questions would need to be completed for every member of the household (including dependents) and could include:

- How long have you been living in the UK?
- How long have you been living in this local authority area?
- Which countries you have lived in for more than 12 months over the past 10 years?
- Do you intend to stay in the area, and for how long? Are you planning to stay for (a) up to a year; (b) one to two years; (c) two to five years; (d) over five years; (e) don’t know?

This process should be administered by local authorities, giving them the opportunity to forecast service use (particularly around healthcare, education and housing) and the degree of churn in the short and longer term. Some short-term residents evade paying council tax, and so we recognise that this proposed method may not capture data from every resident. Nevertheless, the requirement to pay council tax is issued to all households, and so asking additional questions would not involve substantially greater costs to local authorities. More importantly, it would provide data that would result in more cost-effective planning for the future.

Recommendation 2: Local authorities should **regulate the private rented housing sector**, through landlord licensing schemes to prevent overcrowding and poor living conditions. They should also be given the power and responsibility to **monitor local employers** in order to enforce the minimum wage and, where necessary, impose and recoup fines where rules are flouted.

As described in the previous chapter, citizens who are more transient – predominantly though not exclusively migrants – are more vulnerable to exploitation. This is harmful to migrants and their families, driving churn and undermining integration and stability. It also strains community relations by undermining notions of fairness, for example by undercutting wages, causing housing overcrowding or pushing up rental costs.

---

22 Previous IPPR reports have recommended the introduction of local registration for all citizens – see IPPR 2014, Glennie and Pennington 2014.
In this section we outline measures designed to counter exploitation in housing and employment specifically.

**Tackling poor-quality housing in the private rented sector**

Local authorities currently have the power to regulate the private rented sector through enforcement powers on environmental health grounds. Some local authorities recognise that the private rented sector is a risk to vulnerable members of the community, many of whom will be transient residents without fixed attachments, and have introduced landlord licensing schemes in response.

Newham council and Barking and Dagenham council have introduced such schemes in recent years. Their schemes include sanctions on landlords who fail to comply with licensing terms and conditions. In Barking and Dagenham, the fine for not complying with the licence requirement is £20,000, and there is a £5,000 penalty for any breaches of the terms of a licence. In a recent prosecution in Newham, one landlord was fined £25,000 for renting out an unlicensed property that was found by housing officers to be ‘crowded, unhygienic and dangerous’ (see Johnstone 2014).

We recommend that areas characterised by high inflows of immigration and a high proportion of private rented properties should introduce mandatory landlord licensing schemes (rather than voluntary accreditation schemes). Local authorities would need to work with landlords to introduce the scheme and explain the reasoning behind it. To reinforce this cooperative approach, councils should assist landlords who comply with the regulations but experience problems with their tenants, such as where the tenants themselves exceed the agreed occupancy limit.

In order to mitigate the effects of churn and promote stability, we also recommend that local authorities should be able to require longer-term tenancies and to refuse to license landlords who will not allow them.

A landlord licensing scheme would make a considerable difference in Normanton, for example, where landlords frequently flout the law. For example, where landlords frequently flout the law. In many cases it is vulnerable, transient residents that are exploited. This has a serious impact on integration, not only for the tenants themselves but also for the settled residents nearby, who feel aggrieved by the flouting of rules and high levels of churn.

**Tackling labour market enforcement**

We strongly recommend bolstering efforts to enforce the minimum wage. The national minimum wage (NMW) acts as an important protection for British workers, in particular by preventing undercutting of wages, as well as aiming to prevent migrant workers from being exploited. Migrants who are earning above the minimum wage will be able to support themselves and their families, which will in turn increase the degree to which they feel they belong in their area. However, there are many people – both migrants and British citizens – earning below this threshold.

Our recommendation is for the government to partially devolve enforcement of the national minimum wage to local authorities. In this, we support recommendation 12 of the Centre for London’s *Settle for Nothing* report, published last year (Hull 2013). This report found that local authority staff are more likely to know and be known to workers in their area, which would make reporting NMW non-compliance more likely. Local authorities may not be used to enforcing employment rights, but they do deal with employers in their area in a number of other ways, in relation to business rates, planning, licensing, trading standards and waste, street trading, food registration and safety, noise and so on. Many of these roles include an enforcement element, which means that council staff are already visiting and staying in touch with businesses in their local authority area on a regular basis.

