

A study of the housing and related needs of the Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) and Migrant Worker (A8 and A2) communities in North Yorkshire

Andy Steele, Lisa Scullion and Gareth Morris
Salford Housing & Urban Studies Unit
University of Salford

November 2009



Acknowledgement

The research team would like to express their appreciation to the Project Steering Group for their support and guidance throughout the study period and in particular, their efforts in ensuring that the study was a success. We would also look to thank those members of the community who came forward to be trained as Community Interviewers and whose commitment to the project enables us to reach those sections of the communities which it may have been difficult to contact otherwise. Finally, we would like to extend our gratitude to those organisations and individuals who gave freely of their time to contribute to the study findings.

Contents

List of tables	8
List of appendices	11
Introduction	12
Methodological Approach	13
Part 1: The Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Community	15
Introduction	
Chapter 1: BME Population & Projections	16
Introduction	
Population size	
Housing needs of the BME population	
Chapter 2: The Housing & Related Support Needs of the BME Community: Stakeholder Feedback	18
Introduction	
The collection of statistics on the ethnic profile of service users	
BME as a proportion of the client group receiving services	
Changes in the number of BME people using services in the last few years	
Promotion and publicity of services	
BME people's awareness of the services available in the area	
Problems for the BME community to access services	
Use of interpretation and translation services	
Agency information in minority languages	
The development of organisations to meet the needs of BME people	
Consultation with BME groups about service provision	
Problems accessing mainstream services	
The need for BME specific services	
The priority support needs affecting BME people	
The housing related needs of the BME community	
Recommendations for the housing and related support needs of the local BME people	
Additional comments about the housing and related support needs of the local BME people	
Chapter 3: Findings from the BME Household Survey	26
Introduction	
Ethnicity of respondents	
Section 1: Respondent & Household Characteristics	30
Introduction	
Gender and age profile	
Household size and composition	
Language skills	
Section 2: Home & Community	39
Introduction	
Type and tenure of property occupied	
Length of time at current property	
Size of property	

Views on size of property	
Perception of overcrowding	
Cultural needs	
Level of satisfaction with home	
Level of satisfaction with area	
Sense of belonging	
Likelihood of moving home	
Household members in receipt of support	
Section 3: Social Isolation & Safety Issues	55
Introduction	
Availability of friends, family and neighbours	
Support to avoid social and cultural isolation	
Experience of crime and anti-social behaviour	
Perceived safety in the local area	
Home security	
Section 4: Health & Social Care	64
Introduction	
Incidence of health problems	
Caring responsibilities	
Property adaptations	
Specialist accommodation	
Access to services	
Recreational activity	
Part 2: Migrant Workers (A8 and A2)	71
Introduction	
Chapter 4: Existing evidence regarding migrant workers	72
Introduction	
Actual and perceived impacts	
Employment	
Language barriers	
Accommodation	
Health	
Rural migrant workers	
Chapter 5: Official data on the migrant worker population	78
Introduction	
Work permit applications	
International Passenger Survey (IPS)	
The Census	
Labour Force Survey (LFS) and the Annual Population Survey (APS)	
The School Census	
Electoral registers/roll	
Worker Registration Scheme (WRS)	
National Insurance Registration data (NINo)	
What the data tells us	
The national picture	

Chapter 6: The Needs & Experiences of Migrant Workers: Stakeholder Feedback	85
Introduction	
Employers and recruitment agencies	
ESOL providers	
Housing	
Other community groups	
Chapter 7: Findings from the Interviews with Migrant Workers	93
Introduction	
Section 1: Information about the Respondents	93
Nationality and ethnicity	
Year of arrival	
Age and gender	
Religion	
Marital status and number of dependants	
Section 2: Migration Experiences	100
Introduction	
Migration patterns prior to North Yorkshire	
Reasons for living in North Yorkshire	
Frequency of home visits	
Section 3: Education and qualifications	103
Introduction	
Qualifications	
English language skills	
Completion of language courses	
Section 4: Employment	109
Introduction	
Previous employment in home country	
Trade or skill from home country	
Previous job	
Employment experiences in North Yorkshire	
Employment rate	
Current employment	
Comparison between home country and current occupation	
Travelling to current employment	
Recruitment	
Security of employment	
Official registration	
Hours and pay	
Section 5: Housing	124
Introduction	
Housing experiences in North Yorkshire	
Previous accommodation	
Current accommodation type and tenure	
Rent or mortgage payments	
Living arrangements	
Overall satisfaction with accommodation	
General housing problems and issues	

Understanding of entitlement	
Homelessness/rough sleeping	
Causes of homelessness/rough sleeping	
Help and support to come out of homelessness	
Accommodation intentions and aspirations	
Intentions to move to a new property	
Section 6: Community & Neighbourhood	137
Introduction	
Views on their specific neighbourhood	
Aspirations to move to a different area	
Community engagement	
Sense of cohesion	
Contact with other people	
Perceptions of safety and security	
Experiences of crime and hate crime	
Overall feelings of safety	
Section 7: Access to Goods, Services & Facilities	146
Introduction	
Access to health care	
Services used	
Particular health needs	
Section 8: Education for Children	149
Introduction	
School/nursery/college attendance	
Learning support in schools	
Section 9: Benefit Take-up	150
Introduction	
Levels of take-up	
Understanding of entitlement	
Section 10: Other Goods, Services & Facilities	152
Introduction	
Local facilities/services	
Council services	
Section 11: Future intentions	155
Introduction	
Intended length of stay in North Yorkshire	
Future destination	
Family reunification	
Chapter 8: Emerging Themes & Recommendations	159
Introduction	
BME Community: Emerging Themes & Recommendations	160
Introduction	
Language and support needs	
Awareness and use of services	
Housing needs and aspirations	
Social isolation and personal safety	
Sense of place	

Unmet housing related support needs
Health related supported needs
Specialist accommodation

MW Community: Emerging Themes & Recommendations **166**

Introduction
Employment
Language barriers
Accommodation
Community cohesion and involvement
Access to services
Future intentions

Further Research **172**

Appendices **173**

Appendix 1: Questionnaires – Household Interviews
Appendix 2: What the data tells us about North Yorkshire
Appendix 3: Previous towns / cities
Appendix 4: Current employment

List of tables

Table 1:	Estimated population of white and BME people in 2005 and 2030, in each district of North Yorkshire
Table 2:	Sample distribution by local authority
Table 3:	Ethnic breakdown
Table 4:	Ethnic origin (2001 Census classification) by local authority
Table 5:	Ethnicity (re-grouped) by local authority
Table 6:	Gender of respondent
Table 7:	Age of respondent
Table 8:	Age of respondent by local authority
Table 9:	Size of household
Table 10:	Size of household by local authority
Table 11:	Household composition
Table 12:	Household composition by local authority
Table 13:	Number of household members aged 16 or younger
Table 14:	Number of household members aged 60 or over
Table 15:	Adults within the household unable to read or write English
Table 16:	Adults within the household unable to speak English
Table 17:	Access to interpretation services
Table 18:	Type of property
Table 19:	Tenure of property
Table 20:	Length of time at current address
Table 21:	Number of bedrooms
Table 22:	Views on amount of space in home
Table 23:	Living in overcrowded conditions
Table 24:	Home meets religious or cultural needs
Table 25:	Overall level of satisfaction with home as place to live
Table 26:	Overall level of satisfaction with local area as a place to live
Table 27:	View on sense of belonging to immediate neighbourhood
Table 28:	Likely to move to a different property in the future
Table 29:	Household member in receipt of support from family members or someone outside family
Table 30:	View on whether support received meets the needs of the individual
Table 31:	Support required
Table 32:	Degree of support required
Table 33:	Other types of support required
Table 34:	Help required with day-to-day tasks – managing household bills
Table 35:	Help required with day-to-day tasks – dealing with debt
Table 36:	Help required with day-to-day tasks – claiming benefits
Table 37:	Help required with day-to-day tasks – dealing with correspondence
Table 38:	Help required with day-to-day tasks – accessing services
Table 39:	Help required with day-to-day tasks – maintaining accommodation and avoiding eviction
Table 40:	Help required with day-to-day tasks – maintaining or development of independence
Table 41:	Availability of close friends / family who can look out for them
Table 42:	Frequency of meeting up with friends
Table 43:	Frequency of meeting up with family members not living with them
Table 44:	Frequency of meeting up with neighbours
Table 45:	View on help or support required
Table 46:	Experience of crime and anti-social behaviour

Table 47:	Currently fear being a victim of crime or anti-social behaviour
Table 48:	Perceived personal safety outside in local area after dark
Table 49:	Perceived personal safety outside in local area during the day
Table 50:	Current home security features
Table 51:	Home security features needed
Table 52:	Experience of disability and ill health
Table 53:	Type of property adaptation have or need
Table 54:	Where to go for advice on property adaptations
Table 55:	Need for specialist forms of housing
Table 56:	Local services used
Table 57:	Number of times taken part in a sport or recreational activity in the last 7 days
Table 58:	UK WRS approved applicants by quarter and year of application, May 2004 – December 2008
Table 59:	NINo registrations to A8/A2 nationals, January 2002 – September 2008
Table 60:	Geographical distribution of registered workers, May 2004 – December 2008
Table 61:	Nationality of respondents
Table 62:	Year of arrival in the UK
Table 63:	Age of respondents
Table 64:	Gender of respondents
Table 65:	Religious beliefs
Table 66:	Number of respondents living with spouse/partner
Table 67:	Number of respondents living with their children
Table 68:	Number of sons/daughters living with respondents in North Yorkshire
Table 69:	Have you lived anywhere else in the UK prior to this local authority area?
Table 70:	Reasons for living in a particular town/city
Table 71:	How often do you visit your home country?
Table 72:	Highest level of educational qualification
Table 73:	Ability to speak English
Table 74:	Ability to write English
Table 75:	Understanding of spoken English
Table 76:	Understanding of written English
Table 77:	English language courses – which of the following apply to you?
Table 78:	Do you have a particular trade or skill?
Table 79:	How long have you spent in this trade/using these skills?
Table 80:	Employment rates prior to coming to the UK
Table 81:	Last job in home country (Standard Occupational Classification, SOC)
Table 82:	Last job in home country (Standard Occupational Classification, SOC) by gender
Table 83:	Currently in paid employment
Table 84:	How long have you been without paid employment?
Table 85:	Current job (Standard Occupational Classification, SOC)
Table 86:	Comparison between home country and current job (SOC)
Table 87:	Method of travelling to work
Table 88:	How did you find your current job?
Table 89:	Security of employment
Table 90:	Official registration (WRS)
Table 91:	Official registration (A2 nationals)
Table 92:	Official registration (NINo)
Table 93:	Number of hours per week

Table 94:	Current weekly pay
Table 95:	Deductions from pay
Table 96:	Number of homes
Table 97:	Accommodation type
Table 98:	Current tenure
Table 99:	How did you find your current home in North Yorkshire?
Table 100:	Rent or mortgage level paid per month
Table 101:	Does your accommodation have enough space?
Table 102:	Overall satisfaction with current accommodation
Table 103:	Do you understand your rights/entitlement in relation to housing?
Table 104:	Do you think you will move to a different property in the next three years?
Table 105:	Future accommodation preference
Table 106:	Reasons for living in their specific neighbourhood
Table 107:	Level of satisfaction with local area
Table 108:	Would you like to move to another area?
Table 109:	Do you agree/disagree that your neighbourhood is a place where people from different backgrounds mix well together?
Table 110:	Contact with people from home country
Table 111:	Contact with British people
Table 112:	Experiences of crime
Table 113:	Did you go to anyone for support/assistance?
Table 114:	How safe or unsafe do you feel when outside in your local area during the day?
Table 115:	How safe or unsafe do you feel when outside in your local area after dark?
Table 116:	Do you feel safe in your home at night?
Table 117:	Use of health services
Table 118:	Do you or any of your family living with you have any health problems?
Table 119:	Benefit take-up
Table 120:	Do you understand your rights/entitlement in relation to benefits
Table 121:	Use of selected services
Table 122:	Have you had contact with your local council?
Table 123:	Why have you had no contact with your local council?
Table 124:	Problems with contacting local council
Table 125:	Intended length of stay in North Yorkshire
Table 126:	Future destination
Table 127:	Will you be joined by other family members?

Appendices Tables

Table I:	Craven registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008
Table II:	Hambleton registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008
Table III:	Harrogate registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008
Table IV:	Richmondshire registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008
Table V:	Ryedale registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008
Table VI:	Scarborough registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008
Table VII:	Selby registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008
Table VIII:	York registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008

Introduction

This report documents the findings from a recent study of the housing and related needs of the Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) and Migrant Worker (A8 and A2) communities living in North Yorkshire. The research was commissioned by the North Yorkshire Strategic Housing Partnership (SHP) and was undertaken by the Salford Housing and Urban Studies Unit at the University of Salford. The study was managed by a Project Steering Group comprising representation from some of the parties involved in the SHP. The decision was made during initial discussions with the Project Steering Group to differentiate between the settled BME community and A8 and A2 economic migrants on the basis that their respective experiences, needs and aspirations were distinctive. Hence, different issues were addressed by the two sample groups, although the same methodological approach was adopted for both groups. The structure of this report reflects the fact that two surveys were undertaken simultaneously. Part 1 considers the issues relating to the BME community, while Part 2 looks specifically at the migrant workers.

Part 1 begins with a review of the existing evidence based on the size and needs of the BME community (Chapter 1), which is then followed by a summary of the findings from the consultation exercise with a range of stakeholders about their perceptions of the housing and related needs of their local BME communities. The third Chapter documents the findings from the personal interviews with members of the BME community from across the study area.

Part 2 initially provides a contextual background for the study findings by considering the existing literature on these community groups (Chapter 4). Chapter 5 gives an overview of the official data on migrant workers, while Chapter 6 presents the findings from the stakeholder consultation. Chapter 7 describes the findings from the personal interviews with a selection of migrant workers themselves.

Methodological Approach

The approach adopted for the study had three elements. First, a desk-based review of available information on the settled BME communities and migrant workers including official statistics and other research studies. The second element consisted of consultation with a range of agencies providing services to the BME and migrant worker communities. The intention of the approach here was to distribute short pro formas to a range of organisations to collect information about their perceptions of the needs and experiences of these communities. However, this approach was not very successful and very few pro formas were returned. It was subsequently decided to hold telephone interviews with key staff from these agencies and this proved to be more successful. This stage was also designed to encourage the agencies to take a proactive approach to the study, particularly in terms of publicizing the research to their client groups and partner agencies, identifying potential community interviewers and respondents. To this end, a series of 'study launches' were organised in York, Craven, Harrogate and Selby. These were the only local authorities who expressed the desire to host such an event, although representations from the remaining three local authority areas were invited to these events.

