



All Party Parliamentary Group on

Social Integration

INTERIM REPORT INTO INTEGRATION OF IMMIGRANTS



This is not an official publication of the House of Commons or the House of Lords. It has not been approved by either House or its Committees. All-Party Parliamentary Groups (APPGs) are informal cross-party groups of Members of both Houses with a common interest in particular issues that have no official status within Parliament. The views expressed in this report are those of the group.

This Report was researched and written by Anna Kere and Richard Bell from *The Challenge*, the UK's leading social integration charity. *The Challenge* provides the Secretariat to the APPG on Social Integration. Details of the Secretariat and the registrable benefits received by the group can be found on the official Register Of All-Party Parliamentary Groups: <https://www.Parliament.uk/mps-lords-and-offices/standards-and-financial-interests/Parliamentary-commissioner-for-standards/register-of-interests/register-of-all-party-party-Parliamentary-groups/>

FOREWORD

In August 2016, the All Party Parliamentary Group on Social Integration launched our inquiry into how the UK's immigration system could more effectively promote integration. I am pleased to commend our interim report, which brings the first stage of this inquiry to a close.

We are grateful to the independent experts who have contributed to our work to date—whether through appearing at parliamentary meetings or through submitting written evidence. We would also like to extend our thanks to all the front line service workers, councillors, local authority officers, teachers, young people, and community group members who took the time to discuss their views on immigration and integration with APPG members.

At times, it seems we argue endlessly about who we should let into our country and why, but we don't spend nearly enough time thinking and talking about what happens when immigrants settle in our communities. Through this inquiry, we have sought to explore the impact of the UK's approach to immigration not so much on our economy or international relationships, but on communities across the UK.

Very few of the individuals we have met during visits to Boston in Lincolnshire and Halifax in Yorkshire were hostile to immigration. Indeed, most shared the view that it has been fantastic for our economy and for the cultural life of our country. It is clear, however, that demographic and cultural change has threatened people's sense of security, identity, and belonging within their communities and—in some instances—put pressure on local public services.

It's also clear that immigration has impacted on different communities in different ways. As Dame Louise Casey recently argued in her government-backed review into integration and opportunity in the UK, the pace of change in some areas has led some people to feel a sense of bewilderment and estrangement from their communities. This need not be the case and we are clear that policy makers must do much more to help people continue to feel a sense of ownership of their communities even as they change.

In addition, we must confront the fact that immigrant communities and members of the settled population in some parts of modern Britain are leading parallel rather than interconnected lives. This issue has been swept under the carpet for far too long.

To some extent this has been a passive process over the decades; in other instances it has been deliberate, where individuals have quite understandably chosen to associate and mix mainly with members of their own community.

We are of the view that Government—national, regional, and local—cannot stand by whilst our communities fragment in this way and has a duty to address this lack of integration. Why? Because it has left a vacuum for extremists and peddlers of hate on all sides to exploit. It deprives people of jobs and opportunities and increases isolation, ill health, and anxiety. It reduces social mobility. Above all, it compromises trust between groups at a time when, in an uncertain and changing world, it is all too easy to blame 'the other' for all our problems.

So the task before us now is to design and deliver a meaningful integration programme which will work for all parts of the UK—an immigration policy which will enable Britons of all backgrounds to both celebrate and look beyond our differences. I believe that it is possible to craft a middle way between the laissez-faire multiculturalism favoured by successive British governments—and the assimilationist politics of the French Burkini ban. Too often, calls for greater integration are attacked, wrongly, as a rejection of multicultural Britain. In fact, breaking down the barriers between communities is the best defence of the diverse country we have become. And, of course, it is very important to recognise that integration is a two way street: newcomers and the settled community both have a role to play.

In the wake of the Brexit vote, we must develop a new approach to immigration which works for everyone in our country—both the 52% who voted to Leave and the 48% who voted for Remain—and a system with integration at its heart. This report sets out six principles which we believe should be incorporated into this system in order to lend our communities the support they will require to accommodate difference, successfully manage change, and thrive in an interconnected world.



Chuka

Chuka Umunna MP
Chair of the APPG on Social Integration

CONTENTS

Introduction	7
Principle One	8
Principle Two	11
Principle Three	14
Principle Four	17
Principle Five	19
Principle Six	22
Conclusion	25

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The APPG would like to thank *The Challenge* for their ongoing support as Secretariat to this group; the witnesses who gave oral evidence to us; the organisations and the individuals who provided written submissions to the inquiry; and all those who participated in our community visits.

We are particularly grateful for the time and attention of the following individuals:

- Dr Rachel Marangozov from the Institute for Employment Studies
- Councillor Bedford and Pauline Chapman from Boston Borough Council
- Robin Tuddenham, Jo Richmond, Sadia Hussain, Heather Stout, and Tahira Iqbal from Calderdale Council
- Holly Lynch MP, and her team
- Matt Warman MP, and his team
- Jamiesha Majeবাদia from the British Academy

SIX PRINCIPLES

PRINCIPLE ONE: The government must develop a comprehensive and proactive national strategy for the integration of immigrants.

- The government should adjust its current definition of integration to include three dimensions: economic, civic, and social. Together, these dimensions would encompass such issues as access to the labour market; awareness of the host country's laws, traditions and culture; democratic participation; and the extent to which people of different backgrounds come into contact with each other.
- The strategy should outline how the government intends to use such policy levers as anti-discrimination and equalities legislation to boost levels of integration in communities.
- As part of the new strategy, the government should examine how well mainstream employment and skills provision currently in place serves the needs of immigrants.
- The strategy should include a focus on developing new and funding existing community institutions that promote integration.
- The strategy must differentiate between, and include, policies to address the needs and circumstances of different categories of immigrants and the communities they live in.

PRINCIPLE TWO: Local authorities must be required to draw up and implement local integration action plans.

- The government should introduce a duty on all local authorities to promote integration through the policy framework set out in its immigrant integration strategy.
- In addition to introducing a new Controlling Migration Fund, as proposed in the Conservative Manifesto, the government should consider immediately bringing forward plans for the introduction of an Integration Impact Fund.

PRINCIPLE THREE: Government must reassess its current 'one size fits all' approach to immigration policy.

- The government should consider co-designing a regionally-led immigration system, with devolved and local authorities, drawing on the Canadian model.
- The government should appoint an independent commission to explore how a devolved or regionally-led immigration system might work.

PRINCIPLE FOUR: For new immigrants, integration should begin upon arrival in the UK.

- The government should proactively build a focus on integration into the process of settling in to the UK.
- All immigrants should be expected to have either learned English before coming to the UK or be enrolled in compulsory ESOL classes upon arrival.
- The Home Office should investigate whether new immigrants could be placed on pathways to citizenship automatically upon their arrival to the UK.

PRINCIPLE FIVE: We need more and better data on the integration of immigrants.

- The government should consider adapting existing data sources and introducing new ones to enable researchers to develop a better understanding of levels of immigrant integration throughout the UK.
- The government should launch a commission to investigate how the opportunities for better data collection created by Brexit and population projections could be used to support the integration of new arrivals.