---

For example, the requirements of the Multiple Occupation Regulations 2006 and the Housing Act 2004.
We propose that a suite of NMW enforcement powers should be devolved in legislation to local authorities, so that council representatives can enter premises, demand access to records and perform wage checks. If investigation reveals NMW non-compliance, they should be able to serve a notice of underpayment demanding the payment of arrears and imposing a fine, as HM Revenue and Customs does now. While the arrears would be paid back to the worker(s) in question, via the local authority, the fines should be paid to the local authority itself, rather than to the government – this already happens with respect to fixed penalty notices for parking, littering, dog-fouling, noise and flytipping. These fines could then be channelled back into the local authority’s NMW enforcement work. In this way, the primary funding mechanism for this work would be the fines collected (ibid).

Recommendation 3: Local authority areas with high inflows of immigration should put in place strategies for mediation and negotiation aimed at alleviating community tensions that arise from population churn. These approaches will need to be responsive to each individual area, but we recognise the benefits of measures such as anti-rumour campaigns in everyday settings and local area mediation schemes to encourage dialogue and compromise. Other schemes, such as the community reconciliation model adopted in Hull (which focuses on finding local solutions and diffusing tensions) may well be an alternative approach for local areas to consider.

Our research uncovered many stories and anecdotes of complaints and incivilities created by tensions between more established residents and more transient residents. Where these tensions come to a head, community relations can become severely strained.

Identifying issues that cause friction in the community and preventing them from escalating is important, but this response needs to be locally driven and sensitive to what is going on in the area. Our proposals are aimed at preventing misunderstandings and incivilities from getting out of control. In addition to being responsive to local circumstances, they would need to recognise the extent to which particular problems are more ingrained or relatively superficial, and to allow for formal steps to be taken, such as antisocial behaviour orders or criminal sanctions.

In this section we highlight two examples, taken from cities outside the UK, which illustrate our recommendations and demonstrate their potential.

**Anti-rumour campaigns**

In November 2010, Barcelona city council unveiled its strategies to improve coexistence among locals and newcomers, encompassing the launch of an ‘anti-rumour citizen network’, a public relations campaign and a variety of educational activities.

The basis of the anti-rumour approach is that local people (rather than officials) move to dispel the rumours, misconceptions and prejudices that many local people hold about minorities and immigrants. The council recruited and trained ‘anti-rumour agents’ to dispel myths and spread the campaign through local organisations and the city’s neighbourhoods.

The idea has been to correct uninformed ideas about immigrants and combat discrimination by taking action in everyday life. In addition to a city-wide advertising campaign, the project has hosted public debates with leading local figures, supported street theatre, and produced tongue-in-cheek videos. However, its greatest success has been a comic book series called *Blanca Rosita Barcelona*.

---


Written by acclaimed Spanish illustrator Miguel Gallardo, it tells the story of Rosita, an elderly woman from southern Spain who lives in Barcelona with her young Peruvian caregiver, Blanca. Each volume explores a campaign theme in the context of everyday life. The first issue of *Rosita Blanca Barcelona* had a print run of 10,000 copies – this was doubled for the second issue.26

The approach taken by Barcelona city council has been widely acclaimed. Other European cities have followed Barcelona’s lead, including Athens and Geneva (Cities of Migration 2014). Its success appears to lie in creating a dialogue that is centred around everyday settings and a focus on fairness, contribution and reciprocity, rather than any grand myth-busting approach that relies on the overall economic contribution of migrants (IPPR 2014). In the UK, a network of local community organisations, housing associations and local workplaces would be well-placed to carry out an anti-rumour campaign of this sort and to provide an opportunity to engage with local residents in everyday areas.27

**Community dialogue and mediation schemes**

The Marseille Espérance28 scheme brings together members of Marseille’s diverse community to create an inclusive forum for dialogue and community mediation. It also initiated a sculpture project, called the ‘Tree of Hope’: 350,000 city residents signed up to the scheme’s message of tolerance, hospitality and sharing, and their names have been engraved at the base of the tree. Marseille Espérance is available to act ‘on demand’ to potential threats to the peaceful coexistence of city residents and has a successful track record of mediating issues of community conflict. In 2004 the Fondazione Laboratorio Mediterraneo awarded Marseille Espérance the Mediterranean Peace Prize for its work in facilitating intercultural dialogue and understanding.