The third phase of the study involved undertaking personal interviews with members of the BME and migrant worker communities. A target sample of 500 achieved interviews was agreed with the Project Steering Group, stratified first by local authority area (on the basis of the relative size of the BME/migrant worker populations) and then by ethnic groups (Asian, Black, Mixed and Other). However, it was recognised that the available evidence on the size of both the BME and migrant worker populations was far from comprehensive and as such, therefore, was used more as a guide.

Given the rural dimension of the study it was felt important to implement an approach to the survey which would enable access to individual households living across the respective local authority areas and not just confined to the main urban areas. For this reason, a community-based research approach was adopted. This involved recruiting members of the local BME and migrant worker community from across the study area to be trained in interview techniques, contact and then interview people from their community. The study recruited a total of 32 Community interviewers, although they were predominantly from four of the seven local authority areas. They were each given a target number of interviews to achieve, however, due to a relatively high drop-out rate, a greater degree of flexibility was adopted in relation to the quota sample for each interviewer.

The interviewers were encouraged, through the use of financial incentives, to interview households in the three areas where no interviewers were recruited. However, this proved problematic. In an attempt to increase the response rate from the local authorities, members of the Project Steering Group contacted local schools in their area to ask them to host events for members of the migrant worker community (whose children attend the school) to complete the questionnaire with assistance from both a translator and staff from the University of Salford. Four such events were organised but only a relatively small number of community members attended.

Various attempts were made to secure the greater participation of members of the BME community from Hambleton and Richmondshire by both the research team and the Project Steering Group, such as direct contact with key local authority officers and representatives from voluntary organisations.

A cautionary note

In reviewing the findings from this survey a number of issues need to be taken into account. Firstly, while there are a number of perceived benefits of using BME community members as Community Interviewers as opposed to a market research agency, it is likely that the former approach involved the interviewers engaging with people that they knew from their community. Hence, it was not necessarily a random sample approach, although we endeavoured to compensate for this by recruiting interviewers from a range of ethnic backgrounds, age groups, both genders and from across the study area. Secondly, the small number of achieved interviews with BME people from some of the local authority areas means that the statistical robustness of the findings from these interviews is very questionable. Rather, the findings should be seen as indicative of the issues facing these groups rather than being representative. Third, the personal interview covered a wide range of issues and as such it was not possible to delve into some of the issues in any detail. Fourthly, while instruction was given to the interviewers about the terminology used, for example, an explanation was given about the various forms of supported housing, it is likely that some of these concepts were unfamiliar to the survey respondents and this could have impacted on their understanding of the question.

Having considered the limitations of the approach and the findings, it should be noted that the findings for the sample as a whole and the majority of the local authorities are reliably robust given the numbers involved in comparison to the relative size of the BME household population within North Yorkshire generally and across the constituent local authorities.

Part 1: The Black & Minority Ethnic (BME) Community

Introduction

This first part of the report focuses on the BME community. Chapter 1 provides a summary of the existing information about this population. Chapter 2 presents the findings from the stakeholder interviews, providing a 'provider perspective' on the housing and related needs of the BME communities in the study area. This is followed by Chapter 3 which details the findings from the personal interviews with members of the BME community.

Chapter 1: BME Population & Projections

Introduction

This first chapter provides a summary of the BME population in North Yorkshire, drawing on official statistics and existing research studies.

Population size

According to the most recent census data in 2001 approximately 570,000 people resided in North Yorkshire, of which 98.9% were White British¹. The largest ethnic minority group at that time were Chinese of which there were about 1,000 (0.2% of the total). In the city of York there was a total population of 181,000, 97.8% of whom were White British and, again, the largest ethnic minority was Chinese with around 650 (0.4%)². These figures can be compared to the UK as a whole where the White British majority accounted for 92.1% of the total population³. North Yorkshire and the city of York were under-representative in their ethnic minority populations.

Data which has been published since the census has attempted to estimate population growth in the time since census statistics were collected. NYCC produced some figures estimating that the population of the county would be 4.5% higher in 2007 than in 2001 and 6.6% higher in York⁴. Unfortunately though there was no analysis of ethnic profile within these figures.

However, population figures including ethnic profile up to 2030, using 2005 as the baseline, have been estimated. The following table shows the frequencies of the White and BME communities, by district, in 2005 and the estimates for 2030, including the percentage of the total for both White people and BME people.

Table 1: Estimated population of White and BME people in 2005 and 2030, in each district of North Yorkshire⁵

District	2005		2030		2005		2030	
	White No.	BME No.	White No.	BME No.	White %	BME %	White %	BME %
York	179843	6757	199782	11548	96.4	3.6	94.5	5.5
Craven	52888	1812	59311	2561	96.7	3.3	95.9	4.1
Hambleton	83900	1200	91757	1467	98.6	1.4	98.4	1.6
Harrogate	151360	4140	169716	5615	97.3	2.7	96.8	3.2
Richmondshire	49182	1518	58943	1978	97.0	3.0	96.8	3.2
Ryedale	51379	721	55749	1202	98.6	1.4	97.9	2.1
Scarborough	105038	1962	113125	2792	98.2	1.8	97.6	2.4
Selby	76170	1429	88265	2770	98.2	1.8	97.0	3.0

¹ ONS (2001) North Yorkshire County, available at <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/census2001/profiles/36.asp>

² ONS (2001) York UA, available at <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/census2001/profiles/00ff.asp>

³ ONS (2001) UK, available at <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/census2001/profiles/uk.asp>

⁴ NYCC (2008) Population Estimates 2007: Ward, available at <http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=1637&p=0>

⁵ University of Leeds School of Geography (2006) Yorkshire and the Humber Population Projections: Age and ethnicity, available at <http://www.yorkshirefutures.com/siteassets/documents/YorkshireFutures/C/4/C49D9D4B-6450-4328-A9EE-45AC736DBD08/GAA09%20Population%20Projections%20Age%20and%20Ethnicity.pdf>

What this table shows is that in all areas there is expected to be an increase in population in both the White and BME communities, and that in all areas there will be a larger proportion of BME people in 2030 than there were in 2005.

Housing needs of the BME population

Recent research into the housing needs and aspirations of the BME community has shown that there are a number of reasons why they will remain over-represented in social housing⁶. This is likely to increase due to continued migration, continued economic disadvantage, unaffordable house prices and the reliance of first-time buyers for parents help, and high levels of interest in affordable housing from all BME groups. However, the demand for affordable housing may be restrained if the levels of educational attainment of British-born BME groups improve and the aspirations become aligned with those of White British people.

However, the disadvantages experienced by the BME community in housing can further be compounded when taken in a rural context. Research has revealed that BME people experience a number of disadvantages when living in rural areas⁷. Service delivery is focused more on a 'numbers-led' approach than a 'needs-led' or 'rights-led' one, therefore the many policies and providers ignore the needs of rural minority ethnic people. They also experience barriers to access and the use of services such as advice and information, language and communication difficulties, a lack of culturally sensitive services and investment in building capacity. Housing providers, according to the research, lack the necessary understanding and skills to meet the requirements of minority ethnic households.

⁶ Housing Corporation and CIH (2008) Housing Needs and Aspirations of Ethnic Minority Communities, Coventry: CIH

⁷ de Lima, P. (2008) Rural minority ethnic experiences: housing and health, London: Race Equality Foundation

Chapter 2: The Housing & Related Support Needs of the BME Community: Stakeholder Feedback

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the findings of the stakeholder interviews undertaken as a part of this research project. It will be divided into two parts, the first will be about the housing and related support needs of the BME community and the second will be about the needs and experiences of the migrant worker community. What became apparent as the interviews were undertaken was that in the more rural districts of North Yorkshire especially, there were very few services that catered specifically for the needs of the BME community and it was suggested by respondents that that reflected the size of the BME community which they believed was very small. Services that did target BME specifically tended to be based in larger urban areas or provision was considered to be county-wide.

Another general finding was that although this study viewed the BME and the A8 and A2 migrant worker communities as somewhat distinct, many of the service providers in the county did not seem to distinguish between the two to the same degree that this study has. Therefore, many conversations particularly when using the term 'BME', also included migrant workers. However, the findings of the migrant worker stakeholder interviews were, unless stated, specifically about A8 and A2 nationals.

The collection of statistics on the ethnic profile of service users

All of the respondents said that they did keep records of the ethnic profile of their service users. Most of these had formal systems for collecting and recording these while one described theirs as being recorded 'in a loose way'.

For many of these agencies it is a requirement to collect these statistics and will use a system based on the DCSF, Home Office or Census classifications, while others such as the CAB had developed a system of their own. These typically included the categories of White, Black, Mixed and Asian with sub-categories in each of these, for example, Asian would be divided into Asian British, Chinese, Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Asian Other. One said that they have also added Gypsies and Travellers and another pointed out that they encouraged clients to self-define their ethnicity. Another suggested that there are limitations now with these classifications as they do not account for the diversity among the Eastern European nationals.

BME as a proportion of the client group receiving services

The proportion of the client group receiving services from the respondents varied depending on the type of services on offer. For some, their services are targeted entirely at the BME community while the others whose services are open to all members of the community find that BME clients are very small in number, ranging from 0.1% to 2.5% though most suggested about 2% would be right. The range of nationalities included in these figures included Eastern European migrant workers, South Asian nationals, Chinese, Caribbean and Gurkhas. One service which specifically targets BME also includes some of the White population among its client group as they deal with harassment and victimisation cases and so White adults from Mixed race families may contact them.

Nearly all respondents said that they did not have a waiting list for their services. One which does have a waiting list does not collect ethnic profile data at that stage. A housing association said they have achieved above their allocation target for BME applicants.

Changes in the number of BME people using services in the last few years

The majority of respondents have noticed an increase, albeit a small one, in the number of BME people using their services over recent years. This has been attributed to an increase in the number and mobility of BME groups that are around, particularly migrant workers. The other main reason is respondents believe their services have been successful in increasing their profile and better engagement with communities and finding out what their needs are.

One suggested that the numbers have:

“... levelled out now as many of those who have come to work have since returned, especially single people, while it is the families who tend to remain.”

Where a respondent suggested that the numbers have decreased this has been attributed to the loss of jobs and fewer newcomers in their area.

Promotion and publicity of services

Services typically advertise their services through a range of methods such as local press and radio, agency newsletters and local authority services booklets, talking to community groups, forums and English classes, leaflets and posters, attending local community and agricultural events, through networking with other agencies and by word of mouth.

The majority of respondents said that they do not specifically target the BME community in their promotions and this is because they do not believe that the community is present in their district in any great number, therefore they use generic publicity which is aimed at the whole community. Those that do target them are those services which are BME specific in their provision.

BME people’s awareness of the services available in the area

Most respondents did not think that BME people are sufficiently aware of the full range of services available in the area, though one suggested that there are too few people to answer this question accurately and another said it was better than it was four years ago. The problem may lie in language and cultural differences, for example, as one respondent found:

“If they are from somewhere where these services are not available then they would not expect to see it here.”

On some occasions they may think that they will have to pay for services which are free. Also, there is a time factor as they tend to work day to day.

Migrants may assume all services are government oriented and this will put them off or they may simply not be aware of voluntary sector activity. North Yorkshire’s rurality

will provide difficulties for many, while some may be aware of the services but are afraid of asserting their rights. Also, publicity is usually in English and often slang, or colloquial English is used. There is some evidence to suggest the information is out there and available through local authorities who have been producing handbooks and welcome packs to inform BME and migrant workers.

Problems for the BME community to access services

Most respondents thought that members of the BME community do have problems accessing their own services. The reasons for this could be because they may not be aware that the service exists, there may be cultural differences, for instance, a CAB respondent said that words like 'Citizen' and 'Bureau' had negative autocratic connotations in the Eastern European countries.

Rurality and lack of transport can be a huge problem for all members of the community as can the limited opening hours of some agencies. One respondent suggested that:

"Members of the BME community are less likely to want to engage with services if they have had a bad experience previously, especially if they believe that experience was because of their race or nationality."

Use of interpretation and translation services

Some of the agencies use volunteers to provide interpretation services if they have clients who are unable to speak English. Quite a few said that they use, or would use, Language Line though some are restricted by funding and encourage statutory bodies to pay for or to provide interpreters where there is a statutory obligation to provide a service. Most of the agencies do use external translation services too and suggested Language Line as the service that they would use.

Agency information in minority languages

Respondents appear to be evenly split when they were asked if their agency provides information about their services in minority languages. Those that said they did not do this said it was because there are so many languages they could put it in and that it would not be cost effective, they have found that they have not been requested or used, and that they are not sure how literate people are in their own language.

Those that do provide information in minority languages use leaflets, and one uses DWP factsheets about benefits. Among the respondents in total, the range of languages provided for are Polish, Urdu, Turkish, Bengali, Cantonese, Russian, Punjabi and some African languages.

The development of organisations to meet the needs of BME people

Most of the respondents identified services or service improvements that they would like to develop in the next 12 months and these varied depending on the nature of the organisation. Some of them thought that improvements to interpretation and translation services would be helpful, as would improved outreach services to reach people who are limited by transport and rurality problems.

It would also be useful to know more about what the demands are and be better able to respond to those. One of the respondents said:

“We are constantly developing their services in the form of smaller projects to meet certain demands.”

Consultation with BME groups about service provision

Most of the respondents said that their agency does have some form of consultancy with their service users. Some do this through more formalised channels such as Citizen’s Forums, and by using customer satisfaction questionnaires and feedback forms, while others said they obtain feedback through ongoing dialogues with their clients in a less structured way. Those that do not have regular consultation said that they would not know where to start as the community is so small.

Problems accessing mainstream services

Respondents were mixed in their opinions as to whether they thought BME people experience problems accessing mainstream services in the area. Many of them thought that they did have problems and said that this could be because of various reasons:

- Not knowing about their entitlements;
- Expense (of ESOL);
- System bureaucracy and knowing where to begin to navigate it;
- Language barriers and little face-to-face help;
- Access to transport;
- Limited opening times of mainstream services;
- Confidence in trusting organisations;
- Fear of reprisal (when making complaints);
- Racial intolerance of the general public;
- Services that are ignorant of their needs; and
- Building their expectations on the (often inaccurate) information that they have been given by others, which is likely to be due to an inability to understand written English.

One commented that the problems they think BME people encounter are not specific to any ethnic minority. Some responded by saying that they do not think that BME people have any problems accessing mainstream services but they did not give an explanation as to why they thought this. Another said that they had done their own research which found that BME people did not have problems accessing mainstream services.

The need for BME specific services

Again, there were mixed opinions as to whether there is a need for services in the area that cater specifically for the needs of BME people. Answers to this seemed to depend on the location of the interviewee and the area which they represent. For example, in the rural areas of the county where it is believed there are very few BME people residing, there was no reason to have a specific service, but mainstream services may need to be adapted to better meet the needs of the BME population.