PRINCIPLE SIX: The government should demonstrate strong political leadership on immigration in order to build public confidence and facilitate successful integration of new arrivals at a regional and local level.

- The government should recognise that integration is a two-way street, requiring the involvement of both newcomers and host communities.
- The government should consider the impact of any post-Brexit immigration policy on social integration, to ensure that it does not create social division and pressures among those communities already grappling with rapid social change.
- Immigration policy and rhetoric should not be conflated with issues of counter-terrorism.
- In articulating the role of immigrants in the UK economy, the government should consider drawing more heavily on the voice of employers who currently benefit from access to a large immigrant workforce, particularly where there are clear, tangible benefits to the local or regional economy.



INTRODUCTION

This is the interim report of the All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Social Integration's inquiry into integration and immigration.

The APPG brings together Parliamentarians from all political parties with an interest in the issue. The group's mission is to drive forward a cross-party conversation on policy solutions which could break down barriers to integration and create opportunities for people from all walks of life to build bonds of trust. The APPG is chaired by Chuka Umunna MP and Vice Chairs include James Berry MP, Naz Shah MP and Lord Glasman. A full list of the APPG members is available in the annex to this report and online.

The integration and immigration inquiry has so far involved two oral evidence sessions in Parliament, two community visits, and a call for written evidence. This report summarises the findings of this inquiry, which focussed on the following two policy themes:

1. How the division of responsibility for integration policy within government impacts on levels of integration across the UK, and whether a central government strategy for the integration of immigrants is required.
2. How a new post-Brexit immigration system could be designed so as to support communities to manage demographic and cultural change and better facilitate integration (measured by any or all of the following: civic participation, labour market entry, contact between immigrants and members of the settled population, and other relevant indicators).

The report has been commissioned and approved by the APPG's members and written by the Secretariat, *The Challenge*.

Definitions

Throughout the report the term 'integration' will be used. This term is understood by the APPG to mean the extent to which people conform to shared norms and values and lead shared lives.

The term 'immigrant', unless otherwise specified, is used to refer to economic migrants, as opposed to refugees or asylum seekers. The APPG's definition of an economic migrant encompasses people who legally immigrate to the United Kingdom to advance their economic and professional prospects. This includes both recent immigrants and those who have resided in the country legally for a number of years, but do not have British citizenship. The APPG's understanding of the term applies equally to high-skilled, low-skilled, and unskilled immigrants.

This interim report does not aim to offer a comprehensive set of policies for the government to adopt, but rather a set of general principles to follow when designing an immigration system with integration at its heart.

Evidence Collected

We used a range of methods to collect evidence as part of this inquiry. We held two oral evidence sessions in Parliament, at which the APPG heard from witnesses including academics and representatives of the private, public and charity sectors. All witnesses are listed in the annex to this report.

We held two evidence sessions outside Parliament with local residents in Boston, Lincolnshire, and Halifax, West Yorkshire. We spoke to approximately 40 people as part of these sessions, including local residents of different ethnicities, religions and ages, in addition to local authority officials and civil society representatives.

We also received 15 written evidence submissions from a wide range of individuals and organisations, including charities, think-tanks, and academics. A full list is available in the annex to this report and online.

PRINCIPLE ONE: THE GOVERNMENT MUST DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE AND PROACTIVE STRATEGY FOR IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION.

Over the course of the APPG's inquiry, it has become evident that the UK does not have an overarching national policy framework for the integration of immigrants.

The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) has a broad commitment to 'create the conditions for integration', as mentioned in its 2012 strategy.¹ Since the current government is yet to announce an integration strategy, we assume that this is the only framework available. The central thrust of this policy is that the government will act only exceptionally and that it regards integration as mainly a local issue.

The Home Office under the administration of Prime Minister David Cameron from May 2010 to July 2016 offers some limited integration policies and strategies relating to refugees, but not to immigrants more broadly.² Some of these strategies were framed principally through a focus on counter-extremism and de-radicalisation.³ In addition, some of the Government Equalities Office's anti-discrimination and community cohesion policies include immigrants within their remit. Organisations, such as the Migrants' Rights Network (MRN) and the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants (JCWI) have emphasised the importance of these policies in their submissions.

While refugee integration initiatives and anti-discrimination laws are important, the UK is lacking a more holistic, centrally coordinated national strategy for the integration of immigrants. The current integration policy is fragmented, ad-hoc, and lacking in coordination due to the lack of an integrated strategy across government departments.⁴ The result—as noted within Louise Casey's government-commissioned review into integration and opportunity—is that “for generations we have welcomed immigrants to the UK but left them to find their own way in society while leaving host communities to accommodate them and the growing diversity of our nation.”⁵

Although there is a 2012 government strategy on integration in place, this has not been prioritised or taken forward in any of the government's key programmes of work, either at the national or local level. For example, the strategy does not address how the government's flagship Work Programme will meet the needs of immigrants, even though unemployment remains a barrier to integration.⁶

Viewing integration as mainly a local issue, as the 2012 paper does, is also problematic as it absolves central government of responsibility. Yet it was the failure of central government in the early 2000s to anticipate the large numbers of EU Citizens arriving from Accession countries in a relatively short space of time that lead to integration challenges at a local level.⁷

¹ Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG). 2012. *Creating the conditions for integration*.

² See for example: Home Office, *Integration Matters: A National Strategy for Refugee Integration*, March 2005; UKBA, *Moving on Together: Government's recommitment to supporting refugees*, March 2009; Home Office, *Spotlight on refugee integration: findings from the Survey on New Refugees in the UK*, Research Report 37, July 2010.

³ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Submissions to the Call for Evidence: IPPR, Still Human Still Here*. Available from: http://d3n8a8pro7vnm.cloudfront.net/themes/570513f1b504f500db000001/attachments/original/1480496892/APPG_SI_October_2016_Submissions.pdf?1480496892

⁴ It is important to note that in Scotland a refugee integration strategy has been developed between national and local government stakeholders and communities and this model and method may lend itself to wider work across different policy areas.

⁵ Casey, Dame Louise DBE CB. 2016. *The Casey Review: A review into integration and opportunity*. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/574565/The_Casey_Review.pdf

⁶ DCLG 2012.

⁷ Audit Commission. 2007. *Crossing Borders, Responding to the Local Challenge of Migrant Workers*. Available from: <http://www.local.gov.uk/c/documentlibrary/getfile?uuid=b41c8e48-9d03-46d1-8ab7-e5ea7764087d&groupId=10180>

The APPG calls on the government to draw up a clear national immigrant integration strategy and to clarify the responsibilities of different government bodies in delivering it, including central government departments and agencies, as well as devolved administrations and local government. As part of this strategy, local authorities, government bodies, and public service providers should be encouraged and equipped to view integration holistically. This would be accomplished through the mainstreaming of immigrant integration practices in all public service provision for which they enjoy responsibility, rather than an extension of immigration policy powers which fall within the remit of the Home Office.