Mediation schemes start from the premise of sharing experiences and seeking positive solutions, rather than laying blame. Where there are entrenched local problems arising from friction between established residents and more transient residents, mediation schemes can give residents the opportunity to come together in a neutral setting to air grievances and find solutions. In the UK, local authorities would need either to publicise existing schemes and ensure broad membership, or to apply to the European Commission Integration Fund or the Settlement Support Fund (set out in recommendation 7) to finance such a scheme.

### 3.2 Facilitating ‘shared ground’: creating inclusive settings to deepen connections and promote interaction

Our recommendations in this section explore ways to create and support settings where people from all backgrounds can get to know one another better. We set out ways to ensure that services (both non-government and government) can provide high-quality, inclusive provision for migrants and British citizens alike.

**Recommendation 4:** Incentive and outreach schemes should be created to encourage more parents of all backgrounds to send their children from age two to inclusive preschool settings.

Education settings are important sites of socialisation, as well as potential sites where people from different backgrounds can mix. Studies in Germany have shown that early education can significantly improve outcomes for migrants, particularly

---

26 Partly inspired by *Rosita Blanca Barcelona*, and the stories we heard during our time in Forest Gate and Normanton, we have published a comic of short stories, called *Be here now* – it is available from the IPPR website, at [http://www.ippr.org/publications/shared-ground](http://www.ippr.org/publications/shared-ground).

27 Funding is available at the European level for a campaign like this: the Barcelona anti-rumour campaign is funded by the European Commission Integration Fund (see EWSI 2014).

28 For more information, see Maytree Foundation 2012.
for girls from more traditional communities and children who are learning English as an additional language (Ramalingam 2013). Indirectly these interventions foster the social and cultural integration of children and their families.

IPPR has previously outlined a commitment to universal, high-quality and affordable early-years provision (Ben-Galim 2014). A vital aspect of that vision is a commitment to extending the offer for two-year-olds to 15 hours a week for all children (where currently 40 per cent of the most deprived children are eligible). We echo that recommendation, and emphasise the need for specific outreach approaches – such as better alignment between children’s centres, health visitors and peer-to-peer support – to encourage high take-up of these places. This is particularly important in light of findings from the Childcare and Early Years parents’ survey indicating that children of black African, Pakistani and Bangladeshi mothers are substantially less likely to receive funded early-years provision than children whose mothers are white (DfE 2014).

In addition, we suggest that councils should create additional incentives for take-up of these places by allowing parents of children attending nursery to be able to attend free ESOL classes, or adult education classes, either at the children’s centre or in local settings. This could be funded by the local authority through an application to the Settlement Support Fund (as set out in recommendation 7).

Recommendation 5: Funding should be provided for services and activities that encourage inclusivity, and should be allocated in a transparent manner. This is important in order to prevent segregation from setting in, and would provide a fair way of distributing funds at a time when resources are scarce.

We urge local authorities to introduce transparent funding programmes for local community organisations, and we encourage local authorities to ensure that, as far as possible, local service delivery is inclusive. The presumption should be against single-group funding (for one particular ethnic or religious group), unless there is a clear public interest reason (we echo this proviso in recommendation 6 below) (CIC 2007).

Fostering inclusive settings is likely to prevent segregation from bedding in or from arising in the first place. Our intention here is not to pursue an ‘assimilative’ approach; we are not suggesting that policymakers should be trying to make everyone ‘more like one another’. Instead, we urge policymakers to explore ways to avoid exclusion, to deepen connections, and to provide increased opportunities for people to interact when accessing services and activities.

For example, Newham council’s approach of issuing £200 for neighbours to run inclusive street parties is proving extremely popular, despite being a relatively small, low-cost initiative. We encourage other local councils to consider the merits of such a scheme. Other alternatives, such as subsidising funding for high-street pop-up shops that are inclusive (showcasing arts and crafts from across the community) or providing small grants for sporting activities that have inclusive membership, also provide positive ways of encouraging and enabling people to mix in local, social settings. Alternative methods of funding, such as local crowd-sourcing schemes, could also be considered (Murray 2012).

Recommendation 6: Some community organisations provide support that is specific to one ethnic group, particularly for newcomers, which can aid integration. These groups should receive funding from local authorities, but only if they can demonstrate that they are providing a service that is in the public interest. The reasons behind the award of any single-group funding should be clearly publicised (CIC 2007).
We also recommend that local authorities should provide some time-limited subsidies and give recognition to ethnic or religious-specific organisations that are delivering valuable, specialised support services. We believe that inclusivity in services is an important goal. Nevertheless, our research has also highlighted that some community organisations providing exclusive services can play a significant role in supporting the initial steps in newcomers’ integration. Ethnic-specific community organisations that provide exclusive services and targeted interventions can promote belonging, which in turn aids broader, longer-term integration (Rutter 2013).