In urban areas some of the interviewees are already providing targeted services. One of these said that:

'A BME specific service is better positioned to challenge the practices of mainstream organisations - it would be more difficult for people within them to do that.'

The priority support needs affecting BME people

There have been a number of priority support needs that interviewees suggested as affecting BME people generally, though some commented that these are really no different to the rest of the population. The support needs that were mentioned were:

- Employment issues (redundancies, legal rights, getting time off, contractual problems, sickness benefits);
- Debt problems;
- Cultural competence of services and language issues;
- Access to primary health care;
- Developing community cohesion;
- Making services 'complaint-friendly';
- Housing rights;
- Understanding background and heritage (Black people stand out in parts of the county and cannot readily identify with their peers);
- Access to English classes and leisure services;
- Feeling safe and secure; and
- Addressing feelings of isolation.

The housing related needs of the BME community

There are various ways in which respondents described the housing-related needs of the BME community. Some of these were about the availability of and access to appropriate housing such as: the ability to obtain private rented accommodation; difficulty obtaining local authority housing (migrant workers); the lack of affordable housing; and, the size of accommodation is important too as housing associations build houses that are too small and BME families are often larger – they build a lot of two bedroom homes which did not cater for different family structures.

There are some issues which are related to their knowledge and rights too such as:

- Access to housing benefits;
- Fair treatment by estate agents and landlords;
- Knowing housing rights; and
- Knowing homelessness rights.

There were also a number of issues which seemed to characterise the problems of migrant workers such as:

- Tied accommodation;
- Overcrowding;
- Exploitative landlords;
- Hot-bedding (bed-sharing in shifts);
- Poor housing;
- Living in caravans in fields; and
- Lack of knowledge regarding rights, for example, some migrants have believed that if they have a baby they will automatically be given a council house.

Recommendations for the housing and related support needs of the local BME people

Respondents were asked what recommendations they would make in respect of the housing and related support needs of local BME people. The general responses to this were as follows:

- More resources for agencies to look at the need and develop the provision of services;
- More knowledge of the BME community such as demographic information, their accommodation needs, and how to engage with them and get them to sign up to be involved in decision-making;
- Find out what their needs are and have them in a decision-making organisation that is for them;
- They must be able to link into mainstream services until they are sufficiently able to support themselves;
- Look at practice elsewhere - it is very challenging to provide for that complexity;
- Develop independent voluntary and community services for BME people to access;
- More funding for BME specific agencies to extend county-wide;
- Support to set up community groups and gain a better understanding of what is available mainstream;
- Develop an information pack for families with children who are about to start school; and
- Social tolerance and understanding.

Some of the responses were specifically about language:

- Basic information in a variety of different languages about where to get help; and
- North Yorkshire County Council could commission access to Language Line across the county for all voluntary organisations.

Some responses were specific to housing needs:

- There needs to be more houses to rent from councils and housing associations, especially with regard to size of houses provided;
- A mechanism for regulating tied accommodation;
- The system is overwhelming which is a big barrier that can create apathy. This can cause a problem for council as they (migrant workers) will come back for council housing;
- Regarding problems with landlords, migrant workers are not completely aware that the council can support them. Instead of producing written literature council representatives could access existing contract points such as English classes – speaking directly to them will be better than distributing leaflets; and
- Educate landlords and tenants about HMO's.

Additional comments about the housing and related support needs of local BME people

Finally, respondents were asked if they would like to make any additional comments about the housing and related support needs of the BME community:

- For the Ghurkhas and other Commonwealth nationals who have joined the British Army and who reside in North Yorkshire, there is a risk of getting into debt as the Army does not pay for their families to travel over here. They take out loans in order to pay for this which they can have problems paying back;
- With regards to the CAB, they have an immigration specialist advisor who is based in one district and they would like to expand this provision further across the county;
- One respondent said that their Polish clients were having more problems with employment than housing and benefits;
- Travelling to work is difficult for some because of the lack of public transport. In some places there are no buses after 6pm and so people may have to walk 4 or 5 miles to get to home or to work;
- There are few constituted bodies for BME groups, migrant workers are busy working and meeting their basic needs so they do not form themselves into groups;

- Carrying out research into these groups is time-consuming and the numbers are few. Therefore, those that do engage get consultation fatigue. It is speculative but maybe some BME groups and their members are protecting their own personal and organisational needs by not engaging;
- BME people are over represented in prison and in the courts; and
- One respondent said that there were differences in the attitudes of each generation of a migrant community: the first generation will not want to stand out and will try to blend in; the second will feel more assertive as they have the right to be there and will want the culture to change; and, the third should have learned from the previous two generation's experiences.

Chapter 3: Findings from the BME Household Survey

Introduction

This chapter considers the findings from the interviews with those who defined themselves as being from the BME community, that is, not White British and not from the migrant worker community (A8 and A2). A total of 464 interviews were completed. The distribution of the sample across the seven local authorities is shown in Table 2 below. The largest proportions were from York and Scarborough (33.0% in each case), followed by Harrogate (15.7%) and Craven (5.8%). In the case of Hambleton only one interview was achieved (0.2%), while in Richmondshire the figure was 16 (3.4%) and Selby 17 (3.7%). Due to the very low response from Hambleton it is very difficult to include this in any meaningful analysis, although from the point of view of completeness, the information has been presented in the tables. Caution also needs to be exercised in the interpretation of the findings from Richmond and Selby given the relatively small sample size, especially when sub-groups of the respondents from these areas are examined (i.e. information is analysed by ethnicity).

Table 2: Sample distribution by local authority

Local authority	No.	%
York	153	33.0
Harrogate	73	15.7
Craven	27	5.8
Scarborough	153	33.0
Selby	17	3.7
Ryedale	24	5.2
Hambleton	1	0.2
Richmondshire	16	3.4
Total	464	100.0

Ethnicity of respondents

Although respondents were provided with the opportunity to identify their own ethnicity, the resulting information has been grouped according to the classification used in the 2001 Census. The table below (Table 3) shows that the largest group (32.5%) were from the Chinese community, while 12.9% were White Other and 11.9% were from the Other category.

Table 3: Ethnic breakdown

Ethnic group	No.	%
White Other	60	12.9
Pakistani	30	6.5
Bangladeshi	2	0.4
Indian	32	6.9
Asian Other	43	9.3
Black African	43	9.3
Black Caribbean	2	0.4
Black Other	15	3.2
Chinese	151	32.5
Other	55	11.9
Mixed	31	6.7
Total	464	100.0

Table 4: Ethnic origin (2001 Census classification) by local authority

Ethnic group	Local Authority															
	York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Hambleton		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
White Other	23	15.0	21	28.8	4	14.8	6	3.9	-	-	4	16.7	-	-	2	12.5
Pakistani	9	5.9	-	-	20	74.1	1	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bangladeshi	1	0.7	-	-	-	-	1	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Indian	17	11.1	5	6.8	-	-	6	3.9	-	-	3	12.5	1	100.0	-	-
Asian Other	14	9.2	2	2.7	1	3.7	22	14.4	-	-	4	16.7	-	-	-	-
Black African	21	13.7	10	13.7	-	-	12	7.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black Caribbean	1	0.7	1	1.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black Other	8	5.2	-	-	-	-	6	3.9	-	-	1	4.2	-	-	-	-
Chinese	25	16.3	22	30.1	1	3.7	71	46.4	16	94.1	6	25.0	-	-	10	62.5
Other	25	16.3	7	9.6	1	3.7	13	8.5	1	5.9	4	16.7	-	-	4	25.0
Mixed	9	5.9	5	6.8	-	-	15	9.8	-	-	2	8.3	-	-	-	-
Total	153	33.0	73	15.7	27	5.8	153	33.0	17	3.7	24	5.2	1	0.2	16	3.4

The table above shows that:

- The sample group from York tended to be the most ethnically diverse, contrasting particularly with the residents from Selby and Richmondshire;
- The largest ethnic groups from York were the Chinese and Other (16.3% in both cases), followed by the White Other (15.0%) and the Black African groups (13.7%);
- Three out of ten of those from Harrogate were Chinese (30.1%), followed by 28.8% from the White Other group and 13.7% from the Black African community;
- Three-quarters (74.1%) of those interviewed in Craven were Pakistani;
- Nearly half of the respondents from Scarborough were Chinese (46.4%), followed by the Asian Other group (14.4%);
- 94.1% of the Selby respondents were Chinese;
- One quarter of the Ryedale interviewees were Chinese, smaller but similar numbers were White Other, Asian Other and Other; and
- 62.5% of those from Richmondshire were Chinese.

For analysis purposes the ethnicity information has been re-grouped into four distinct categories: Asian, Black, Mixed and Other and the distribution of each within each local authority is highlighted below.

Table 5: Ethnicity (re-grouped) by local authority

Ethnic group	Local Authority															
	York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Hambleton		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Asian	41	26.8	7	9.6	21	77.8	30	19.6	-	-	7	29.2	1	100.0	-	-
Black	30	19.6	11	15.1	-	-	18	11.8	-	-	1	4.2	-	-	-	-
Mixed	9	5.9	5	6.8	-	-	15	9.8	-	-	2	8.3	-	-	-	-
Other	73	47.7	50	68.5	6	22.2	90	58.8	17	100.0	14	58.3	-	-	16	100.0
Total	153	33.0	73	15.7	27	5.8	153	33.0	17	3.7	24	5.2	1	0.2	16	3.4

Section 1: Respondent & Household Characteristics

Introduction

This initial section provides details of those households who participated in the study including the gender and age profile of the respondents, household composition and language skills.

Gender and age profile

Slightly more than half the sample were men (52.3%) and with the exception of those from the Other ethnic group (where the figure was 49.0%). This was also the case among the remaining three ethnic groups, although the proportion ranged from 53.3% (Mixed) and 55.7% (Asian) to 60.0% (Black).

Table 6: Gender of respondent

Gender	All		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male	240	52.3	59	55.7	36	60.0	16	53.3	129	49.0
Female	219	47.7	47	44.3	24	40.0	14	46.7	134	51.0
Total	459	100.0	106	23.1	60	13.1	30	6.5	263	57.3

The largest group overall was the 25-39 year olds (49.9%) and this was also the case among the four ethnic groups, equating to 50.0% of the Asian respondents, 55.0% of the Black group and 51.1% of those from the Other ethnic group: in the case of those from the Mixed ethnic group the figure was 29.0% - Table 7.

Table 7: Age of respondent

Age group	All		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
16-17	2	0.4	-	-	1	1.7	-	-	1	0.4
18-24	70	15.1	11	10.4	10	16.7	8	25.8	41	15.4
25-39	231	49.9	53	50.0	33	55.0	9	29.0	136	51.1
40-49	94	20.3	21	19.8	12	20.0	6	19.4	55	20.7
50-59	39	8.4	7	6.6	2	3.3	4	12.9	26	9.8
60-74	23	5.0	12	11.3	2	3.3	4	12.9	5	1.9
75-84	2	0.4	1	0.9	-	-	-	-	1	0.5
85 & over	2	0.4	1	0.9	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
Total	463	100.0	106	22.9	60	13.0	31	6.7	266	57.5

The table below which looks at the age profile of the respondents from the eight local authorities shows that:

- York – half of the respondents were aged 25-39 (50.0%) and 18.4% were in the age range 40-49;
- Harrogate – 38.4% were aged 25-39 and a slightly smaller number (34.2%) were in the age range 40-49;

- Craven – half the respondents (51.9%) were aged 25-39;
- Scarborough – 48.4% were aged 25-39 and one quarter (25.5%) were younger (18-24);
- Selby – seven out of ten (70.6%) were aged 25-39;
- Ryedale – half (50.0%) were in the age group 25-39; and
- Richmondshire – all but two of the respondents (87.5%) were aged 25-39.

Table 8: Age of respondent by local authority

Age group	Local Authority															
	York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Hambleton		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
16-17	-	-	2	2.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18-24	15	9.9	8	11.0	4	14.8	39	25.5	1	5.9	3	12.5	-	-	-	-
25-39	76	50.0	28	38.4	14	51.9	74	48.4	12	70.6	12	50.0	1	100.0	14	87.5
40-49	28	18.4	25	34.2	6	22.2	24	15.7	4	23.5	7	29.2	-	-	-	-
50-59	16	10.5	7	9.6	1	3.7	12	7.8	-	-	2	8.3	-	-	1	6.2
60-74	15	9.9	3	4.1	2	7.4	3	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
75-84	2	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
85 & over	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6.2
Total	152	32.8	73	15.8	27	5.8	153	33.0	17	3.7	24	5.2	1	0.2	16	3.5

Looking at the age of the respondents from the four ethnic groups, according to local authority area, the findings shows:

- York – the largest proportion of the Asian (37.5%), Black (60.0%) and Other groups (53.4%) were in the age range 25-39, while 33.3% of the mixed group were aged 60-74;
- Harrogate - 85.7% of the Asians and 45.5% of the Black community were aged 25-39, while 60.0% of the Mixed ethnic group were aged over 50 and 40.0% of those in the Other category were aged 40-49;

- Craven – 47.6% of the Asian group were aged 25-39 as were 66.6% of the Black group; and
- Scarborough – 56.7% of the Asians, 50.0% of the Black group and 50.0% of the Other group were aged 25-39, while 46.7% of those in the Mixed ethnic group were aged 18-24.

Household size and composition

Slightly more than one fifth of households contained four people (21.3%) and 18.8% had three. A small number (6.7%) were single person households and 11.3% had seven or more members, including two households with 12 members, 1 with fourteen and one with 16 members.

These larger households tended to be from the Other ethnic group and to a lesser extent, the Asian community. In contrast, nearly four out of ten of those from the Mixed ethnic group had either just one or two members (38.8%).

Table 9: Size of household

Household size	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 person	31	6.7	4	3.7	6	10.0	6	19.4	15	5.6
2 persons	77	16.6	18	16.8	11	18.3	6	19.4	42	15.8
3 persons	87	18.8	18	16.8	18	30.0	5	16.1	46	17.3
4 persons	99	21.3	23	21.5	14	23.3	3	9.7	59	22.2
5 persons	62	13.4	8	7.5	7	11.7	8	25.8	39	14.7
6 persons	55	11.9	19	17.8	4	6.7	-	-	32	12.0
7 persons	15	3.2	5	4.7	-	-	-	-	10	3.8
8 persons	19	4.1	11	10.3	-	-	2	6.5	6	2.3
9 persons	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
10 persons	13	2.8	1	0.9	-	-	-	-	12	4.5
11 persons	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
12 persons	2	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.8
14 persons	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
16 persons	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	1	3.3		
Total	464	100.0	107	23.1	60	12.9	31	6.7	266	57.3

In terms of the size of households according to local authority area (Table 9):

- York – the largest proportion (27.5%) were households with three members and a further 23.5% had four;
- Harrogate – 26.0% had four persons and 23.3% had five;
- Craven – the largest proportion had 6 or more members (44.4%) and one third (33.3%) had four;
- Scarborough – the most common household size was that of six or more members (35.9%);

- Selby – slightly more than half the sample were from households with five members (58.8%);
- Ryedale – 29.2% had four persons and smaller but similar numbers had either two or six or more members (20.8% in each case); and
- Richmondshire – the largest number (37.5%) were households with six or more members.