As David Goodhart has highlighted in his submission to the APPG, there are policy levers at government's disposal that can be used to encourage integration.⁸ This covers everything from equality and anti-discrimination legislation to laws governing spousal visas or outlawing female genital mutilation. **The new government strategy should outline how the government intends to use these policy levers to boost levels of integration in communities.**

The tendency to conflate integration with counter-extremism has been counterproductive. While there might be a link between segregation and radicalisation, making that link the focal point of an integration strategy risks eroding local trust and alienating communities, thereby making other integration initiatives and measures less likely to succeed. Such an approach suggests integration is primarily an issue for communities where there is a risk of radicalisation, when social integration is an issue for everyone. It means ensuring that people of different faiths, ethnicities, sexual orientations, social backgrounds, origins, and generations do not just tolerate one another or live side by side but meet, mix and forge relationships.

This conflation of integration with counter-extremism is symptomatic of a broader issue—a lack of clarity on what integration policy is actually intended to achieve.⁹ Integration is not a single process. It has different dimensions: economic, civic, and social. A comprehensive approach needs to consider all three dimensions and the relationship between them. Experiences in one dimension can impact on another, but they are not necessarily mutually reinforcing. An individual may, for instance, be in full-time employment, but be socially isolated because they work anti-social hours or work solely with fellow immigrants. This was a trend which was highlighted to us by local residents in Boston.

The APPG calls on the government to revise its working definition of integration to include three dimensions—economic, civic, and social—and to develop a clear framework through which immigrant integration policy should be developed and assessed. This framework must recognise that immigrant integration is a two-way process: action is required from both host communities and immigrant communities. It must also take account of the fact that even though different dimensions of integration are not mutually reinforcing, some tend to have a greater effect than others and so may need to be addressed first.

With regard to economic integration, during one of the APPG evidence sessions in Parliament, Professor Heath from the Centre for Social Investigation at Oxford highlighted research which showed the economic empowerment of immigrants is crucial and has a greater impact on integration than any other policy intervention, followed closely by differences in levels of education and language skills.¹⁰ **The government should examine how well existing mainstream employment and skills provision serves the needs of different immigrant communities.** As argued by the Casey Review, there may be a need to introduce additional tailored programmes to

⁸ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Submissions to the Call for Evidence: David Goodhart*.

⁹ Ibid

¹⁰ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Evidence Session 17 October 2016*. Available from: <https://soundcloud.com/user-300659603/evidence-session-17-october-2016>

promote smooth access to and progression within the labour market, complemented by specialist language provision where appropriate.¹¹

Civic integration is understood by the APPG as an awareness of and respect for the host country's laws, traditions, and culture, as well as knowledge of national languages and participation in democracy and political life. These are the practical aspects of living in a new country and, as outlined in Principle Three, they should be addressed prior to, or immediately upon, the arrival of immigrants to the UK.

Social integration, which is the key focus of the APPG, is measured as contact between people from different ethnicities, cultures, faiths, ages, and income groups. A lack of social integration has been shown to prevent the development of bonds of trust and sense of belonging which underpin successful communities.¹² The APPG feels that this particular dimension of integration policy has not received the attention it deserves.

The new government strategy should rectify this by including a focus on developing and funding new and existing community institutions to promote meaningful contact between immigrants and host communities.

In doing so, the government may look to programmes like National Citizen Service (NCS). This voluntary service programme brings together sixteen and seventeen year olds from different backgrounds to participate in outdoor activities, spend a week living away from home, and design and deliver campaigns for change in their communities. The largest single provider of NCS is the social integration charity *The Challenge*, which provides the secretariat to this APPG. The government should invest in initiatives aimed at engaging with young immigrants to give them a sense of belonging to Britain and encouraging them to participate in NCS alongside their British peers. The Casey Review's recommendation that DCLG should commission area-based plans and projects to achieve key outcomes including increased social mixing between young people out-of-school is also certainly worthy of consideration.¹³

Finally, integration needs and outcomes vary not only across the different dimensions of integration but also between distinct immigrant groups. Immigrant communities are more diverse than ever before in Britain and therefore have a wider range of needs. According to research carried out by Professor Anthony Heath for DCLG, there is good evidence to support this claim.¹⁴ For instance, people with South Asian backgrounds, tend to be well integrated in aspects of political life, including electoral registration and voting, while the largest gap in fluency in English is among men and women of Bangladeshi or Pakistani origin. New immigrants from Eastern Europe tend to be young adults and are less likely to use adult social care and most health services than those born in the UK. However, they are more likely than those born in the UK to have young children, and so they are expected to use more education provision and maternity care.¹⁵

The Centre for Social Investigation underlined in their submission to our inquiry that even within these immigrant groups we may need to distinguish between those who arrived as primary-school-age children, those who arrived late in their school career (who tend to have greater problems in learning English and gaining qualifications)¹⁶, those who arrived as adults¹⁷, and those who arrived later in life (for example, elderly parents arriving for family reunification). The Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) have also pointed out the need to distinguish between short-term and long-term

¹¹ Casey, Dame Louise DBE CB. 2016.

¹² Putnam, R.D. 2007. 'E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30:2, 137-174.

¹³ Casey, Dame Louise DBE CB. 2016.

¹⁴ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Submissions to the Call for Evidence: CSI Oxford*

¹⁵ Migration Observatory. 2015 (1). *Election 2015 Briefing—Impacts of Migration on Local Public*

¹⁶ Heath, A., & Kilpi-Jakonen, E. 2012. 'Immigrant Children's Age at Arrival and Assessment Results' *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 75. OECD Publishing (NJ).

¹⁷ Problems of integration may vary over the life cycle: ethnic differences in unemployment, for example, are more pronounced among the young while language difficulties tend to be greatest among the elderly.

immigrants, as efforts directed towards integrating the latter may need to be more comprehensive.

The new national immigrant integration strategy should differentiate between, and include, policies shaped to reflect the needs and circumstances of different categories of immigrants. These categories may include, but are not limited to: long-term and short-term immigrants, economic migrants, skilled and unskilled workers, and immigrants coming in under the family reunion scheme, students, child immigrants, new immigrants, elderly immigrants, and immigrants who have lived in the UK for some time. It should also recognise the gendered experiences of immigration, whether as sponsors, actors, or dependents.

PRINCIPLE TWO: LOCAL AUTHORITIES MUST BE REQUIRED TO DRAW UP AND IMPLEMENT LOCAL INTEGRATION ACTION PLANS TO REFLECT LOCAL NEEDS.

The tangled division of responsibility for immigrant integration between government departments, as detailed above has been compounded by a lack of clarity as to the role of local and regional government in this area. Local authorities prefer central government not to dictate policy priorities so that they can shape policies according to their local needs and adapt these as times change.