In Newham, for example, there are a number of organisations that are providing an important and valuable service, such as ethnic-specific support for women who have experienced domestic violence. These organisations cannot automatically be expected to start delivering an inclusive service – indeed, their very raison d’être is the specificity of the services they provide. These groups should receive (or continue to receive) funding from local authorities, but only if they can demonstrate they are providing a service that is in the public interest – that is, that they are supporting the welfare or wellbeing of the wider community. This might include, for example, supplementary schools which provide an inclusive service that improves education standards, or specialised health or advice services, such as for young girls at risk of female genital mutilation.

We also recommend that smaller community organisations providing targeted services should be acknowledged and appreciated by local councils where their intervention is deemed valuable. These organisations often play a significant role in communities receiving very little support and facing ever-dwindling budgets. This might be through publicly acknowledging the importance of their role (through ‘local champion’ awards), subsidising the costs of employing volunteers (by reducing the cost of applying for disclosure and barring service checks, for example), promoting their services in council literature and referring newcomers onwards, or reducing the cost of council facilities.

3.3 Cementing ‘shared ground’: supporting and promoting settlement

Our third set of recommendations represents a proactive agenda of supporting and promoting settlement. We recognise that there will always be a significant level of transience in local areas, because Britain has a flexible labour market and people are always free to seek out new opportunities. Here, however, our aim is to provide residents with more avenues towards achieving stability. Our focus is on local financing in areas characterised by high levels of diversity and population churn, and on citizenship as a rite of passage that confers settlement but could also provide opportunities for longstanding residents to become involved and give back to their local area.

Recommendation 7: Central government should set up a Settlement Support Fund, funded by citizenship fees and an increased levy on visa fees, to allocate money to local areas experiencing a high degree of population churn.

The Settlement Support Fund would be resourced by citizenship fees (currently £906 per adult) and a £75 levy on all visa fees (which would be an increase on the £50 levy, which was previously put towards the now-defunct Migration Impacts Fund29). On this basis, we calculate that the fund could be worth £390 million.30

29 The Migration Impacts Fund (MIF) was established in 2008 under the previous Labour government to help local authorities deal with unexpected pressure on housing, schools and hospitals created by migration. It was funded from a levy on visa fees and so did not represent a cost to the taxpayer.

30 Based on government data showing the number of people awarded citizenship and the numbers applying for visas in 2013.
The fund would be managed by central government but distributed to affected local areas (which may well change over time depending on levels of migrant inflows). We recommend that councils use these funds to instigate the following measures (or to maintain similar existing schemes).

- Local authorities should ensure that there is **adequate signposting and information specifically for new arrivals in their area.** Such information might be provided accompanying council tax forms, for example, or via a designated council-run webpage or social media profile or app for new arrivals. The information might cover:
  - details of local ‘drop-in’ advice surgeries, where new arrivals (British as well as migrants) can receive a local area welcome pack, paid for by local advertising
  - bin collection
  - local MPs and councillors
  - ESOL classes and adult-education
  - health and social care services
  - volunteering opportunities.

- The local authority could also link this welcome process to a scheme to provide free ESOL classes – for example, attending a local drop-in advice surgery or by signing up for information online (via an email-newsletter or app) could entitle new residents who do not speak English to receive free ESOL classes.

- Local authorities should put in place **measures to prevent exploitation and alleviate tension** (such as those set out in recommendations 2 and 3).

- Local authorities should also consider using funding from the fund to invest in preserving and revitalising communal public places that benefit all citizens, such as parks and libraries. The local authority would need to ensure that consultations on civic regeneration are as participatory and representative as possible and not aimed primarily or exclusively at the settled population.

Recommendation 8: **Incentives to carry out voluntary work** should be introduced for people seeking British citizenship, alongside a more **localised, inclusive application process.**

Citizenship is a key milestone on an individual’s integration journey. However, our research demonstrates that it is currently viewed largely as a transactional process – that is, it is simply ‘what you must do to get a passport’. The process has been widely criticised for being excessively bureaucratic and for failing to provide opportunities for migrants to engage with British life (see for example Sanghani 2013).