Table 10: Size of household by local authority

Household size	Local Authority															
	York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Hambleton		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 person	15	9.8	6	8.2	1	3.7	6	3.9	-	-	3	12.5	-	-	-	-
2 persons	30	19.6	9	12.3	2	7.4	27	17.6	1	5.9	5	20.8	1	100.0	2	12.5
3 persons	42	27.5	14	19.2	1	3.7	25	16.3	-	-	3	12.5	-	-	2	12.5
4 persons	36	23.5	19	26.0	9	33.3	23	15.0	3	17.6	7	29.2	-	-	2	12.5
5 persons	11	7.2	17	23.3	2	7.4	17	11.1	10	58.8	1	4.2	-	-	4	25.0
6+ persons	19	12.4	8	11.0	12	44.4	55	35.9	3	17.6	5	20.8	-	-	6	37.5
Total	153	33.0	73	15.7	27	5.8	153	33.0	17	3.7	24	5.2	1	0.2	16	3.4

Nearly four out of ten (38.4%) of households consisted of three or more adults aged 16 or over, followed by 21.2% with two parents and one or more children under 16. Single person households accounted for 8.4% and couples without children 14.7%. Among the Asian group the dominant household type was that of three or more adults (36.4%), followed by two parent families (27.1%). Nearly one quarter of the Black households consisted of three or more adults and 20.0% were two parent families, while single parent households equated to 16.7%. One quarter of the Mixed group (25.8%) were from Other types of families (such as multi-generational families), while 45.7% of the Other group were households comprising only of adults and 19.6% were two parent families.

Table 11: Household composition

Household type	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 adult under 60	24	5.2	1	0.9	4	6.7	5	16.1	14	5.3
1 adult aged 60 or over	15	3.2	5	4.7	1	1.7	2	6.5	7	2.6
2 adults both under 60	50	10.8	14	13.1	7	11.7	5	16.1	24	9.1
2 adults at least one over 60	18	3.9	6	5.6	3	5.0	1	3.2	8	3.0
3+ adults aged 16 or over	178	38.4	39	36.4	14	23.3	4	12.9	121	45.7
1 parent family with 1+ children	26	5.6	3	2.8	10	16.7	1	3.2	12	4.5
2 parent family with 1+ children	98	21.2	29	27.1	12	20.0	5	16.1	52	19.6
Other	54	11.7	10	9.3	9	15.0	8	25.8	27	10.2
Total	463	100.0	107	23.1	60	12.9	31	6.7	265	57.2

Analysis of household type according to local authority area reveals that:

- York – the dominant household type is those consisting of three or more adults over 16 years of age, with one in five being households with two adults and one or more children under 16;
- Harrogate – 34.2% are two parent households with one or more children and 30.1% consist of three or more adults;
- Craven – half the households are those with two parents and one or more children (51.9%);
- Scarborough – 45.4% of households consist of three or more adults;
- Selby – 88.2% are households with three or more adults;
- Ryedale – 33.3% are households with three or more adults; and
- Richmondshire – 37.5% consist of households with three or more members and 25.0% classified themselves as Other types of household.

Table 12: Household composition by local authority

Household type	Local Authority															
	York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Hambleton		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1 adult under 60	8	5.2	5	6.8	1	3.7	7	4.6	-	-	3	12.5	-	-	-	-
1 adult aged 60 or over	11	7.2	1	1.4	-	-	2	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6.2
2 adults both under 60	19	12.4	5	6.8	1	3.7	19	12.5	1	5.9	3	12.5	1	100.0	1	6.2
2 adults at least one over 60	10	6.5	2	2.7	1	3.7	4	2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6.2
3+ adults aged 16 or over	54	35.3	22	30.1	4	14.8	69	45.4	15	88.2	8	33.3	-	-	6	37.5
1 parent family with 1+ children	10	6.5	9	12.3	1	3.7	3	2.0	-	-	2	8.3	-	-	1	6.2
2 parent family with 1+ children	29	19.0	25	34.2	14	51.9	20	13.2	1	5.9	7	29.2	-	-	2	12.5
Other	12	7.8	4	5.5	5	18.5	28	18.4	-	-	1	4.2	-	-	4	25.0
Total	153	33.0	73	15.8	27	5.8	152	32.8	17	3.7	24	5.2	1	0.2	16	3.5

As Table 12 shows, the majority of households (63.0%) did not include children aged 16 or younger, with the remainder generally having either one (17.0%) or two children (15.3%). In a minority of cases there were three or more children present (4.8%).

Households within the Other ethnic group were the least likely to include children (66.5%), followed by the Asian group (61.7%), contrasting with 60.0% of the Mixed ethnic group and around half of the Black community (50.8%). With the exception of one Black household, those with three or more children were exclusively from the Asian community.

Table 13: Number of household members aged 16 or younger

Number	Ethnic group									
	All		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
None	289	63.0	66	61.7	30	50.8	18	60.0	175	66.5
One	78	17.0	14	13.1	11	18.6	8	26.7	45	17.1
Two	70	15.3	18	16.8	15	25.4	2	6.7	35	13.3
Three	13	2.8	2	1.9	2	3.4	2	6.7	7	2.7
Four	4	0.9	3	2.8	1	1.7	-	-	-	-
Five+	5	1.1	4	3.7	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
Total	459	100.0	107	23.3	59	12.9	30	6.5	263	57.3

The proportion of households from each local authority area without children was as follows: York (68.4%); Harrogate (50.0%); Craven (25.9%); Scarborough (68.7%); Selby (94.1%); Ryedale (58.3%); and Richmondshire (50.0%). Those with four or more children were particularly likely to live in the Craven area (25.9% of those from this area had children), compared with 0.7% of those from Scarborough and York respectively and none of those from the remaining areas.

Nearly nine out of ten households did not contain a member aged 60 or over (89.6%) and while 6.8% and 2.9% had one and two older members respectively, a tiny minority contained three (0.7%). The proportion of households from each of the four ethnic groups without older members ranged from 94.3% (Other) and 89.7% (Black) to 83.3% (Mixed) and 80.0% (Asian) – see Table 14.

Table 14: Number of household members aged 60 or older

Number	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	%	Black No.	%	Mixed No.	%	Other No.	%
None	407	89.6	84	80.0	52	89.7	25	83.3	246	94.3
One	31	6.8	13	12.4	3	5.2	3	10.0	12	4.6
Two	13	2.9	6	5.7	3	5.2	2	6.7	2	0.8
Three	3	0.7	2	1.9	-	-			1	0.4
Total	454	100.0	105	23.1	58	12.8	30	6.6	261	57.5

Those with older household members were more likely to be from York (20.4% of households from this area contained someone aged 60 or over), followed by Craven (12.0%), Harrogate (9.7%), Richmondshire (7.1%), Ryedale (4.2%) and contrasting with 2.7% from Scarborough and none of those from Selby.

Language skills

Nine out of ten of the Asian respondents (90.6%) reported being able to read or write in English, as could 88.3% of the Black group, 96.7% of those from a Mixed ethnic origin and 84.9% of those from the Other ethnic group.

In one quarter of households there was at least one person who was unable to read or write in English, equating to 33.1% of those from the Other ethnic group, 23.4% of the Asian community and much smaller numbers from the Black and Mixed ethnic groups (3.3% and 3.2% respectively).

Table 15: Adults within the household unable to read or write English

Read or write	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	%	Black No.	%	Mixed No.	%	Other No.	%
Yes	116	25.0	25	23.4	2	3.3	1	3.2	88	33.1
No	348	75.0	82	76.6	58	96.7	30	96.8	178	66.9
Total	464	100.0	107	23.1	60	12.9	31	6.7	266	57.3

The proportion of households from each local authority area who contained at least one person who was unable to read or write in English ranged from 94.1% (Selby), 68.8% (Richmondshire), 29.2% (Ryedale), 24.7% (Harrogate), to 23.5% (Scarborough), 22.2% (Craven) and 13.7% (York).

In terms of the proportion of respondents from each ethnic group who could speak English, this equated to 93.5% of the Mixed group, 71.9% of the Asians, 68.3% of the Black community and just over half (53.3%) of those in the Other ethnic group.

The proportion of households from each local authority area who contained at least one person who was unable to speak English is shown in Table 16.

Table 16: Adults within the household unable to speak English

Speak	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	%	Black No.	%	Mixed No.	%	Other No.	%
Yes	113	24.4	22	20.6	2	3.3	1	3.2	88	33.1
No	351	75.6	85	79.4	58	96.7	30	96.8	178	66.9
Total	464	100.0	107	23.1	60	12.9	31	6.7	266	57.3

Overall, just 9.0% reported that members of their household who were unable to speak or read and write in English had access to translation services and this was slightly more likely to be the case among the Asian and Other community groups (10.4% and 9.6%) compared with the Black and Mixed Ethnic groups (5.3% in each case). Hence, 68.6% suggested that no such translation services were available to them with the figure rising to 71.9% in the case of the Black community. Slightly more than one fifth (22.3%) were not sure whether or not such services existed in their locality –Table 17.

Table 17: Access to interpretation services

Access	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	%	Black No.	%	Mixed No.	%	Other No.	%
Yes	38	9.0	10	10.4	3	5.3	1	5.3	24	9.6
No	289	68.6	65	67.7	41	71.9	12	63.2	171	68.7
Don't know	94	22.3	21	21.9	13	22.8	6	31.6	54	21.7
Total	421	100.0	96	22.8	57	13.5	19	4.5	249	59.1

In terms of access to translation services according to which local authority they lived in, the proportion who reported not having access to such a service ranged from 33.3% (Richmondshire), 57.9% (Scarborough), 63.6% (Ryedale) and 66.7% (Selby) to 75.0% (Craven), 77.3% (York) and 83.6% (Harrogate).

The main reasons given for not having access to such a service were:

- An understanding that interpretation services were not available in their area:

'I have no idea where it is.'

'Services not available in this area.'

'No one offered and don't think it is available.'

- A lack of appreciation of where to go for such a service:

'Some services try harder than others to communicate. Some services do not offer interpretation easily.'

'I have no idea where it is.'

'Where is it?'

- Others suggested that interpretation was provided informally by family members or friends:

'Those in the household who can speak English help those who cannot.'

'We don't know where it is so we ask our friends to help.'

'My husband can read and write in English.'

- In a small minority of cases, there was an awareness that some translation service does exist but that it is limited:

'There is one Nepalese Ghurkha interpreter but one is not enough and sometimes you can't get to see her. There needs to be an increase in the number of interpreters in the area.'

- Another commented that translation services were available via their employer:

'My employer can speak Thai.'

- One respondent commented on the difficulties of meeting people from other ethnic groups due to language problems:

'We seldom communicate with other groups due to language barriers.'

Finally, respondents were asked to consider which language they would want information provided by local services to be written in. The vast majority (71.5%) referred to English, with smaller numbers mentioning Chinese/Cantonese (16.3%), Turkish (1.2%), French (0.6%), Korean (0.6%), French (0.6%), Portuguese (0.6%), Farsi (0.4%), Iranian (0.4%), Polish (0.4%), Arabic (0.4%), with a large number of languages mentioned by just one respondent, such as Thai, Gujarati, Russian and Urdu.

Section 2: Home & Community

Introduction

This second section provides a description of the type and tenure of the property occupied by the respondents, length of occupancy, their views on the size of their accommodation and views on their local area.

Type and tenure of property occupied

The largest proportion of respondents (26.1%) lived in a semi-detached property, followed by slightly smaller numbers who referred to a flat or apartment (25.7%) and a terraced house (23.8%). Those living in a detached home equated to around one in five (19.2%).

Among the Asian group the most common property type was that of a terraced house (34.6%), followed by a semi-detached house (23.4%). The Black group were particularly likely to live in a flat or apartment (38.3%), followed by a semi-detached house. This was also the general finding in relation to the Mixed ethnic group: 32.3% occupied a flat or apartment and 29.0% a semi-detached house. Among the Other ethnic group, the main types of properties occupied were a semi-detached house (26.8%), a flat or apartment (24.9%) and then a terraced house (22.6%).

Table 18: Type of property

Property type	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Detached house	89	19.2	23	21.5	7	11.7	5	16.1	54	20.4
Semi-detached house	121	26.1	25	23.4	16	26.7	9	29.0	71	26.8
Terraced house	110	23.8	37	34.6	10	16.7	3	9.7	60	22.6
Bungalow	12	2.6	-	-	3	5.0	1	3.2	8	3.0
Flat/apartment	119	25.7	20	18.7	23	38.3	10	32.3	66	24.9
Sheltered housing	6	1.3	2	1.9	-	-	1	3.2	3	1.1
Other	6	1.3	-	-	1	1.7	2	6.5	3	1.1
Total	463	100.0	107	23.1	60	13.0	31	6.7	265	57.2

The findings also show that the BME community were more likely to live in different property types according to local authority area:

- York – 30.7% lived in a semi-detached and 23.5% lived in a terraced property;
- Harrogate - 42.5% lived in a semi-detached and 19.2% a terraced house;
- Craven – all the respondents lived in a terraced property (100.0%);
- Scarborough – 41.2% lived in an apartment or flat and 26.1% lived in a detached house;
- Selby – the most common type of property was a semi-detached house (58.8%), followed by a terraced property (41.2%);

- Ryedale – slightly more than one third (34.8%) occupied a flat or apartment and 30.4% lived in a detached house; and
- Richmondshire – 43.8% lived in a flat or apartment and 31.2% mentioned a semi-detached house.

In terms of the tenure profile for each local authority area, it can be seen that:

- York – 38.6% were renting privately, 34.0% were home owners; 7.8% were living in tied accommodation, 5.2% were RSL renters and 3.3% were living in council properties. One out of ten (9.2%) occupied other, non-specified tenures;
- Harrogate – 37.0% were home owners, 27.4% lived in tied accommodation, 23.3% rented from a private landlord, 4.1% were RSL tenants and 2.7% rented from the Council;
- Craven – three-quarters (66.6%) were home owners and 18.5% rented privately. None lived in the social housing sector;
- Scarborough – 41.8% were private renters 26.1%, were owner-occupiers, 25.5% lived in tied accommodation and similar numbers (1.3% in each case) rented from an RSL or the Council;
- Selby – the vast majority (82.4%) lived in tied accommodation, with 11.8% being home owners and the remainder (5.9%) renting privately;
- Ryedale – four out of ten (39.1%) were in tied accommodation, 26.1% were home owners and 21.7% rented privately. There was twice as many RSL as opposed to Council tenants (8.7% and 4.3% respectively); and
- Richmondshire – 62.5% were living in tied accommodation and 31.3% were home owners: 6.2% rented privately.