Over the course of our inquiry it has become increasingly clear that experiences of immigration in Britain vary across regions and towns. Around 37% of people living in the UK who were born abroad live in London. Similarly, around 37% of people living in London were born outside the UK.¹⁸ Yet the Migration Observatory's research shows that Londoners are less likely than those living outside London to favour sharp reductions in immigration to the UK. This finding also holds true for white UK-born Londoners.¹⁹ At the same time Boston, Lincolnshire, where the proportion of immigrants is much lower—13% according to the last census—is often heralded as the 'most divided place in England'.²⁰

One of the explanations for this was offered to the APPG by the IPPR. They have found that the areas that are most successful at managing immigration are those where both immigrants and the local community have had time to adapt to each other.²¹ In contrast, communities that have experienced high levels of 'churn', as immigrants come and go, struggle with social integration. To some extent, increasing patterns of churn are part of the dynamics of globalisation, as technology, labour market trends and cheap travel have made it easier to spend short periods in a foreign country. However, to a large extent, high levels of churn are also the consequence of public policy and could be better addressed if local authorities were empowered to make decisions based on local needs.

Places such as Halifax, which the APPG visited in August, face segregation challenges which have little to do with new immigrants. In Halifax, the APPG saw first-hand the entrenched ethnic division which has come to characterise many of the mill towns of West Yorkshire. People from different communities live in the same town, but lead completely parallel lives; and whilst a number of impressive local initiatives are working

¹⁸ House of Commons Library, 2016. *Briefing Paper: Migration Statistics*.

Available from: <http://researchbriefings.Parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN06077>

¹⁹ Migration Observatory, 2015 (2). *UK Public Opinion toward Immigration: Overall Attitudes and Level of Concern*. Available from: <http://www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/briefings/uk-public-opinion-toward-immigration-overall-attitudes-and-level-of-concern/>

²⁰ *The Independent*, 2016. *Boston: How a Lincolnshire town became 'the most divided place in England'*. Available from: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/boston-how-a-lincolnshire-town-became-the-most-divided-place-in-england-a6838041.html>

²¹ APPG on Social Integration, 2016. *Submissions to the Call for Evidence: IPPR*.

to address this, local MP and APPG member Holly Lynch warned that without more support communities in her constituency might become more divided. This has serious implications for community cohesion. A lack of social integration has been shown to undermine trust between neighbours, to grow the fear of crime and bolster the prejudice which fuels the politics of recrimination and blame.

These patterns of localised variation point to the importance of localised strategies of intervention. For joined-up working between central and local government to succeed, central government must provide a knowledge base and a policy framework, as well as set an integration standard for all local authorities to work to. Following the APPG's visit to Halifax, Holly Lynch argued that towns like hers would benefit from a clearer allocation of responsibility for integration. **The APPG believes that the government should introduce a duty on all local authorities to promote integration through the policy framework set out in its immigrant integration strategy.** Local authorities should have the funding and the freedom to come up with their own, localised action plans, co-produced by wider civic society, of achieving the integration standard. In developing these plans, they should identify the biggest integration barriers in their area—be that the economic, civic or social dimension—and seek to prioritise them.

CASE STUDY

New Scots: Integrating Refugees in Scotland's Communities²²

The Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) is the representative voice of Local Government in Scotland and works with member councils to deliver services to local communities. The COSLA Migration, Population and Diversity (MPD) Team works specifically on immigration issues.

The development and implementation of a strategy for the integration of asylum seekers and refugees in Scotland is a prime example of central and local government working together to coordinate integration support. 'New Scots: Integrating Refugees in Scotland's Communities' was initially developed by officers from COSLA's MPD team in partnership with the Scottish Government and the Scottish Refugee Council. It aims to coordinate the efforts of all organisations involved in supporting refugees and people seeking asylum in Scotland. This outcomes-based strategy seeks to make the most of available resources by promoting partnership approaches, joined-up working and early intervention. It also seeks to be grounded in refugees' experiences of life in Scotland. The strategy has expanded to meet the needs and experiences of refugees who are part of the Syrian Vulnerable People Resettlement scheme and also demonstrated its efficacy in informing other policy areas in housing, employment, and education.

For example, if it is a lack of English language skills that is identified as an integration barrier in a particular area, local authorities may want to look to improve that through expanding English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) provision. This could be done through offering business rate discounts to local enterprises who invest in ESOL training for their employees or through ensuring that immigrants have opportunities to practice their English language skills outside the classroom; boosting the provision of community schemes facilitating social mixing and language learning.

²² APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Submissions to the Call for Evidence*: COSLA.

Stepney City Farm Open Volunteers²³

Working alongside others in a natural outdoor setting has huge therapeutic and health benefits for individuals, but can also be a great way to practice new language skills at your own pace. Stepney City Farm offers Open Volunteering sessions every Tuesday and Thursday, allowing adults of all ages, backgrounds, and abilities to come together in a safe environment and work on practical tasks together. New English speakers can be paired with volunteers with stronger language skills and can attend the sessions as often as they like. Doing practical tasks together helps to build bonds between volunteers from the local community, regardless of their different backgrounds, and gives a sense of belonging to and investment in the community.

The APPG believes that in addition to introducing a new Controlling Migration Fund, as proposed in the Conservative Manifesto, the government should consider immediately bringing forward plans for the introduction of an Integration Impact Fund. Not only should this funding pot be significantly larger than the last Labour government's Migration Impact Fund, it should be used by local authorities to fund programmes promoting English language learning and social mixing between immigrant and host communities.

²³ Insights gained from conversations with Fiona Stone, a volunteer, and Simon White, the Volunteer Manager, at Stepney City Farm. More information available on the farm's website: <http://stepneycityfarm.org/>

PRINCIPLE THREE: GOVERNMENT MUST REASSESS ITS CURRENT 'ONE SIZE FITS ALL' APPROACH TO IMMIGRATION POLICY.

In addition to empowering local authorities to effectively manage demographic and cultural change, the government should consider reforming the immigration system to more actively shape immigrant settlement patterns within the UK. Through the introduction of policies aimed at directing population flows to areas of the country which require higher levels of immigration or do not currently attract a great many immigrants, policymakers might minimise strain on public services and on community relations whilst bolstering regional economies.

Promoting the geographic dispersal of immigrants has been shown by numerous academic studies to lead to higher levels of integration.²⁴ In contrast, 'one size fits all' immigration systems tend to lead to lopsided patterns of chain migration, wherein new immigrants are attracted to areas with high immigrant concentrations.²⁵ This prevents some regions from benefiting from the economic advantages of immigration.²⁶ In addition, chain migration can lead immigrants—facing no immediate imperative to improve their English skills or knowledge of local cultural practices—to develop exclusive social networks and alternative labour markets, which in turn alienates host communities and entrenches social segregation.²⁷

Indeed, the UK's points-based immigration system is generally unresponsive to demographic, economic, and cultural differences between our constituent nations and regions. This has led to friction between the Scottish and UK governments, as the former's aim of increasing immigration (in order to grow its labour force) has come into conflict with the Home Office's commitment to cut net immigration.^{28 29}

In their written submission to the APPG's call for evidence, the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) pinpointed a declining and ageing population as Scotland's principal demographic challenge.³⁰ COSLA reported that the Scottish government and Scottish local authorities are acutely aware of this challenge. As a result, there is a significant amount of work being carried out by Scottish councils to make their area an attractive place to live and work for immigrants. This includes building affordable housing, attracting inward investment, and creating employment, education, and training opportunities. It remains the case, however, that these efforts in Scotland could be undermined by a nationally-driven reduction in the number of immigrants arriving in the UK.