Currently, migrants who have lived legally in the UK for at least five years are entitled to apply for British citizenship. They must pass a ‘Life in the UK’ test, demonstrate that they have a good standard of English (or Welsh), and pay a fee (currently £906 per adult). This is expensive by international standards: in Canada, Sweden, Australia and Germany, the cost ranges from around £150–200.

Demonstrating that new citizens have a good standard of English (or Welsh) is undoubtedly beneficial, and so we do not suggest any amendment to this element. But the ‘centralised’ Life in the UK test, focused on national history and institutions, does little to help people get to know their local area or make connections with others living locally. This can contribute to anxieties about the social distance between migrants and settled communities, and the contribution that relative newcomers make to British society. This is a missed opportunity for social integration, and so as a response our recommendations in this section seek to incentivise and localise the citizenship process.

---

Incentivising voluntary work as part of the citizenship process
People seeking British citizenship should have a strong incentive to share in and make a contribution to their neighbourhood. We propose that adults applying for British citizenship who can demonstrate that they have volunteered or served in their neighbourhood for at least 40 hours in the previous year should pay a reduced fee and have access to a fast-track process. We suggest that the application fee is reduced to £400 (a discount of £506, based on current fees) and that individuals are able to apply for citizenship after four years of living in the UK (rather than the current five). It is likely that total fees received from citizenship will continue to increase, given that citizenship grants have more than doubled since 2000 and trends indicate that these will continue to rise. In 2012, 194,344 foreign citizens naturalised as British citizens, up from 177,878 in 2011 and from a five-year average of 169,373 from 2006–2010 (Blinder 2013).

Applicants would have to provide evidence of their volunteering or other activities, and have the support of a ‘sponsor’ from a registered charity or public body. Activities could include playing an active role as a community service volunteer, taking part in a time-banking scheme, helping out at a youth club, or volunteering for a local charity. The focus should be on activities that help others in the neighbourhood and provide opportunities for people who have moved to this country to make connections beyond their immediate social circle.

Localising the citizenship process
Our proposal is for local councils to manage the process of citizenship through the Settlement Support Fund, as set out above. If citizenship fees are allowed to filter down to the local level, this would provide an incentive for councils to encourage and support more residents to obtain citizenship.

The current citizenship test lacks local or practical dimensions. Some of the questions are relatively obscure, detached from the everyday reality of British daily life. Our research has demonstrated that applicants view the current test as a memory exercise rather than an opportunity to connect and engage with the local area and British life more generally.

As an alternative, we suggest that the process requires applicants to learn about their local area, as well as British life more generally. We recommend retaining the test as an element of the citizenship process, but suggest that applicants are encouraged to attend classes (run by local community groups, commissioned by the local council) in order to pick up practical information about the local area, its history and culture. After this, a test would be designed and set locally, by the local council (incorporating some national standards).

As it is now, the process would culminate in a citizenship ceremony – currently, this is generally at the local town hall. However, as a change, we recommend that these ceremonies should be publicised as community events, which all local residents are welcome to attend, and should take place in local civic venues, such as museums, parks, libraries and schools, in order to further weave citizenship into the local landscape.

3.4 Conclusion
Central and local government need to work together to manage the impacts of population flux created by migration, to build inclusivity in institutions and services, and instil responsibility among all citizens. Central government needs to set standards (through its requirements for local authorities and its overall approach to settlement and citizenship). However, it also needs to pass on funding to significantly affected local areas. Crucially, this does not necessitate an approach that explicitly targets migrants. We argue that promoting inclusivity and settlement
are positive, effective and direct responses to the challenges posed by transience and churn.

Politicians and policymakers urgently need to find ways of increasing public acceptance of high inflows of immigration and, in turn, of supporting migrants to settle and integrate in the UK. This will continue to be pressing because, in our increasingly globalised world, high levels of immigration are likely to be the reality for the years to come. An approach that seeks to build ‘shared ground’ is likely to make immigration a less toxic issue. Anti-immigration views are often shaped by local experiences, or fears about changes to culture or identity. Policymakers need to design policies that respect and protect the public things that so many citizens respect and cherish.