Among the sample as a whole, the largest proportion of respondents rented privately (33.0%), followed by a slightly smaller number (32.4%) who were home owners, the majority of whom had a mortgage on their property (20.1% of the sample as a whole). A significant number (22.7%) also lived in tied accommodation. Those renting in the social housing sector equated to 5.4%, a slightly larger proportion of whom were housing association as opposed to council tenants.

Some important differences can be seen in tenure according to ethnicity. Nearly half the Asian group (49.5%) were home owners with a further 24.3% being private renters. In contrast, half of the Black community rented in the private sector (50.0%) and just one in five owned their own home (20.0%). Similarly, 32.3% of the Mixed group were privately renting and 35.5% were home owners. Slightly less than one third of the Other ethnic group rented privately, while the proportion of this group living in tied accommodation was particularly high (28.3%)

Table 19: Tenure of property

Tenure	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Outright home owner	57	12.3	18	16.8	6	10.0	8	25.8	25	9.4
Home owner (with mortgage)	93	20.1	35	32.7	6	10.0	3	9.7	49	18.5
Shared ownership	6	1.3	1	0.9	1	1.7	1	3.2	3	1.1
Council rented	10	2.2	3	2.8	2	3.3	1	3.2	4	1.5
HA rented	15	3.2	2	1.9	3	5.0	3	9.7	7	2.6
Private rented	153	33.0	26	24.3	30	50.0	10	32.3	87	32.8
Tied accommodation	105	22.7	19	17.8	7	11.7	4	12.9	75	28.3
Other	24	5.2	3	2.8	5	8.3	1	3.2	15	5.7
Total	463	100.0	107	23.1	60	13.0	31	6.7	265	57.2

Details from the 2001 census, which is still the most comprehensive source of information on ethnicity found important tenure differences between various ethnic groups. It noted that while the level of home ownership among the White British was 70%, among the Indians it was 76%, followed by the Pakistanis (67%), while around one quarter of Black African households (26%) and less than two-fifths of Other Black and Bangladeshi households (36% and 37% respectively) were home owners in 2001. More recently, a review of the evidence base undertaken for the then Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (now CLG) by Harrison and Philips (2003) confirmed this tenure differentiation.

Considering the main tenures of the properties occupied by the respondents from the different local authority areas:

- York – 38.6% were in the private rented sector, 34.0% were home owners and 3.5% lived in the social housing sector;
- Harrogate – 37.0% were home owners, 27.4% lived in tied accommodation, 23.3% rented privately and 5.4% rented social housing;
- Craven – 66.6% were home owners, 18.5% rented privately and no-one rented from either a housing association or the council;
- Scarborough – 41.8% rented privately, 25.5% lived in tied accommodation and 25.1%, home owners and 2.6% were in the social housing sector;
- Selby – 82.4% lived in tied accommodation and 11.8% were owner occupiers. No-one lived in social housing;
- Ryedale – 39.1% occupied tied accommodation, home owners accounted for 26.1% and 13.0% rented from a housing association/council;
- Richmondshire – 31.3% were home owners, 62.5% rented privately and none of the respondents lived in social housing.

Length of time at current property

While one third of residents (33.9%) had been living at their current property for between 1 and 3 years, a significant proportion (27.4%) had moved to their home within the last 12 months. This compares with 14.2% who referred to a time frame of 10 or more years.

Table 20: Length of time at current address

Length of time	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than 6 months	49	10.6	6	5.6	14	23.3	1	3.2	28	10.6
6-12 months	78	16.8	11	10.3	13	21.7	3	9.7	51	19.2
1 year but less than 3	157	33.9	31	29.0	12	20.0	11	35.5	103	38.9
3 years but less than 5	59	12.7	11	10.3	9	15.0	4	12.9	35	13.2
5 years but less than 10	53	11.4	16	15.0	6	10.0	5	16.1	26	9.8
10 years but less than 20	40	8.6	20	18.7	5	8.3	2	6.5	13	4.9
20 years but less than 30	15	3.2	9	8.4	-	-	2	6.5	4	1.5
30+ years	11	2.4	3	2.8	1	1.7	3	9.7	4	1.5
Can't remember	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.4
Total	463	100.0	107	23.1	60	13.0	31	6.7	265	57.2

Those who can be referred to as 'long-term' residents (i.e. had been at their current home for 10 or more years) were more likely to be from the Asian community (29.9%), contrasting directly with 22.7% of the Mixed ethnic group, 10.0% of the Black group and 7.9% of the Other ethnic group. The largest proportion of the Mixed and Other ethnic group mentioned a period of between 1 and 3 years (35.5% and 38.9% respectively), while 45.0% of the Black group cited a period of less than 12 months.

Looking at length of residency according to where respondents lived:

- York – 41.9% had been at the same address for less than 12 months and 19.6% for 10 or more years;
- Harrogate – 12.3% referred to less than 12 months and 9.6% for 10 or more years;
- Craven – while 18.5% had moved to their home within the last 12 months, 51.8% had been at the same property for 10 or more years;
- Scarborough – 26.1% mentioned less than 12 months and 8.5% 10 or more years;
- Selby – 17.7% had been at the same property for 12 months or less and there were no long-term residents (10+ years);
- Ryedale – 13.0% cited a period of 12 months or less and 8.7% indicated a time frame of 10 or more years; and
- Richmondshire – 12.5% had moved to their present address within the last year and no-one had been living at the same property for 10 or more years.

Size of property

As an indicator of the size of property, the respondents were asked to indicate how many bedrooms they had at their disposal. The table below (Table 20) shows that the largest proportion of respondents lived in a three bedroom property (26.9%), while 21.8% had four and 20.7% had two. In contrast, a small number (6.9%) had just one bedroom and 23.7% had five or more bedrooms. The larger properties with five or more bedrooms were more likely to be occupied by those from the Asian group (27.1%), followed closely by those from the Other ethnic group (26.7%) and then the Mixed group (25.8%), which contrasts with 3.4% of the Black community. The one-bedroom accommodation was also more likely to be a feature of the Mixed ethnic group (19.4%) contrasting with just 2.8% of the Asian community.

Table 21: Number of bedrooms

Number of bedrooms	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	Asian %	Black No.	Black %	Mixed No.	Mixed %	Other No.	Other %
One	32	6.9	3	2.8	7	11.7	6	19.4	16	6.0
Two	96	20.7	19	17.8	22	36.7	5	16.1	50	18.8
Three	125	26.9	24	22.4	18	30.0	10	32.3	73	27.4
Four	101	21.8	32	29.9	11	18.3	2	6.5	56	21.1
Five	48	10.3	10	9.3	1	1.7	5	16.1	32	12.0
Six or more	62	13.4	19	17.8	1	1.7	3	9.7	39	14.7
Total	464	100.0	107	23.1	60	12.9	31	6.7	266	57.3

There appears to be a correlation between size of property and tenure, such that:

- 46.9% of the one bedroom properties are in the private rented sector, 18.8% are housing association properties and just 6.2% have been purchased by the respondents;
- 45.8% of the two bedroom properties are in the private rented sector and 27.1% are owned privately;
- Half of the three bedroom properties (51.6%) are in the owner-occupied sector and 25.0% are rented privately;
- Four out of ten (42.7%) of the properties with four bedrooms are in the owner-occupied sector, 26.7% are privately rented and 22.8% represent tied accommodation; and
- The largest proportion of 5+ bedroom properties are tied properties, 32.7% are privately rented and 13.6% are privately owned.

Looking at dominant property sizes occupied by the BME community within each local authority area:

- York – 9.2% lived in properties with one bedroom, the largest proportion (26.8%) had three and 13.7% had five or more;
- Harrogate – 6.89% had one bedroom, 30.1% had three and 11.7% had five or more;

- Craven – none of those from this area had one bedroom, 59.3% had four bedrooms and 3.7% had five or more;
- Scarborough – 7.2% had one bedroom, 28.1% had three and 39.2% had five or more;
- Selby – there were no one bedroom properties, 41.2% had four and 29.4% had five or more;
- Ryedale – no-one occupied a one bedroom property, 33.3% had three and 20.8% had six or more bedrooms; and
- Richmond – there were no one bedroom properties, 18.8% had two and 62.5% had five or more including 37.5% who had six or more.

Views on size of property

The majority view (69.3%) was that they had sufficient room in their home and this was the view of the Asian (71.0%), Black (71.7%) and Mixed (74.2%) ethnic groups, but less so among the Other ethnic group (67.4%). However, having said that, those from the Black community were the most likely to explicitly state that they did not have sufficient room (26.7%), contrasting with 22.4% of the Asian group.

The proportion who felt that they had insufficient space in their home for their families needs according to where they lived was: York (20.9%); Harrogate (24.7%); Craven (40.7%); Scarborough (21.6%); Selby (43.8%); Ryedale (30.4%) and Richmondshire (25.0%).

Table 22: Views on amount of space in home

Enough space	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	320	69.3	76	71.0	43	71.7	23	74.2	178	67.4
No	112	24.2	24	22.4	16	26.7	7	22.6	65	24.6
Don't know	30	6.5	7	6.5	1	1.7	1	3.2	21	8.0
Total	462	100.0	107	23.2	60	13.0	31	6.7	264	57.1

Perception of overcrowding

In addition to asking about the amount of space in their home, respondents were asked to comment upon whether or not they felt that they were living in overcrowded conditions. The table below (Table 22) suggests that slightly more than one fifth of the sample did feel that they were (22.9%) and this was particularly the views expressed by 29.7% of those from the Other ethnic group and contrasting with just 6.5% of the Mixed group.

Harrison and Phillips (2003) found that nationally, 2% of the White British population were overcrowded compared with 7% of Indian households, 23% of the Bangladeshi and Pakistani households and 9% of the Black households).

Table 23: Living in overcrowded conditions

Overcrowded	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	106	22.9	16	15.1	9	15.0	2	6.5	79	29.7
No	333	71.9	85	80.2	49	81.7	26	83.9	173	65.0
Don't know	24	5.2	5	4.7	2	3.3	3	9.7	14	5.3
Total	463	100.0	106	22.9	60	13.0	31	6.7	266	57.5

The proportion who felt that they were living in overcrowded conditions was greatest among those with dependent children (66.7% felt that they were overcrowded compared with 60.0% where there were no children aged 16 or younger in the household).

Looking at perception of overcrowding according to tenure, the findings reveal that nearly half of those living in tied accommodation (45.7%) feel that they are overcrowded, as do 21.7% of home owners, 21.1% of those renting privately and 16.0% of those in social housing.

The perceived extent of overcrowding according to local authority was:

- York (9.9%);
- Harrogate (23.3%);
- Craven (22.2%);
- Scarborough (24.85%);
- Selby (76.5%);
- Ryedale (33.3%); and
- Richmondshire (56.2%).

By considering the main tenures where respondents felt to be living in overcrowded conditions according to local authority, the results show:

- York – 16.7% of those in tied accommodation suggesting they are overcrowded, as do 12.5% of those in housing association properties and 12.1% of those renting privately;
- Harrogate – 35.0% of those in tied accommodation are overcrowded, 26.2% of home owners and 23.5% of those in the private rented sector;
- Craven – 42.6% of owner-occupiers and 20.0% of private renters; and
- Scarborough – one third of those in tied accommodation (33.3%), 29.2% of home owners and 25.0% of those in the private rented sector.

Cultural needs

The vast majority of respondents felt that their home meets their cultural or religious needs while 8.9% felt that this was not the case. This latter group were more likely to be from the Black and Mixed ethnic groups (16.9% and 16.1% respectively) than from the Other or Asian groups (7.6% and 5.7% respectively).

Table 24: Home meets religious or cultural needs

Meets needs	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	418	91.1	99	94.3	49	83.1	26	83.9	244	92.4
No	41	8.9	6	5.7	10	16.9	5	16.1	20	7.6
Total	459	100.0	105	22.9	59	12.9	31	6.8	264	57.5

Of those who felt that their property does not meet such needs, 39.0% were renting privately and 14.4% were home owners. Further analysis of the data shows that while only a very small minority from the majority of the local authority areas suggested that their home did not meet their cultural/religious needs, the figure among the York sample was 15.2% and among those from Scarborough 8.6%.

The reasons given for why they felt that their home did not meet their cultural needs included:

- Concerns about the layout of their home, especially toilet facilities:

'According to the Islamic perspective the toilet should be separate from the place where you bath/shower.'

'The bathroom is not suitable according to our traditions.'

'The kitchen is not detached from the dining room.'

- General criticisms about the size of their accommodation:

'In my culture, most live in detached properties with larger rooms.'

'The living room is too small for everyone to meet.'

'There needs to be private space for the family and specifically for women.'

- The difficulty of holding religious meetings at home due to the absence of such facilities locally:

'Not enough room for the family to pray and have friends around.'

'There are no religious facilities near by and my home is too small to accommodate groups of people.'

Also, a small number currently living in shared accommodation (such as barracks and student halls), comment upon the difficulties of sharing their home with people from different nationalities and with different beliefs:

'They are all from a different country and have a different religion to me.'

'People living here are different nationalities.'

Level of satisfaction with home

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with the home as a place to live. Among the sample as a whole 29.3% reported being very satisfied and collectively, 72.4% were positive. In contrast, 6.0% were critical. The proportion from each ethnic group who were complimentary ranged from 83.9% (Mixed) and 78.4% (Black) to 76.6% (Asian) and 68.1% (Other).

In a review of available research evidence, Harrison and Phillips (2003) found that 11% of the White British were dissatisfied with their home compared with 33% of the Indians, 42% of the Bangladeshi and Pakistanis and 19% of the Black community.

There was a greater likelihood of those living in tied accommodation to be dissatisfied (12.4%), followed by private renters (5.9%) and home owners (4.3%) compared to none of those renting in the social housing sector.

Level of satisfaction with their accommodation was not found to be related to local authority area.

Table 25: Overall level of satisfaction with home as a place to live

Level of satisfaction	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	%	Black No.	%	Mixed No.	%	Other No.	%
Very satisfied	136	29.3	43	40.2	22	36.7	15	48.4	56	21.1
Satisfied	200	43.1	39	36.4	25	41.7	11	35.5	125	47.0
Neither/nor	100	21.6	18	16.8	10	16.7	4	12.9	68	25.6
Dissatisfied	21	4.5	5	4.7	1	1.7	-	-	15	5.6
Very dissatisfied	7	1.5	2	1.9	2	3.3	1	3.2	2	0.8
Total	464	100.0	107	23.1	60	12.9	31	6.7	266	57.3

Level of satisfaction with area

The proportion who were very satisfied with the area where they lived equated to slightly more than one third (36.4%) and collectively 78.9% were positive, contrasting with 3.0% who were dissatisfied and 0.6% who were very dissatisfied. The proportion from each ethnic group who were satisfied with their place of residence ranged from 83.3% (Black) and 82.3% (Asian) to 77.5% (Other) and 70.9% (Mixed).