The APPG believes that the government should consider designing a devolved or regionally-led immigration system. In doing so, the government might look to the Canadian precedent. During a visit to Montreal in September 2016, APPG Chair Chuka Umunna discussed Canada's comparatively regionalised immigration system with Kathleen Weil MNA, Minister for Immigration, Diversity and Inclusiveness within the Government of Quebec.

²⁴ Migration Observatory. 2011. *Integration*.

Available from: <http://www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/primers/integration/>

²⁵ Migration Observatory. 2013. *Sub-National Immigration Policy: Can it Work in the UK?* Available from:

<http://www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/primers/sub-national-immigration-policy-can-it-work-in-the-uk/>

²⁶ The RSA's City Growth Commission recently argued that the UK's 'blanket' immigration approach is stifling growth in some parts of the country. See RSA. 2014. *Unleashing metro growth: final recommendations*. Available from:

<https://www.thersa.org/globalassets/pdfs/reports/final-city-growth-commission-report-unleashing-growth.pdf>

²⁷ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Submissions to the Call for Evidence: Welsh Refugee Council*.

²⁸ Migration Observatory 2013.

²⁹ The Smith Commission report (section 96) provides further opportunities to take forward matters. The parties involved agreed that the Scottish and UK Governments should work together, for example, to 'explore the possibility of introducing formal schemes to allow international higher education students graduating from Scottish further and higher education institutions to remain in Scotland and contribute to economic activity for a defined period of time'.

See The Smith Commission. 2014. *Report of the Smith Commission for further devolution of powers to the Scottish Parliament*. Available from: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20151202171017/http://www.smith-commission.scot/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/The_Smith_Commission_Report-1.pdf

³⁰ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Submissions to the Call for Evidence: COSLA*.

The Canadian precedent³¹

Whilst Canada's points-based immigration system is closely comparable to the UK's, it has been adapted over a number of years to accommodate differences between the specific demographic, economic, and cultural profiles of that country's constituent provinces and enable regionalised policy-setting.

Through Provincial Nominee Programmes (PNPs) jointly agreed with the federal government, all ten Canadian provincial governments are empowered to set region-specific requirements for immigrants. This enables these administrations to address labour shortages in certain fields and industries within their regions and to enforce place-specific cultural criteria. Immigrants are required to reside within the region which approves their visa until they become eligible to apply for Canadian citizenship.

There are, however, questions as to the extent to which dispersal can be achieved through the enforcement of visa laws alone. The Canadian federal government has, accordingly, sought to create incentives for immigrants to move to new areas. Regions and towns in provinces including British Columbia have been supported to design and launch 'Welcoming Communities' initiatives. These federally-funded schemes offer regional government funding to develop and execute strategies to attract immigrants to live and work in their areas, enabling investment in strategic infrastructural improvements and in initiatives promoting positive attitudes towards cultural diversity.

Of course, the socio-economic and demographic profiles, aspirations, and behaviours of immigrants to the UK are different to those of immigrants to Canada and both countries' economies also have different needs. There are, however, clear parallels between the present British experience of immigration and the drivers that led the Canadian federal government to embark on a process of devolving immigration policy powers.

PNPs were devised in part to address the historical tendency of Canadian immigrants to settle in the major cities of Toronto, Montreal, and Vancouver—a situation arguably mirroring that of modern-day London.³²

³¹ Insights gained from: CIC. 2003. *Government Response to the Report of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration: The Provincial Nominee Program*. Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada; Hiebert D. 2003. 'Are immigrants welcome? Introducing the Vancouver community studies survey.' RIIM, Working Paper Series (03-06): Vancouver, BC; Reitz, J. G. 1998. *Warmth of the Welcome: The Social Causes of Economic Success for Immigrants in Different Nations and Cities*. Boulder, CO.: Westview Press; Walton-Roberts, M. 2005. 'Regional immigration and dispersal: lessons from small and medium-sized urban centres in British Columbia'. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* XXXVII(3): 14-34.

³² House of Commons Library 2016.

Furthermore, this model was preceded by one—agreed to by the Canadian federal and Quebec governments—which is broadly comparable to the modern Scottish ‘shortage occupation list’. This initiative allows employers to offer particular jobs to non-EU nationals without first advertising them domestically and is the only notable concession to the specific needs of constituent nations built into the UK immigration system (although institutions including the London Chamber of Commerce have called for the introduction of a ‘London Visa’ following the Brexit vote.³³) Policymakers in both countries instituted these schemes as they had become convinced that a centrally imposed approach to immigration policy was no longer serving the needs of their constituents.

The APPG calls on the government to seriously consider devolving a degree of control over immigration policy powers to the constituent nations and regions of the UK so as to boost levels of integration. **The government should appoint an independent commission to explore how a devolved or regionally-led immigration system might work**, addressing questions including:

- Whether powers over economic immigration as devolved to Scotland previously could be extended to Wales, Northern Ireland, London, and newly-constituted English metro regions through the devolution agenda.³⁴
- Whether these powers could be strengthened to enable the constituent nations and regions of the UK to develop more expansive immigrant criteria reflecting place-specific demographic and cultural conditions.
- Whether the UK government might copy the Canada-Quebec Accord, wherein control of immigration is substantially devolved to the provincial government of Quebec, which directly sets the criteria for and evaluates visa applications.

Devolving substantial immigration policy powers to the UK’s nations and regions would almost certainly involve significant challenges, but might be achieved through the introduction of region (and potentially sector) specific visas. Quotas for the dissemination of these visas could be agreed by devolved administrations, city regions, and other democratic forums (IPPR have proposed the introduction of grand committees in the English regions for this purpose.³⁵)

A move to regionalise the UK’s immigration system might have a positive knock-on effect on the public debate on immigration. Shaping immigration criteria to address nation or region-specific economic and cultural needs might instil confidence among members of the public that the immigration system works for their area; whilst enabling nations and regions to set regional immigration quotas would create new incentives for politicians to actively make the case for immigration in their area.

³³ London Chamber of Commerce and Industry. 2016. *Permits, points and visas*. Available from: <http://www.londonchamber.co.uk/docimages/14742.pdf>

³⁴ For example, the government may want to consider bringing back and expanding The Fresh Talent scheme. See *Immigration Directorates’ Instructions*. 2007. Chapter 5, Section 14: Fresh Talent: Working in Scotland Scheme. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/chapter-5-section-14-fresh-talent-working-in-scotland-scheme>

³⁵ *New Statesman*. 2016. *How a devolved immigration policy could work in Brexit Britain*. Available from: <http://www.newstatesman.com/politics/staggers/2016/10/how-devolved-immigration-policy-could-work-brexit-britain>

PRINCIPLE FOUR: FOR NEW IMMIGRANTS, INTEGRATION SHOULD BEGIN UPON ARRIVAL IN THE UK.

During the inquiry's first evidence session in Parliament in September 2016 Elizabeth Collett, Director of Migration Policy Institute (MPI) Europe, pointed out that the UK's debate on integration policy is very different from other countries'.³⁶ We talk a lot about community cohesion and civic participation but our policies and initiatives fail to address the practical aspects of adapting to life in a new country.