This is particular pressing in diverse local areas that are characterised by high immigration inflows. Areas that foster respect for people of all identities, maintain effective enforcement of law and order, put in place local strategies for mediation and negotiation when friction arises, prioritise well-maintained public spaces, and support a vibrant civil society will have better integration outcomes for migrants and greater social equality for all citizens.
REFERENCES

http://philosophyfaculty.ucsd.edu/faculty/rarneson/
ElizabethAndersonWhatIsthePointofEquality.pdf


APPENDIX 1: METHODOLOGY

Our research was carried out over a six-month period between January 2014 and June 2014. Our approach was to explore the experiences of residents living in diverse areas characterised by high inflows of immigration.

We carried out qualitative research in two case study areas: Normanton in Derby and Forest Gate in the London Borough of Newham. We chose these areas because they have populations made up of British residents and migrants (both new and long-established) with a range of religions and ethnicities. Both areas have a young age-profile and high population turnover. They are economically poor but thriving communities with a range of civic institutions and community services, both governmental and non-governmental.

We carried out 50 interviews with residents in our study areas: 20 in Normanton and 30 in Forest Gate. The interviews were carried out with a mix of ages (although reflecting the relatively young age-profile of both areas), gender (26 women and 24 men), ethnic background and migration status (we interviewed a mix of migrants who have arrived in the past two years, settled migrants, British-born residents and vulnerable citizens, including refugees and Roma migrants) and work status (people working in the service economy, professionals, students, carers, unemployed people and inactive citizens, both retired and out of work).

In each area, we worked with local partners to recruit research participants. In Normanton we partnered with two local community organisations: a welfare-to-work charity called Jobs Education and Training (JET) and a local community charity called the St James Centre. In Forest Gate we worked with a recruitment agency, local community organisations and neighbourhood coordinators from Newham borough council. All participants taking part in the interviews gave informed consent, and their names have been changed throughout this report.

In addition to the face-to-face interviews, 23 of our 50 research participants also agreed to keep a photo diary in the first week of each of three months. Participants were asked to note in their diary an account of the ‘everyday’ locations they had been to and the people they had met, noting on a continuum whether it was a place where they felt they belonged or did not belong.

At the outset of the project, we carried out an open, public meeting in each area. One took place at JET in Normanton and was attended by local residents, police representatives, community activists and local employers. The other took place at the Gate Library in Forest Gate and was attended by local residents, Newham council representatives, community activists and education professionals.

With the support of our community partner, the St James Centre, we carried out a ‘round-the-kitchen-table chat’ at a local resident’s house in Derby, involving eight neighbours living on the same street, and held a discussion group with students at a community school in Forest Gate. IPPR researchers also carried out direct observation in the case study locations, including nurseries, schools, local streets, pubs, shops, leisure centres and parks. We also carried out a series of stakeholder interviews in both locations, with local councillors, head teachers, faith representatives, ESOL teachers, community activists, housing association staff and local employers.
We carried out stakeholder meetings in both locations to communicate our findings and receive feedback on our recommendations at an early stage. The meeting in Normanton was held at JET and was attended by Derby council representatives, local community activists, police representatives, local employers and education professionals. The meeting in Forest Gate was held at a local community organisation and was attended by local community activists, education professionals and nursery school staff.
APPENDIX 2: CASE STUDY LOCATIONS – FOREST GATE AND NORMANTON

2.1 Introducing Forest Gate
Our research took place in the wards of Forest Gate North and Forest Gate South in the London Borough of Newham, east London. Forest Gate has a broadly similar demographic profile to the borough-wide average, with a relatively young population. Newham is a ‘hyper-diverse’ borough. It is not dominated by any one ethnicity, nationality or language group, and residents come from over 120 countries and speak more than 100 different languages. As a local area, Forest Gate reflects this diversity, with fewer than half of its residents being born in the UK.