Table 26: Overall level of satisfaction with local area as a place to live

Level of satisfaction	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	%	Black No.	%	Mixed No.	%	Other No.	%
Very satisfied	169	36.4	40	37.4	27	45.0	13	41.9	89	33.5
Satisfied	197	42.5	48	44.9	23	38.3	9	29.0	117	44.0
Neither/nor	81	17.5	15	14.0	6	10.0	6	19.4	54	20.3
Dissatisfied	14	3.0	4	3.7	3	5.0	2	6.5	5	1.9
Very dissatisfied	3	0.6	-	-	1	1.7	1	3.2	1	0.4
Total	464	100.0	107	23.1	60	12.9	31	6.7	266	57.3

In terms of local authority area, the respective proportions who were positive and negative were:

- York – 80.4% and 7.2%;
- Harrogate – 82.2% and 2.7%;
- Craven – 88.9% and 3.7%;
- Scarborough – 76.5% and 2.0%;
- Selby – 47.1% and none;
- Ryedale – 75.0% and none; and
- Richmondshire – 93.7% and none.

Sense of belonging

Slightly less than half the sample as a whole felt a very or fairly strong sense of belonging to their immediate neighbourhood compared to 29.5% who had no very strong sense of belonging and 14.0% who had no sense of belonging at all. The general lack of a sense of belonging was greatest among the Other ethnic group (48.5%), then the Black community (45.0%), the Mixed group (42.0%) and contrasting with 30.8% of the Asian sample.

The proportion who had no particular sense of belonging to their local neighbourhood (i.e. 'not at all strongly'), according to local authority were:

- York (17.0%);
- Harrogate: (12.3%);
- Craven (none);
- Scarborough (11.1%);
- Selby (35.3%);
- Ryedale (8.3%); and
- Richmondshire (31.2%).

Table 27: View on sense of belonging to immediate neighbourhood

Strength of belonging	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very strongly	77	16.6	28	26.2	13	21.7	6	19.4	30	11.3
Fairly strongly	144	31.0	41	38.3	16	26.7	10	32.3	77	28.9
Not very strongly	137	29.5	27	25.2	14	23.3	11	35.5	85	32.0
Not at all strongly	65	14.0	6	5.6	13	21.7	2	6.5	44	16.5
Don't know	41	8.8	5	4.7	4	6.7	2	6.5	30	11.3
Total	464	100.0	107	23.1	60	12.9	31	6.7	266	57.3

The presence of children aged 16 or under in the households did not materially impact on respondents sense of belonging.

Likelihood of moving home

Half the sample (50.6%) suggested that they were likely to move to a different property in the future and a further 22.8% were unsure. Hence, just one in five felt that they were not likely to move. The likelihood of moving to a different property was

greatest among the Black group (65.0%), followed by those from the Mixed ethnic group (54.8%), the Other group (50.8%) and latterly the Asian community (41.1%).

This compares with nationally compiled data which suggests that while 35% of the White British want to move home, the figures for the BME groups are: Indian 45%; Pakistani and Bangladeshi (52%); and Black 52%) (Harrison and Phillips, 2003).

Table 28: Likely to move to a different property in the future

View	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	Asian %	Black No.	Black %	Mixed No.	Mixed %	Other No.	Other %
Yes	235	50.6	44	41.1	39	65.0	17	54.8	135	50.8
No	94	20.3	35	32.7	9	15.0	7	22.6	43	16.2
Don't know	106	22.8	18	16.8	9	15.0	5	16.1	74	27.8
Happy here	29	6.2	10	9.3	3	5.0	2	6.5	14	5.3
Total	464	100.0	107	23.1	60	12.9	31	6.7	266	57.3

Further analysis of the potential mover group according to their current tenure suggests that: 67.3% of the private renters are likely to move; 60.0% of those in social housing; 48.6% of those in tied accommodation and 34.0% of home owners.

The proportion from each local authority area who contended that they were likely to move home was as follows:

- York (49.7%);
- Harrogate (57.5%);
- Craven (33.3%);
- Scarborough (58.2%);
- Selby (23.5%);
- Ryedale (33.3%); and
- Richmondshire (37.5%).

In terms of the preferred housing options of these potential movers, overall the main preference was for homeownership (50.6%), followed by renting from a private landlord (28.6%), renting from a housing association (6.3%) and renting from the council (4.2%). A small group would also want a shared ownership property (3.6%).

Nearly two-thirds of the Asian group (64.6%) would want to buy their own home and 27.7% mentioned renting privately with just 1.5% indicating a preference for renting in the private sector. Similarly, the largest proportion of the potential movers among the Black community would want owner-occupation (43.2%), with one in five (20.5%) citing the private rented sector: 18.2% mentioned social housing. This trend is also evident among the Mixed group with home ownership being the dominant preference (52.4%), followed by renting privately (23.8%) and social housing (19.1%). Although the dominant preference among the Other ethnic group was also for home ownership (47.5%), a large proportion (31.2%) referred to the private rented sector and one in ten (10.9%) would want a social housing tenancy.

Looking at the main tenure preferences of the potential movers according to local authority the results show:

- York – 48.9% want home ownership, 23.9% prefer to rent privately and 14.7% wanted social housing;
- Harrogate – over half (53.8%) mentioned owner-occupation, one quarter (25.0%) the private rented sector and 13.5% social housing;
- Craven – 64.3% would prefer home ownership, 28.6% the private rented sector and none of the group mentioned social housing;
- Scarborough – half (50.0%) cited home ownership, 34.6% the private rented sector and around one in twenty (5.8%) would want to rent in the social housing sector;
- Selby – 54.5% home ownership, 18.2% the private rented sector and 18.2% social housing;
- Ryedale – 56.2% owner-occupation, 18.87% rent privately and 12.5% social housing (exclusively housing association properties); and
- Richmondshire – 28.6% stated a preference for home ownership, 35.7% want to rent privately and 21.4% to rent social housing.

Household members in receipt of support

A minority of respondents reported that someone in their household received support from either other family members or an outside agency to help them with undertaking day-to-day tasks. The figure among the Mixed group was 12.9% compared with 9.3% of the Asian households, 5.0% of the Black community and 4.5% of those in the Other ethnic group.

The proportion of households in receipt of such support from each local authority area was:

- York (9.2%);
- Harrogate (4.2%);
- Craven (7.4%);
- Scarborough (4.6%);
- Selby (none);
- Ryedale (4.2%); and
- Richmondshire (12.5%).

Table 29: Household member in receipt of support from family members or someone outside family

Receive support	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	29	6.3	10	9.3	3	5.0	4	12.9	12	4.5
No	433	93.7	97	90.7	57	95.0	27	87.1	252	95.5
Total	462	100.0	107	23.2	60	13.0	31	6.7	264	57.1

In the vast majority of cases (92.3%) the support provided was deemed to meet the needs of the individual concerned as the table below confirms.

Table 30: View on whether support received meets the needs of the individual

Meets needs	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	Asian %	Black No.	Black %	Mixed No.	Mixed %	Other No.	Other %
Yes	24	92.3	8	88.9	2	100.0	5	100.0	9	90.0
No	2	7.7	1	11.1	-	-	-	-	1	10.0
Total	26	100.0	9	34.6	2	7.7	5	19.2	10	38.5

In the largest proportion of cases the support was provided by a family member (9 out of 29) and a further two respondents referred to friends providing the support and two more cited neighbours. Eight mentioned an outside agency: the job centre (1); a cleaning agency (1); social services (1); the council (1); and a private healthcare agency (1).

The type of support received included: help with cleaning the home (7 mentioned this); assistance with childcare (5) including help with a disabled child (2); financial assistance (2); and help with gardening, lifting heavy items and transport (3).

In response to the question 'How can the support provided be improved?' three of the group suggested that no improvements were necessary, while three referred to affordability and two to having someone who could speak their own language providing the support:

'Someone who can respond to my needs in my own language as my English is limited.'

In addition, one respondent said:

'By employing more qualified people for more hours.'

All respondents were asked if anyone in their household needed help or support with a range of daily tasks. There was found to be a particular need for help with laundry/ironing (14.1%) and cleaning (14.0%), followed by cooking (7.5%) and shopping (7.0%) and to a lesser extent, personal hygiene (6.4%) and using household appliances (6.2%).

Among the Asian and Black households the main support required was with cleaning (19.8% and 6.9% respectively), while the Mixed ethnic group tended to need either help with cleaning or the laundry/ironing (17.2% in each case). Among the Other ethnic group the need tended to be for help with the laundry/ironing and cleaning (14.4% and 12.9% respectively).

Table 31: Support required

Type of support	Ethnic group									
	All		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Cleaning	64	14.0	21	19.8	4	6.9	5	17.2	34	12.9
Cooking	34	7.5	12	11.7	2	3.4	4	13.3	16	6.1
Shopping	32	7.0	12	11.5	4	6.8	4	13.8	12	4.6
Laundry/ironing	64	14.1	18	17.5	3	5.2	5	17.2	38	14.4
Using appliances	28	6.2	7	6.9	3	5.2	5	16.7	13	5.0
Personal hygiene	29	6.4	6	5.9	4	6.8	3	10.3	16	6.1

In most cases, the level of help/support needed tended to be ‘a little.’ For example in relation to cleaning, 61.3% felt that they need a little help as opposed to a lot of help (24.0%) or not being able to manage without help (4.0%). However, one in five who felt that they needed help with shopping (19.5%) felt that they could not do without the help.

Table 32: Degree of support required

Type of support	A little help		A lot of help		Can't do without help		Don't know	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Cleaning	46	61.3	18	24.0	3	4.0	8	10.7
Cooking	21	47.7	12	27.3	5	11.4	6	13.6
Shopping	17	41.5	10	24.4	8	19.5	6	14.6
Laundry/ironing	36	48.6	21	28.4	6	8.1	11	14.9
Using appliances	24	57.1	3	7.1	5	11.9	10	23.8
Personal hygiene	21	50.0	8	19.0	5	11.9	8	19.0

A further 4.6% (21 respondents) felt that either they themselves or other members of their household needed other types of support or help to manage their home. The main types of help referred to were: financial assistance (3 mentioned this), help with gardening (2) and help with English language skills – seen as important for understanding bills etc.(2).

Table 33: Other types of support required

Other support	Ethnic group									
	All		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	21	4.6	9	8.6	5	8.3	3	9.7	4	1.5
No	377	82.9	84	80.0	51	86.0	27	87.1	215	83.0
Don't know	57	12.5	12	11.4	4	6.7	1	3.2	40	15.4
Total	455	100.0	105	23.1	60	13.2	31	6.8	259	56.9

A range of other forms of support were listed and respondents asked whether they themselves or other family members could benefit from such support. Help with managing household bills (Table 33) was referred to by 7.7% of the sample as a whole, increasing to 15.0% among the Black group and more than one in ten of the Mixed and Asian groups (12.9% and 12.6% respectively).

Table 34: Help required with day-to-day tasks – managing household bills

Support needed	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	%	Black No.	%	Mixed No.	%	Other No.	%
Yes	35	7.7	13	12.6	9	15.0	4	12.9	9	3.4
No	394	86.2	87	84.5	50	83.3	25	80.6	232	88.2
Don't know	28	6.1	3	2.9	1	1.7	2	6.5	22	8.4
Total	457	100.0	103	22.5	60	13.1	31	6.8	263	57.5

A slightly smaller group mentioned wanting help to deal with debt (7.2%) and the need for this type of support was greatest among those from the Black and Mixed ethnic groups (13.3% in each case) – Table 35.

Table 35: Help required with day-to-day tasks –dealing with debt

Support needed	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	%	Black No.	%	Mixed No.	%	Other No.	%
Yes	33	7.2	5	4.9	8	13.3	4	13.3	16	6.1
No	392	85.9	92	90.2	50	83.3	24	80.0	226	85.6
Don't know	31	6.8	5	4.9	2	3.3	2	6.7	22	8.3
Total	456	100.0	102	22.4	60	13.2	30	6.6	264	57.9

Slightly more than one in ten (11.2%) felt that they could benefit from help in claiming benefits and again, the level of need for this type of service was greatest among the Black and Mixed ethnic groups (15.3% and 13.3% respectively) – Table 36.

Table 36: Help required with day-to-day tasks – claiming benefits

Support needed	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	%	Black No.	%	Mixed No.	%	Other No.	%
Yes	51	11.2	8	7.8	9	15.3	4	13.3	30	11.4
No	374	82.0	91	88.3	49	83.1	24	80.0	210	79.5
Don't know	31	6.8	4	3.9	1	1.7	2	6.7	24	9.1
Total	456	100.0	103	22.6	59	12.9	30	6.6	264	57.9

Dealing with correspondence was seen as a particular issue among the sample with 13.5% suggesting that they could benefit from support with this – increasing to 17.7% among the Other ethnic group and contrasting with just 5.8% of the Asian group (Table 37).

Table 37: Help required with day-to-day tasks – dealing with correspondence

Support needed	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	%	Black No.	%	Mixed No.	%	Other No.	%
Yes	62	13.5	6	5.8	6	10.0	3	10.0	47	17.7
No	381	83.0	96	92.3	52	86.7	27	90.0	206	77.7
Don't know	16	3.5	2	1.9	2	3.3	-	-	12	4.5
Total	459	100.0	104	22.7	60	13.1	30	6.5	265	57.7

As Table 38 shows, the largest identified need for support was in terms of accessing services (18.4%) and this was a particular need among the Other ethnic group (22.1%), followed by the Asian households (15.4%) and contrasting with 6.7% of those from the Mixed ethnic group.

Table 38: Help required with day-to-day tasks – Accessing services

Support needed	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	%	Black No.	%	Mixed No.	%	Other No.	%
Yes	84	18.4	16	15.4	8	13.3	2	6.7	58	22.1
No	353	77.2	84	80.8	48	80.0	27	90.0	194	73.8
Don't know	20	4.4	4	3.8	4	6.7	1	3.3	11	4.2
Total	457	100.0	104	22.8	60	13.1	30	6.6	263	57.5

Only a small minority (2.4%) felt that they needed help to maintain their accommodation and avoid eviction –Table 39.

Table 39: Help required with day-to-day tasks – maintaining accommodation and avoiding eviction

Support needed	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	%	Black No.	%	Mixed No.	%	Other No.	%
Yes	11	2.4	2	1.9	3	5.1	1	3.3	5	1.9
No	392	85.8	97	93.3	51	86.4	28	93.3	216	81.8
Don't know	54	11.8	5	4.8	5	8.5	1	3.3	43	16.3
Total	457	100.0	104	22.8	59	12.9	30	6.6	264	57.8

Slightly less than one in twenty (4.4%) referred to needing support or help to maintain or develop their independence, although among the Black group this figure increases to 11.7%.