Around 1,700 newcomers arrive in the UK each day planning to stay for at least a year.³⁷ They face unique barriers including a lack of local knowledge, insufficient language skills, procedural delays in ascertaining entitlements, and non-recognition of professional qualifications. Research conducted by the Migration Observatory at the University of Oxford has shown that many of these barriers can be easily resolved through offering a targeted integration programme for new arrivals, but addressing them in the period following arrival has not been a priority for the UK government.

In Belgium, for instance, every non-EU immigrant is required, and every EU immigrant is encouraged, to register with a Welcome Office and participate in a civic integration programme—Inburgering³⁸. Throughout the course of this programme, the Welcome Office encourages new arrivals to build up a social network, get to know their local town or community, practise their Dutch, sign up to become a member of a local association or sports club, or take up voluntary work.

CASE STUDY

Inburgering³⁹

The programme consists of two stages: primary and secondary. The primary stage of the programme is compulsory and is organised by one of the four regional Welcome Offices, funded by the government of Flanders. The programme followed by a newcomer is established in their civic integration contract. Courses included in this programme include social orientation, Dutch as a second language, career orientation, and individual counselling. A person who signs a civic integration contract commits to follow the training programme on a regular basis. This implies that the newcomer must attend at least 80% of all courses for each component of the training programme. Upon completion of the civic integration programme, they receive a civic integration certificate.

During the secondary programme, immigrants can shape the choice they made during the primary civic integration programme, that is to start working or to take up further education. The newcomer can, for instance, follow vocational training or entrepreneurship training, or enrol for more Dutch language classes. The courses on the programme are free, but participants are expected to invest in their own textbooks.

³⁶ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. Minutes for Meeting on Monday 5 September 2016. Available from: https://d3n8a8pro7vnm.cloudfront.net/labourclp355/pages/1103/attachments/original/1474218612/160916_5_September_meeting_minutes.pdf?1474218612

³⁷ This data is taken from the COMPAS submission to the APPG: 636,000 long-term international migrants moved to the UK in the year ending June 2015 (averaging 1,742 a day). The definition here is of someone who moves to a country other than that of his or her usual residence for a period of at least a year, so that the country of destination becomes his or her new country of usual residence. Of the 636,000, 45% were non EU citizens, 42% were EU citizens and 13% British citizens.

³⁸ Insights gained from the Belgian government website, Inburgering: <http://inburgering.be/en>

³⁹ Ibid.

The APPG calls on the government to explore the example of Belgium and other countries which have proactively built a focus on integration into the process of settling in their country. The government should invest in cultural orientation programmes for new immigrants and consider making attendance at these courses compulsory.

When it comes to new immigrants in particular, research has shown that language competency is key to expanding people's social networks, as well as increasing access to work, and thus has positive spillover effects to many aspects of integration.⁴⁰ Indeed, according to the testimony given to the APPG by the Australian High Commissioner to the United Kingdom, the Hon Alexander Downer AC, the high standard of English language proficiency required to gain a visa to Australia is one of the main reasons for the comparative success of their immigration system.⁴¹

The APPG believes that all immigrants should be expected to have either learned English before coming to the UK or be enrolled in compulsory ESOL classes upon arrival. As was acknowledged by the Casey Review, speaking English is the key to full participation in our society and economy, and is a prerequisite for meaningful engagement with most British people.⁴² The APPG would, therefore, urge the government to markedly increase ESOL funding as well as explore innovative policy ideas to increase the availability and take-up of English language classes.

The Welsh Refugee Council told us that immigrant communities sometimes rely on 'word of mouth' within their own networks to find employment, rather than finding job opportunities through other methods such as online searches (due to a lack of digital access and language barriers).⁴³ Creating accessible training programmes, including intensive and flexible ESOL provision which fit around working hours, would support those locked into low-paid and low-skilled work to improve their integration outcomes over time. As part of an effort to address this issue, the government might consider opening community mentoring programmes, such as Time Together, and expanding the remit of such programmes to encompass immigrants as well as refugees.

CASE STUDY

Time Together⁴⁴

Time Together was set up by the charity TimeBank UK in 2002, in response to a government white paper that recommended the provision of mentoring schemes to help refugees integrate better in the UK. The scheme aimed to complement the well-established services already provided by refugee organisations and community groups.

Since November 2002 Time Together has recruited and matched over 2,500 refugees with volunteer mentors. Mentors spend five hours per month with their mentee for a period of 6 months to a year, meeting at least twice a month. Mentors help their mentee to feel more at home in the UK by sharing their knowledge and experience, and offering their friendship. This might mean doing anything from helping to write a CV, to visiting a museum or art gallery, to helping to practise English. Time Together provides full training and support to mentors and mentees throughout the course of the mentoring relationships.

⁴⁰ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Submissions to the Call for Evidence: CSI Oxford*.

⁴¹ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Minutes for Meeting on Monday 5 September 2016*.

⁴² Casey, Dame Louise DBE CB 2016.

⁴³ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Submissions to the Call for Evidence: Welsh Refugee Council*.

⁴⁴ Insights gained from the NCVO website:

<http://www.mandbf.org/resources/case-studies/community-cohesion/time-together-mentoring-refugees-london>

A number of experts, including those from British Future and IPPR, have effectively argued that policies that disincentivise settlement also disincentivise integration.⁴⁵ An immigrant has no incentive to get to know the local area or to seek to identify with local customs and values if they know they are only likely to reside in that area for a short period of time. While this might be acceptable to some immigrants who are here on a short-term basis, a distinction needs to be made between these individuals and those who are here to stay and therefore have a higher need to be fully integrated into the British society and are more likely to respond to integration overtures. As proposed by the Casey Review, the government should review the route to full British citizenship⁴⁶.

The APPG proposes that the Home Office investigate whether new immigrants could be placed on pathways to citizenship automatically upon their arrival to the UK. This system might operate on an opt-out basis and would include comprehensive guidance as to the requirements, costs, and benefits of gaining British citizenship. Furthermore, the government might consider reducing the naturalisation fees, which have recently spiralled to just under £1,200—almost ten times the cost to the Home Office of processing the application, and over six times more than the cost in countries such as Germany and Canada.⁴⁷

PRINCIPLE FIVE: WE NEED MORE AND BETTER DATA ON THE INTEGRATION OF IMMIGRANTS.