Area demographics

Table A1
Key demographics, Forest Gate North and South wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Forest Gate North ward</th>
<th>Forest Gate South ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49% female, 51% male</td>
<td>47% female, 53% male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td>Average age: 32</td>
<td>Average age: 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median age: 29</td>
<td>Median age: 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/region of birth</td>
<td>England: 48.2%</td>
<td>England: 43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bangladesh: 6.4%</td>
<td>Bangladesh: 8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India: 4.2%</td>
<td>India: 6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan: 3.6%</td>
<td>Pakistan: 4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria: 2.8%</td>
<td>Nigeria: 2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana: 1.9%</td>
<td>Ghana: 1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamaica: 1.8%</td>
<td>Jamaica: 1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somalia: 1.4%</td>
<td>Somalia: 1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South America: 1.4%</td>
<td>South America: 1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ireland: 0.9%</td>
<td>Ireland: 1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First language</td>
<td>English: 63.8%</td>
<td>English: 58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bengali: 7.4%</td>
<td>Bengali: 8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polish: 4.0%</td>
<td>Urdu: 3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urdu: 3.0%</td>
<td>Gujarati: 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romanian: 2.2%</td>
<td>Polish: 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithuanian: 2.1%</td>
<td>Lithuanian: 2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gujarati: 1.7%</td>
<td>Romanian: 1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portuguese: 1.5%</td>
<td>Punjabi: 1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Punjabi: 1.3%</td>
<td>Portuguese: 1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgarian: 1.1%</td>
<td>French: 1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Christian: 46.1%</td>
<td>Christian: 38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim: 27.0%</td>
<td>Muslim: 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No religion: 12.8%</td>
<td>No religion: 11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindu: 4.0%</td>
<td>Hindu: 5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sikh: 1.5%</td>
<td>Sikh: 2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buddhist: 0.5%</td>
<td>Buddhist: 0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish: 0.1%</td>
<td>Jewish: 0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agnostic: 0.1%</td>
<td>Atheist: 0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 The data in these sections is drawn from the Office for National Statistics 2011 census.
Local area integration policy
Since 2011 Newham council has been pursuing an agenda that focuses on ‘building personal, economic and community resilience’. The emphasis is on supporting and encouraging residents to build the skills, relationships and networks they need to thrive and be an active part of their community.

The mayor’s integration plan focuses on building connections between different groups, including funding for programmes that bring different groups together, such as English language classes. The council supports local people to host events that encourage people to mix, such as inclusive street parties. The borough is supporting families through its free school meals scheme for all primary age children and its ‘Every Child a Reader’ and ‘Every Child a Musician’ schemes.

The mayor has also taken proactive action against landlords who rent dangerous and overcrowded housing by introducing mandatory licensing of all privately rented homes and becoming a key player in the local private rented sector.

2.2 Introducing Normanton
Our research took place in Normanton, an inner-city suburb situated approximately two miles south of Derby city centre. The area locally known as ‘Normanton’ overlaps several ward boundaries, covering parts of Abbey ward and Arboretum ward, and so we took a broad approach when carrying out our research. Our research area was bounded by Carlton Road and Burton Road to the west and north west, Osmaston Road to the north east, the railway line to the east and the ring road to the south.

Area demographics
Relatively speaking, Normanton has a very young population and a high ethnic majority population, with the largest concentration of Derby’s Asian community – in particular, people identifying as Asian Pakistani account for over a third of Normanton residents. Areas such as Normanton Road (the main thoroughfare leading to the centre of Derby) have numerous Asian shops, businesses and fast-food outlets, and is well-known for its Pakistani, Indian and Bangladeshi restaurants. Since the expansion of the European Union in 2004, there has been a noticeable influx of new immigrants to the area from eastern European countries, and an increasing number of eastern European shops and restaurants have opened up in the area.

Normanton has a wide number of places of worship. There are four Sikh gurdwaras in the area, and the local Sikh community organises a parade around Normanton for the annual Vaisakhi festival. There are five mosques, a Hindu temple, and various Christian churches, from mainstream Anglican and Roman Catholic congregations to free churches and newer house churches. There are also Polish, Ukrainian and Serbian churches in the area.

Levels of deprivation (measured according to the index of multiple deprivation) vary across the Normanton area, although one neighbourhood is in the top 7 per cent of the most deprived local areas in England. The area has a very large private rented sector, and the local press has frequently reported on problems related to overcrowding and poor housing conditions.

Local area integration policy
Derby council has introduced some specific initiatives to support integration. In 2013, it published its New Communities Strategy, which highlights the need to respond to the growing and diversifying population and urges policymakers and practitioners within the authority, and its partners, to work together to recognise, understand and address the challenges and opportunities associated with the pace and scale of the city’s transformation.
The council has recognised the need to respond to the increase in Roma communities in the area. The council has created a Complex Cases Group for Roma, which comprises partners from within the police, probation and health services and departments of the local authority – the City and Neighbourhood Partnership, Derby Advice, housing, children and young people’s departments, and voluntary sector groups specifically engaged or commissioned to work with Roma families.

The Derbyshire community safety team has produced leaflets that provide information for new arrivals about the local council, residency rights, currency, children and education, healthcare, driving and travel, emergency services, accommodation, employment and the police.