Table 40: Help required with day-to-day tasks – maintaining or development of independence

Support needed	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian No.	%	Black No.	%	Mixed No.	%	Other No.	%
Yes	20	4.4	5	4.9	7	11.7	1	3.4	7	2.6
No	391	85.7	91	89.2	50	83.3	26	89.7	224	84.5
Don't know	45	9.9	6	5.9	3	5.0	2	6.9	34	12.8
Total	456	100.0	102	22.4	60	13.2	29	6.4	265	58.1

Section 3: Social Isolation & Safety Issues

Introduction

The extent to which social and cultural isolation exists among the respondents is considered in this third section as well as respondents' views on personal safety and home security.

Availability of friends, family and neighbours

One third of respondents (34.3%) do not have friends or family members who live close to them and who could look out for them and this was a noticeable feature among the Black group (53.3%), while much less of an issue among the Asian community (25.2%).

The lack of friends and family in close proximity, according to local authority area was as follows: York (35.9%); Harrogate (24.7%); Craven (11.1%); Scarborough (39.2%); Selby (47.1%); Ryedale (33.3%); and Richmondshire (43.8%).

Table 41: Availability of close friends/family who can look out for them

Availability	Ethnic group									
	All		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	305	65.7	80	74.8	28	46.7	19	61.3	178	66.9
No	159	34.3	27	25.2	32	53.3	12	38.7	88	33.1
Total	464	100.0	107	23.1	60	12.9	31	6.7	266	57.3

The largest proportion mentioned that they met up with friends on a weekly basis (47.5%) and for 26.6% it was usually every day. In contrast, 15.6% suggested that they saw their friends every month and 6.9% said that it was less than once per month. A further 3.5% reported that they never met up with friends. The lack of friends (identified by meeting up less than once per month or never) was a particular issue among the Black community (20.0%), which compares with 8.4% among the Asian group.

Table 42: Frequency of meeting up with friends

Frequency	Ethnic group									
	All		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Every day	123	26.6	28	26.2	11	18.3	14	45.2	70	26.4
Every week	220	47.5	49	45.8	31	51.7	11	35.5	129	48.7
Every month	72	15.6	21	19.6	6	10.0	4	12.9	41	15.5
Less than once a month	32	6.9	9	8.4	7	11.7	1	3.2	15	5.7
Never/NA	16	3.5	-	-	5	8.3	1	3.2	10	3.8
Total	463	100.0	107	23.1	60	13.0	31	6.7	265	57.2

Slightly more than six out of ten (63.0%) reported that they either only met up with family members not living with them less than once a month or never, contrasting with one in ten (10.5%) who met up every day and 15.3% and 11.2% who referred to meeting up either weekly or monthly respectively.

Those most likely to meet up with other family members (either on a daily or weekly basis) were from the Asian community (collectively accounting for 45.2%), which contrasts with a figure of 16.6% among the Black group. Those who were most likely to have the least contact with family members were from the Other ethnic group (71.9%), contrasting with 40.3% among the Asian sample.

Table 43: Frequency of meeting up with family members not living with them

Frequency	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Every day	48	10.5	26	25.0	2	3.3	2	6.7	18	6.8
Every week	70	15.3	21	20.2	8	13.3	6	20.0	35	13.3
Every month	51	11.2	15	14.4	9	15.0	6	20.0	21	8.0
Less than once a month	156	34.1	25	24.0	17	28.3	12	40.0	102	38.8
Never/NA	132	28.9	17	16.3	24	40.0	4	13.3	87	33.1
Total	457	100.0	104	22.8	60	13.1	30	6.6	263	57.5

One in five (20.5%) met up with their neighbours on a daily basis and 35.6% referred to meeting them weekly. This compares with one in ten (9.6%) who had contact less than once per month and one fifth (21.8%) who never met up with their neighbours. The Asian and Mixed ethnic groups were more likely to meet up with their neighbours on a regular basis than those from the Black or Other ethnic groups, while over half of those from the Black group either met up very infrequently or not at all (56.7%).

Table 44: Frequency of meeting up with neighbours

Frequency	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Every day	94	20.5	27	25.7	9	15.0	11	35.5	47	17.9
Every week	163	35.6	37	35.2	14	23.3	8	25.8	104	39.7
Every month	57	12.4	12	11.4	3	5.0	4	12.9	38	14.5
Less than once a month	44	9.6	12	11.4	7	11.7	3	9.7	22	8.4
Never/NA	100	21.8	17	16.2	27	45.0	5	16.1	51	19.5
Total	458	100.0	105	22.9	60	13.1	31	6.8	262	57.2

Comparing language skills with the degree to which they met up with friends and neighbours, the findings suggest that those who were unable speak English had more infrequent contact and this was particularly the case in terms of meeting up with neighbours.

It is also interesting to note that households with children and especially single parent households were more likely than households without children to meet up with family less frequently or never. For example, 26.9% of single parent households met up with friends either less than once per month or never, compared with on average 9.0% of those without children. A similar finding was also evident in relation to meeting up with other family members (73.1% meet up less than once a month or never) and to a lesser extent in respect of meeting up with neighbours (50.0%).

Support to avoid social and cultural isolation

With regard to whether respondents felt that they needed help or support with enabling them to meet up with other members of their ethnic group, one third of the sample felt that they did (33.3%) and this was particularly the case among the Other ethnic group (39.5%), followed by 28.3% (Black), 24.5% (Asian) and 19.4% (Mixed).

In terms of help to attend a local place of worship, 23.9% felt that this type of support was needed, ranging from 27.4% (Asian) and 27.2% (Other) to 11.7% (Black) and 6.7% (Mixed).

Slightly less than three out of ten (28.4%) suggested that they would benefit from help to attend community-based activities, including 33.5% of the Other ethnic group, 24.0% of the Asian sample, 19.4% of the Mixed group and 18.3% of the Black community.

One third (33.6%) referred to needing help to access local services and this was a high demand for this type of support among those from the Other ethnic group (39.8%), followed by 28.8% (Asian), 21.7% (Black) and 19.4% (Mixed).

Similarly, 33.8% reported needing support to understand the British culture – 40.2% (Other), 28.2% (Asian), 26.7% (Mixed) and 18.3% (Black).

Table 45: View on help or support required

Activity	Ethnic group									
	All		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Meet regularly with people from own ethnic group	154	33.3	26	24.5	17	28.3	6	19.4	105	39.5
Attend local place of worship	110	23.9	29	27.4	7	11.7	2	6.7	72	27.2
Attend community-based activities	131	28.4	25	24.0	11	18.3	6	19.4	89	33.5
Access local services	155	33.6	30	28.8	13	21.7	6	19.4	106	39.8
Understand 'British' culture	155	33.8	29	28.2	11	18.3	8	26.7	107	40.2

Within each local authority area, the proportion who required help or support to meet up with other people from their own ethnic group were:

- York (25.5%);
- Harrogate (42.5%);
- Craven (none);
- Scarborough (30.1%);
- Selby (94.1%);
- Ryedale (37.5%); and
- Richmondshire (75.0%).

Similarly, the proportion who required help to attend the local place of worship were:

- York (19.2%);
- Harrogate (20.5%);
- Craven (11.1%);
- Scarborough (23.7%);
- Selby (52.9%);
- Ryedale (41.7%); and
- Richmondshire (43.8%).

The extent of help or support to attend community-based activities or groups was:

- York (26.5%);
- Harrogate (34.2%);
- Craven (11.3%);
- Scarborough (24.2%);
- Selby (52.9%);
- Ryedale (29.2%); and
- Richmondshire (56.2%).

Across each authority the demand for support to access local services was:

- York (23.7%);
- Harrogate (32.9%);
- Craven (24.0%);
- Scarborough (34.6%);
- Selby (88.2%);
- Ryedale (37.5%); and
- Richmondshire (68.8%).

The level of demand for support to understand the British culture was:

- York (24.5%);
- Harrogate (35.6%);
- Craven (8.0%);
- Scarborough (42.8%);
- Selby (76.5%);
- Ryedale (25.0%); and
- Richmondshire (31.2%).

Experience of crime and anti-social behaviour

Slightly more than one in ten (13.2%) of households had experienced crime against the property (e.g. burglary), ranging from 30.0% (Mixed) and 17.0% (Asian) to 10.2% (Other) and 11.7% (Black). A relatively small number overall (5.4%) had experienced crime against the person (such as a mugging) and this ranged from 16.7% (Mixed) and 8.3% (Black) to 4.5% (Other) and 2.9% (Asian). A larger proportion (15.4%) had direct experience of hate crime, including 25.8% of those from the Mixed ethnic group, 21.9% of the Asian community, 18.3% of the Black group and around one in ten (10.9%) of those from the Other ethnic group. Slightly less than one quarter of all

households in the sample (23.0%) has experienced anti-social behaviour, ranging from 28.6% (Asian) and 25.8% (Mixed) to 21.1% (Other) and 20.0% (Black).

Table 46: Experience of crime and anti-social behaviour

Crime or ASB	All		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Crime against property	61	13.2	18	17.0	7	11.7	9	30.0	27	10.2
Crime against person	25	5.4	3	2.9	5	8.3	5	16.7	12	4.5
Hate crime	71	15.4	23	21.9	11	18.3	8	25.8	29	10.9
Anti-social behaviour	106	23.0	30	28.6	12	20.0	8	25.8	56	21.1

The proportion from each local authority area who had experienced crime against the property was: York (20.7%); Harrogate (11.0%); Craven (7.4%); Scarborough (13.1%); Selby (none); Ryedale (none); and Richmondshire (none);

The numbers who had experienced crime against the person were: York (8.0%); Harrogate (4.1%); Craven (3.7%); Scarborough (5.2%); Selby (none); Ryedale (4.2%); and Richmondshire (none).

The extent to which residents and their families had experienced hate crime was: York (21.3%); Harrogate (11.0%); Craven (33.3%); Scarborough (13.7%); Selby (5.9%); Ryedale (none); and Richmondshire (none).

Finally, the proportion who had experienced anti-social behaviour was: York (28.0%); Harrogate (21.9%); Craven (22.2%); Scarborough (25.5%); Selby (none); Ryedale (8.3%); and Richmondshire (none).

Among the sample as a whole 14.1% were fearful of being a victim of a crime against their property, including 35.5% of the Mixed ethnic group, 15.1% of the Asian community, 15.0% of the Black group and 11.0% of the Other ethnic group.

A smaller number were concerned about being the victim of a crime against their person (8.9%), ranging from 20.0% (Mixed) and 18.3% (Black) to 7.6% (Asian) and 6.1% (Other).

There was a greater degree of concern about being the victim of a hate crime (15.6%), especially among those from the Mixed ethnic group (22.6%), followed by members of the Black community (20.0%), then the Asian group (18.9%) and latterly, those from the Other ethnic group (12.5%).

Finally, slightly more than one fifth of those respondents consulted were fearful of being a victim of anti-social behaviour, ranging from 29.0% (Mixed) and 26.2% (Asian) to 21.7% (Black) and 17.8% (Other).

Information nationally has found that individuals and households from Black and Asian groups have consistently shown higher levels of concern about crime than individuals from other ethnic groups. According to the British Crime Survey, Black and Asian adults in England and Wales in 2000 were roughly twice as likely to be worried about suffering some form of personal attack, than White adults. Asian adults were also three times as likely to be worried about being insulted or pestered than White adults. Perceptions of risk show variations across the various ethnic groups,

with Asians more than three times as likely to say they were very or fairly likely to be a victim of mugging than Whites (Social Trends, 32)

Table 47: Currently fear being a victim of crime or anti-social behaviour

Crime or ASB	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Crime against property	65	14.1	16	15.1	9	15.0	11	35.5	29	11.0
Crime against person	41	8.9	8	7.6	11	18.3	6	20.0	16	6.1
Hate crime	72	15.6	20	18.9	12	20.0	7	22.6	33	12.5
Anti-social behaviour	97	21.0	28	26.2	13	21.7	9	29.0	47	17.8

The proportion of households from each local authority area fearful of being a victim of a crime against their property was: York (19.5%); Harrogate (9.6%); Craven (11.5%); Scarborough (14.4%); Selby (none); Ryedale (12.5%); and Richmondshire (none).

Those fearful of being a victim of a crime against the person were: York (15.4%); Harrogate (2.7%); Craven (3.8%); Scarborough (8.5%); Selby (none); Ryedale (8.3%); and Richmondshire (none).

The number who were fearful of being the victim of a hate crime was: York (20.5%); Harrogate (11.0%); Craven (30.8%); Scarborough (13.1%); Selby (5.9%); Ryedale (8.3%); and Richmondshire (6.2%).

Finally, the proportion of respondents from each area fearful of being a victim of anti-social behaviour was: York (25.7%); Harrogate (21.9%); Craven (23.1%); Scarborough (18.3%); Selby (5.9%); Ryedale (20.8%); and Richmondshire (6.2%).

Perceived safety in the local area

Respondents were asked to consider how safe they felt going outside in their local area after dark. The vast majority felt either very or quite safe (76.5%), compared with 18.3% who felt not so safe or not safe at all. A small group (2.6%) stated that they never went out alone after dark.

The proportion from each ethnic group who felt safe (very or quite safe) range from 79.3% (Other) and 73.8% (Asian) to 73.3% (Black) and 67.7% (Mixed).

Table 48: Perceived personal safety outside in local area after dark

Degree of safety	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very safe	98	21.1	20	18.7	18	30.0	8	25.8	52	19.5
Quite safe	257	55.4	59	55.1	26	43.3	13	41.9	159	59.8
Not so safe	73	15.7	21	19.6	7	11.7	5	16.1	40	15.0
Not safe at all	12	2.6	2	1.9	3	5.0	3	9.7	4	1.5
Never go out alone	12	2.6	4	3.7	1	1.7	2	6.5	5	1.9
Don't know	12	2.6	1	0.9	5	8.3	-	-	6	2.3
Total	464	100.0	107	23.1	60	12.9	31	6.7	266	57.3

The vast majority (94.2%) also reported feeling very or quite safe going outside in their local area during the day with 4.3% feeling unsafe. The proportion from each ethnic group who felt unsafe ranged from 6.5% (Mixed) and 5.6% (Asian) to 3.8% (Other) and 3.4% (Black).