As previously discussed, the UK already dedicates a considerable amount of resources to supporting and integrating refugees. However, little attention has been given to the need to foster the integration of new economic migrants, or to building up a profile of the particular issues they face. According to COMPAS, data collection remains heavily focussed on ethnic minorities so that we know relatively little about the integration outcomes of those from abroad.⁴⁸ Similarly, the impact of immigration on public services is poorly understood at a local level and there are serious difficulties in measuring this due to a lack of data.⁴⁹ As was argued by the Casey Review, the government might build local communities' resilience in the towns and cities facing the most significant integration challenges by developing a set of local indicators of integration and requiring regular collection of relevant data.⁵⁰

The method currently used by government departments to measure integration is to assess the size of the 'gaps', either from the overall population (for example with respect to income or labour market entry) or from some other benchmark (e.g. a standard of adult competencies). While this is a useful approach, it does not cover other dimensions of integration, such as social relationships or civic involvement. **The APPG calls on the government to consider adapting existing data sources and introducing new ones to enable researchers to develop a better understanding of levels of immigrant integration throughout the UK, with a particular emphasis on social integration.**

To do this, the government may look to bring back the Citizenship Survey, which was stopped in 2011, or to adapt the UK Longitudinal Household Survey. The measurement of community cohesion used to be undertaken through the Citizenship Survey, which included the question 'to what extent do you agree or disagree that this local area (within 15/20 minutes walking distance) is a place where people from different

⁴⁵ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. Minutes for Meeting on Monday 5 September 2016.; Submissions to the Call for Evidence: IPPR.

⁴⁶ Casey, Dame Louise DBE CB 2016.

⁴⁷ Griffith, P. 2014. 'More migrants are becoming British citizens. And it could help to calm concerns about immigration', *Left Foot Forward*, 22 November 2014.

⁴⁸ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. Submissions to the Call for Evidence: COMPAS.

⁴⁹ Migration Observatory 2015 (1).

⁵⁰ Casey, Dame Louise DBE CB 2016.

backgrounds get on well together?'.⁵¹ The government may want to paraphrase this old question, placing more emphasis on contact with people from different backgrounds and whether or not they mix or come together as one community. Alternatively, the government might look to countries like Germany for inspiration and adopt the microcensus model.

CASE STUDY

German Microcensus⁵²

The German microcensus provides official and accurate statistics regarding the population and labour market in Germany. The microcensus supplies statistical information on the population structure; on the economic and social situation of the population; on families, consensual unions and households; on employment, job search, education/training, and continuing education/training; on the housing situation; and on health.

1% of all households in Germany ('small population census') are involved in the microcensus annually. Altogether, about 390,000 households with 830,000 persons take part in the microcensus.

⁵¹ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Submissions to the Call for Evidence*: CSI Oxford.

⁵² APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Evidence Session 17 October 2016*; International Data Service Centre (IDSC). 2014. *German Microcensus*. Available from: <https://idsc.iza.org/?page=27&id=38>



As JCWI pointed out in their submission to the APPG, when it comes to data collection more broadly, planning for immigration cannot be separated from the obligation to plan in general.⁵³ Infrastructure and public services planning is a reality with or without immigration. If we are failing to adequately measure the impact of immigration on public services, as COMPAS research suggests we are, we are not only failing at immigration policy we are failing at planning in general.

Brexit may create additional opportunities for collecting data, as more and more European immigrants who were not previously required to register their presence in the UK will seek to gain official confirmation of their immigration and residence status.⁵⁴ Policymakers should use this opportunity to offer communities more support to manage demographic and cultural change and wherever possible they should seek to do so in advance of waves of immigration.

The demographic position of local authorities could be mapped using population projection data to identify those areas which have a working age population that is projected to increase or decline and then use this data to support strategic planning to ensure that delivery of services in these areas remains viable.⁵⁵ Similarly, having better data on levels of social mixing between immigrants and host communities would allow us to better target integration initiatives as well as help us identify practices that are making the biggest difference. **The APPG calls on the government to launch a commission to investigate how better data collection and population projections could be used to help the integration of immigrants.**

⁵³ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Submissions to the Call for Evidence: JCWI*.

⁵⁴ The number of applications for permanent residence from EEA nationals had risen 78% in the six months to September according to Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD). 2016. *Net migration begins to fall after Brexit vote—but residency applications from Europeans surge*. Available from: <http://www2.cipd.co.uk/pm/peoplemanagement/b/weblog/archive/2016/12/01/net-migration-begins-to-fall-after-brexit-vote-but-residency-applications-from-europeans-surge.aspx>

⁵⁵ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. *Submissions to the Call for Evidence: Welsh Refugee Council*.



PRINCIPLE SIX: THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD DEMONSTRATE STRONG POLITICAL LEADERSHIP ON IMMIGRATION IN ORDER TO BUILD PUBLIC CONFIDENCE AND FACILITATE SUCCESSFUL INTEGRATION AT THE REGIONAL AND LOCAL LEVEL.

Appearing before the APPG, the High Commissioner of Australia, Alexander Downer AC stated that the immigration policy in Australia is always mindful of what he called the “threshold of community comfort”.⁵⁶ This threshold relates to the amount and type of immigrants Australians are prepared to accept. Mr Downer also explained that public confidence in the Australian immigration system comes from the feeling that government is in control of who is entering the country. Skilled immigration is high, for example, because it is seen as fundamentally beneficial for the country by the majority of population. Being more geographically remote, Australia has historically found it easier to control its borders and to have a strict immigration policy. The United Kingdom is unlikely to be able to exercise similar levels of control, which makes it harder for us to fulfil the threshold of community comfort through government control alone. Consequently, the government should take a much more active role in leading the public debate on immigration and in promoting integration to meet that threshold through alternative means.

Speaking at the APPG session in Parliament, Ms Collett, Director of MPI Europe, pointed out that by setting targets for the reduction of immigration which it has gone onto miss repeatedly, the government has created the impression that it is not in control of who is entering the country.⁵⁷ Rather than seeking to address public anxiety regarding the changing shapes of our communities and workforces, officials have unnecessarily stoked public anxiety.

The government has a responsibility to ensure that its policy and rhetorical announcements on immigration do not undermine integration efforts, but instead facilitate the development of welcoming communities and overall community cohesion. The government’s consistent failure to meet its own immigration targets has only served to undermine public confidence in the ability of government to manage immigration effectively and encouraged populist resentment. **The government must consider the impact on social integration of any post-Brexit immigration policy announcements to ensure that it does not create further social division and disadvantage among those communities already grappling with rapid social change.**

⁵⁶ APPG on Social Integration. 2016. Minutes for Meeting on Monday 5 September 2016.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

Immigration policy and rhetoric should not be conflated with issues of counter-terrorism, particularly with regard to refugee and asylum-seeking communities.

To conflate these issues is dangerous and irresponsible in the current climate; it encourages mistrust and division between communities, and further marginalises disadvantaged Muslim communities who already feel targeted by counter-terrorism strategies. It also detracts from the UK's humanitarian duties to those seeking asylum and refuge. Moreover, as Dame Casey argued in her review, a stronger approach to integration is justified on a much wider basis than counter-extremism alone.⁵⁸

In providing responsible leadership on immigration, government policy should acknowledge the impacts of broader social change on disenfranchised communities. Rapid social change is rarely about immigration alone; it is also about growing inequality, the pace of technological developments, longer-term demographic change, and the impact of austerity measures on public services, among many other factors. Articulating this as part of government policy on immigration would highlight the broader forces behind current immigration flows and would help communities understand the trade-offs and implications of restricting free movement. It would also avoid polarised and simplistic debates around 'them' and 'us'.

Economic immigrants follow economic opportunities and are of huge value to UK employers, businesses and sectors. **The government should consider drawing more heavily on voices of those employers who currently benefit from a large immigrant workforce, particularly where there are clear, tangible benefits to the local or regional economy.** Again this would help local communities better understand the drivers of demographic change in more tangible ways than macro-economic arguments. It would also encourage those employers to consider the broader impacts of their recruitment decisions—namely, how they might facilitate the integration of their employees into the local community and/or how they might upskill or incentivise their local workforce to ensure a more sustainable supply of labour.

⁵⁸ Casey, Dame Louise DBE CB 2016.



CONCLUSION

All the evidence gathered by this inquiry strongly supports the need for a comprehensive integration strategy. It is the view of this APPG that this should no longer be an option for the government, but a necessity.

Since 2004, we have seen the largest single wave of immigration that Britain has ever experienced. Alongside this, we have witnessed growing inequalities, rapid technological advancements, and cuts to public and voluntary sector services which have tended to undermine opportunities for social mixing and for the integration of newcomers. Yet, we have seen no proactive government policies to support this kind of extraordinary, rapid social change, which has transformed many communities across the UK and left them feeling insecure and increasingly divided. Brexit has been the wake-up call: globalisation has not delivered for all and now more than ever, we need political leadership to prioritise integration in order to address the deep societal divisions that were exposed on June 23rd.

The government should consider the six principles we propose as the basis for an integration strategy. It is no longer enough to focus solely on the numbers of immigrants arriving in the UK, while ignoring what happens to them and their host communities after arrival. This strategy must articulate integration as the responsibility of us all: a two way process which acknowledges the responsibilities of both the host society and immigrant communities, and which recognises all the dimensions of integration as equally important—the civic and social, as well as the economic. This will provide a strong and inclusive national narrative that defines integration as the success of all groups, and not just a problem of newcomers. In doing so, this narrative will guide the approach of future integration policies and programmes and help instil public confidence in the government's ability and willingness to support communities experiencing rapid social change. It will also go some way towards building a confident and inclusive national identity based on the vision that all communities should be able to participate equally and fairly in civic, social, and economic life.



APPENDIX 1: APPG MEMBERS, WITNESSES, AND WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Members of the APPG on Social Integration

- | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| • Chuka Umunna MP | • Nusrat Ghani MP | • Tulip Siddiq MP |
| • James Berry MP | • Jim McMahon MP | • Rt Hon David Lammy MP |
| • Holly Lynch MP | • Suella Fernandes MP | • Lord Adebawale |
| • Rt Revd Dr Steven Croft | • Gavin Robinson MP | • Stuart C McDonald MP |
| • Lord Glasman | • Jon Cruddas MP | • Naz Shah MP |
| • Matt Warman MP | • Mark Durkan MP | • Debbie Abrahams MP |
| • Anne McLaughlin MP | • Baroness Stroud | • Rushanara Ali MP |
| • Lord Lennie | • Ruth Smeeth MP | • Rt Hon Keith Vaz MP |

The inquiry took oral evidence from the following witnesses:

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| • The Hon Alexander Downer AC, the High Commissioner of Australia to the United Kingdom | • Phoebe Griffith, Associate Director for Migration, Integration and Communities at IPPR and research fellow at Coventry University | • Don Flynn, Director of the Migrants' Rights Network |
| • Elizabeth Collett, Director of Migration Policy Institute (MPI) Europe and Senior Advisor to MPI's Transatlantic Council on Migration | • David Goodhart, Head of the Demography, Immigration, Integration Unit, and the Integration Hub at Policy Exchange | • Representatives from Boston Borough Council: Councillor Michael Brookes, Councillor Paul Gleeson, Phil Drury, Andy Fisher, and Stuart Hellon |
| • Councillor Peter Bedford, Conservative Leader of Boston Borough Council | • Professor Anthony Francis Heath, Emeritus Professor of Sociology, Centre for Social Investigation, Nuffield College, Oxford | • Representatives from Calderdale Council: Robin Tuddenham, Jo Richmond, Sadia Hussain, Tahira Iqbal, and Sail Suleman |
| • Eric Kaufmann, Professor of Politics at Birkbeck College, University of London | • Lindsay Richards, Postdoctoral Researcher, Centre for Social Investigation, Nuffield College, Oxford | • Focus group participants in Boston, Lincolnshire |
| • Sunder Katwala, Director of British Future | | • Focus group participants in Halifax, Yorkshire |

Written evidence was submitted to the inquiry by the following individuals and organisations:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| • Accord Coalition for Inclusive Education | • David Goodhart, Head of the Demography, Immigration, Integration Unit, and the Integration Hub at Policy Exchange | • Migrants' Rights Network (MRN) |
| • Amnesty International UK | • Dr. Philip Wood, Associate Professor, Aga Khan University | • Prof Eric Kaufmann, Professor of Politics at Birkbeck College, University of London |
| • Centre for Social Investigation, Nuffield College, Oxford | • Dr. Siobhan Lambert-Hurley, Reader in International History, Migration Research Group, University of Sheffield | • Still Human Still Here, a coalition of 79 organisations that are seeking to end the destitution of asylum seekers in the UK |
| • Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS) at the University of Oxford | • The Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) | • Welsh Refugee Council |
| • Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) Migration, Population and Diversity Team | • Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants (JCWI) | |
| • Dr. Gemma Catney, Lecturer and Programme Director of MSc Population and Health at the University of Liverpool | | |

APPENDIX 2: TERMS OF REFERENCE

As part of the inquiry into immigration and integration, the APPG focussed on the following questions:

1. What is the current division of responsibility for integration policy within government? What is the impact of this on policy decisions and how could this be improved?
2. Should responsibility for integration of immigrants lie primarily with central or local government? What opportunities does the devolution agenda present in this regard?
3. Could the UK government draw on international examples to develop a new immigration system facilitating higher rates of integration?
4. What is the impact of immigration on public services? To what extent does the UK's present immigration system enable policymakers and communities to anticipate this impact, and how could this be improved?
5. How has the development of alternative labour markets for immigrants affected levels of integration? How could labour market regulatory reforms contribute to the development of more integrated communities?
6. What steps could policymakers within both central and local government take to promote contact between immigrants and members of host communities? Are there examples of local best practice which could be drawn on in this regard?
7. London has the highest proportion of immigrants amongst regions with comparable data in the UK. Would a more regionally balanced dispersal of immigrants lead to better integration? How could this be achieved?
8. To what extent could an immigrant integration strategy be modelled on existing refugee integration strategies?
9. How do levels of integration differ between distinct immigrant groups? How could an immigrant integration strategy be shaped so as to respond to the circumstances, cultures and attitudes of particular immigrant groups?
10. What are the measures and devices used by the government and its agencies to measure integration? Could these be improved?





All Party Parliamentary Group on
Social Integration

The Secretariat to the All-Party Parliamentary Group
on Social Integration is provided by *The Challenge*,
the UK's leading social integration charity



Website: www.socialintegrationappg.org.uk
Twitter: @IntegrationAPPG
Email: APPG.SocialIntegration@the-challenge.org