Table 49: Perceived personal safety outside in local area during the day

Degree of safety	Ethnic group									
	All		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very safe	220	47.4	39	36.4	33	55.0	19	61.3	129	48.5
Quite safe	217	46.8	62	57.9	23	38.3	10	32.3	122	45.9
Not so safe	16	3.4	5	4.7	1	1.7	2	6.5	8	3.0
Not safe at all	4	0.9	1	0.9	1	1.7	-	-	2	0.8
Never go out alone	2	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.8
Don't know	5	1.1	-	-	2	3.3	-	-	3	1.1
Total	464	100.0	107	23.1	60	12.9	31	6.7	266	57.3

Home security

With regard to the type of home security measures respondents had, the most commonly referred to were: a smoke alarm (90.1% overall; Asian 86.5%; Black 89.8%; Mixed 93.5%; and Other 91.2%); window locks (88.0% overall; Asian 90.7%; Black 89.8%; Mixed 80.6%; and Other 87.3%); and to a lesser extent, a burglar alarm (38.9% overall; Asian 31.8%; Black 35.6%; Mixed 41.4%; and Other 42.4%).

Table 50: Current home security features

Security feature	Ethnic group									
	All		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Burglar alarm	176	38.9	34	31.8	21	35.6	12	41.4	109	42.4
Window locks	402	88.0	97	90.7	53	89.8	25	80.6	227	87.3
Burglar bars on windows	77	17.2	18	17.0	6	10.3	6	20.7	47	18.4
Dog for security	18	4.0	2	1.9	3	5.1	2	6.7	11	4.3
Chain on door	137	30.2	30	28.3	19	32.2	10	33.3	78	30.1
Spy hole in door	134	29.7	32	30.8	13	21.7	9	30.0	80	31.1
Smoke alarm	410	90.1	90	86.5	53	89.8	29	93.5	238	91.2

Those without each of the security measures listed were asked to consider whether or not they felt that they needed them. The results show that:

- 82.0% indicated a need for a smoke alarm (Asian 75.4%; Black 83.9%; Mixed 70.6%; and Other 84.9%);
- 76.7% wanted window locks (Asian 83.3%; Black 81.2%; Mixed 68.4%; and Other 74.7%);
- 60.7% wanted a burglar alarm (Asian 54.4%; Black 56.8%; Mixed 55.6%; and Other 64.5%).

Smaller numbers felt that they needed the other security measures listed.

Table 51: Home security features needed

Security feature	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Burglar alarm	236	60.7	49	54.4	25	56.8	15	55.6	147	64.5
Window locks	234	76.7	50	83.3	26	81.2	13	68.4	145	74.7
Burglar bars on windows	137	33.3	26	26.5	11	23.9	7	25.9	93	38.6
Dog for security	36	8.7	4	4.1	4	8.2	4	14.3	24	9.9
Chain on door	138	37.3	34	37.8	17	41.5	5	22.7	82	37.8
Spy hole in door	187	47.6	42	46.7	24	50.0	11	42.3	110	48.0
Smoke alarm	241	82.0	46	75.4	26	83.9	12	70.6	157	84.9

Respondents were also encouraged to identify ways in which their household could be supported to make them feel safer in their community. Around one third of respondents (32.3% or 150 individuals) made a comment and these can be grouped in the following way:

Slightly more than one third (36.6% or 55 out of 150) referred to the need for a greater police presence in the area, or more community policing patrols or a speedier police response to problems, typified by the following comments:

'More police patrols in the area.'

'Neighbourhood watch and local bobby walking around.'

'Police checking the area more often.'

'Police are not very effective and not very helpful. They could make more effort. They're only good for reporting cars incorrectly parked in the street.'

'Faster police response.'

A second issue (9.3%) was that of stopping the level of anti-social behaviour in the area which was generally related to young people hanging around and drinking in public:

'By keeping an eye on anti-social behaviour in the area.'

'The Council should stop the drinking in the streets, in the town centre and the high street.'

'Local residents and the council should stop teen anti-social behaviour.'

'More restrictions on young people in the community, such as cutting down on drinking as this leads to bad behaviour.'

'Parents and authorities need to have more control over the youths within the community.'

'More social education for youngsters.'

The third issue (mentioned by 8.0%) was the need for more or better street lighting:

'More light in the street.'

'Ensuring that there is more street lighting.'

The fourth issue, referred to by 3.3%, was the need for the installation of CCTV:

'CCTV cameras on the streets, especially at night would help us.'

Fifthly, there was a call for agencies to promote better relationships between residents and neighbours in an area (3.0% cited this):

'More investment in the local people in the community.'

'Promoting good relations with local residents.'

'Need closer relationships with neighbours.'

'We need to make more friends in our local community.'

In addition to the above suggestions, a small minority referred to other ideas, such as *'legalising weapons for personal use,' 'further education about 'difference' within the local community'* and *'giving more information about local services, issues and events.'*

A large group (28.6%) felt that no action was required and that they felt safe where they lived and two respondents were not sure what action should be pursued.

Section 4: Health & Social Care

Introduction

This fourth section examines the range and extent of health problems experienced by the respondents and members of their household as well as the type of support in place or required. The need for property adaptations and a range of support accommodation is also considered.

Incidence of health problems

Respondents were asked to document whether they or other members of their household experienced a number of pre-listed health problems. As the table below shows, the most common problems experienced were: arthritis (8.1%); high blood pressure (7.8%); diabetes (6.5%); and mental or emotional distress (5.7%). The table also reveals that a minority of households contained more than one member with the same health problem. For example, 5.0% of households included two or three individuals with mobility problems and similarly, 2.4% included two people with arthritis.

It is inappropriate to analyse these results according to ethnicity or local authority area given the small numbers involved.

Table 52: Experience of disability and ill-health

Health problem or disability	Number of people in household							
	None		1 person		2 people		3+ people	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Visual impairment	446	96.7	10	2.2	4	0.9	1	0.2
Deaf/hard of hearing	445	96.7	13	2.8	1	0.2	1	0.2
Mobility problems	436	95.0	21	4.6	2	4.6	2	0.4
Learning difficulty	446	96.9	9	2.0	2	0.4	2	0.4
Mental or emotional distress	434	94.3	23	5.0	3	0.7	3	0.7
Frailty (elderly)	446	97.1	12	2.6	1	0.2		
Confusion/senile dementia (elderly)	454	98.9	4	0.9	1	0.2		
Living with HIV/AIDS	457	99.8	1	0.2				
Drug/alcohol problems	448	97.8	7	1.5			3	0.7
Arthritis	423	91.9	26	5.7	11	2.4		
Diabetes	431	93.5	26	5.6	4	0.9		
Heart disease	441	96.1	15	3.3	3	0.7		
High blood pressure	424	92.2	31	6.7	5	1.1		
Sickle Cell Disease	454	98.9	5	1.1				
Stroke	454	98.9	5	1.1				
Other	436	95.8	10	2.2	8	1.8	1	0.2

Two-thirds of those experiencing health problems (67.0%) were in receipt of treatment and a further 8.3% were unsure. The type of treatment received related primarily to GP/hospital care, reflecting the nature of the health problems, while other forms of treatment mentioned included attendance by a child at a specialist school, community psychiatric nurse in relation to emotional distress and home nursing care.

At the same time, 22.9% felt that they or the person with the health problem required help or support to access relevant services. The type of help required included: interpretation of information: 'as she has mobility problems and cannot speak English it will be a help if things are explained to her'; the home delivery of medicines; social support for people with addictive behaviours, 'someone to talk to about the benefits of getting treatment for an alcohol problem' and 'social service support for drinking'; help with coping skills; assistance with transportation to attend GP appointments; and more general help around accessing services, especially hospital A&E departments quicker.

Caring responsibilities

A small group of respondents or other members of their household were full-time carers (3.9%) and interestingly 5.4% were unsure if they would classify their or the other persons role in this way. In the case of three out of ten of the carers (30.0% or 9 out of 25) there was felt to be a need for more external support to assist them performing this role.

The most commonly referred to type of support was financial assistance:

'Financial support as she has had to give up work.'

Followed by the establishment of a culturally sensitive support service:

'The council should set up a service to support carers within the BME community.'

And access to appropriate accommodation:

'Get the right sort of accommodation.'

One person mentioned the need for external support at specific times:

'Sometimes need extra support and help from community support staff and the hospital.'

A second simply referred to *'everything.'*

Property adaptations

The most common type of property adaptations that respondents already have were: a downstairs toilet (43.8%); handrails on the stairs (43.4%); and a walk-in shower or disabled bath. It is also worth noting that 8.1% of properties had a fixed or portable hoist and 3.1% had a stair lift.

The greatest level of identified need was for the installation of a downstairs toilet (10.7%), followed by a bathroom grab rail (8.0%) and access ramps inside the home (6.3%). A slightly smaller group also referred to access ramps outside the home (6.1%).

Table 53: Type of property adaptation have or need

Type of adaption	Already have		Don't have but need		Don't have & don't need	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Walk-in shower/disabled bath	127	27.7	27	5.9	304	66.4
Access ramps outside home	57	12.4	28	6.1	375	81.5
Access ramps inside home	9	2.0	29	6.3	420	91.7
Tap adaptations	84	18.3	27	5.9	346	75.5
Handrail on stairs	199	43.4	16	3.5	244	53.2
Stair lift	14	3.1	24	5.2	421	91.7
Bathroom grab rail	49	10.7	37	8.0	374	81.3
Fixed hoist	22	4.8	21	4.6	415	90.6
Portable hoist	15	3.3	23	5.0	419	91.7
Commode	24	5.3	20	4.4	412	90.4
Downstairs toilet	201	43.8	49	10.7	209	45.5

The perceived need for each of the property adaptations listed according to local authority area is considered below. Where a particular authority is not listed then there is no identified need for that particular type of adaptation:

- Walk-in shower/disabled bath – York (7.3%); Harrogate (2.7%); Craven (14.8%); Scarborough (3.9%); and Richmondshire (28.6%);
- Access ramps outside home – York (6.0%); Harrogate (1.4%); Craven (7.4%); Scarborough (9.8%); and Richmondshire (7.1%);
- Access ramps inside home – York (4.7%); Harrogate (2.7%); Craven (3.8%); Scarborough (8.5%); and Richmondshire (42.9%);
- Tap adaptations – York (6.7%); Harrogate (5.5%); Craven (3.7%); Scarborough (6.6%); Ryedale (4.2%); and Richmondshire (7.1%);
- Handrail on stairs – York (2.0%); Craven (3.7%); and Scarborough (7.8%);
- Stair lift – York (6.0%); Harrogate (5.5%); Craven (7.4%); Scarborough (5.3%); and Ryedale (4.2%);
- Bathroom grab rail – York (5.3%); Harrogate (11.0%); Craven (7.4%); Scarborough (8.5%); Ryedale (4.2%); and Richmondshire (35.7%);
- Fixed hoist – York (2.0%); Harrogate (5.6%); Craven (7.4%); Scarborough (6.5%); Ryedale (4.2%); and Richmondshire (7.1%);
- Portable hoist – York (4.0%); Harrogate (5.6%); Craven (3.7%); Scarborough (6.6%); Ryedale (4.2%); and Richmondshire (7.1%);
- Commode – York (2.7%); Harrogate (4.1%); Craven (3.7%); Scarborough (6.6%); Ryedale (4.2%); and Richmondshire (7.1%); and
- Downstairs toilet – York (10.6%); Harrogate (8.2%); Craven (33.3%); Scarborough (7.9%); Selby (5.9%); and Richmondshire (35.7%).

Those who felt that they needed to have their property adapted for someone with a health problem were asked if they needed support to identify or carry out adaptations to their home. In just one case (0.9%) they were already receiving such support and made reference to the Council providing this. The vast majority (85.2%) did not feel that they needed support, while 13.0% suggested that they did. This was found to be particularly the case among those from the Mixed ethnic group (37.5%), followed by the Asian group (17.2%) and contrasting with 8.5% and 8.3% of the Other and Black community groups respectively.

The proportion from each local authority area who needed support was as follows: York (14.9%); Harrogate (11.1%); Craven (16.7%); Scarborough (6.7%); Ryedale (33.3%); and Richmondshire (16.7%).

Among those who felt that they required adaptations to their home the largest group (28.1%) indicated that they were unsure where to go for advice, while 23.7% referred to their local council and smaller numbers mentioned social services (9.6%) and other agencies (9.6%).

Those from the Black and Mixed ethnic groups were the most likely to suggest that they did not know where to go (43.5% and 44.4% respectively), compared with 23.3% of the Asian community and 21.2% of the Other ethnic groups

Table 54: Where to go for advice on property adaptations

Where go for advice	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Council	27	23.7	9	30.0	4	17.4	1	11.1	13	25.0
Housing Association	8	7.0	2	6.7	1	4.3	-	-	5	9.6
Social Services	11	9.6	3	10.0	-	-	2	22.2	6	11.5
GP/Health Centre	8	7.0	5	16.7	1	4.3			2	3.8
CAB	9	7.9	2	6.7	2	8.7	2	22.2	3	5.8
Care & Repair	2	1.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3.8
Community groups	6	5.3	-	-	1	4.3	-	-	5	9.6
Other	11	9.6	2	6.7	4	17.4	-	-	5	9.6
Don't know	32	28.1	7	23.3	10	43.5	4	44.4	11	21.2
Total	114	100.0	30	26.3	23	20.2	9	7.9	52	45.6

Specialist accommodation

The need to move to a form of specialist accommodation by either the respondent or a member of their household is noted in the table below. The first point to note is that 87.0% felt that they did not require any of the forms of supported accommodation listed and 2.2% were unsure. Among the remainder, the greatest need was identified in relation to accommodation with an emergency/alarm call system (5.1%), followed by accommodation without stairs (3.3%) and then accommodation suitable for a wheelchair (1.8%). In 3.1% of cases it was anticipated that a family member would provide the necessary care and support rather than move to such accommodation.

Table 55: Need for specialist forms of housing

Forms of housing	All	
	No.	%
Accommodation without stairs	15	3.3
Accommodation suitable for a wheelchair	8	1.8
Accommodation with on-site warden	3	0.7
Accommodation with emergency/alarm call system	23	5.1
Accommodation with visiting warden	4	0.9
Day time staff on site with emergency call out	5	1.1
Live-in landlady/landlord	-	-
A larger property to accommodate carer	3	0.7
Family providing support	14	3.1
Other support accommodation	4	0.9
None of these	389	87.0
Don't know	10	2.2

A wide range of answers was given in response to the question about where respondents would go for advice about supported or specialist accommodation. The main sources referred to were: the council; social services, their GP; family and friends; their employer; the CAB; and other voluntary sector agencies and latterly, their current landlord.

Access to services

In regard to services used by the respondents, 12.3% had accessed housing advice and this was particularly notable in relation to the Black community (30.0%), followed by those from the Other ethnic group (12.3%) and contrasting with 9.7% of the Asian group and 6.9% of those from the Mixed ethnic group.

Slightly less than one in ten (9.3%) had used the local social services, ranging from 13.5% and 11.9% of the Asian and Black community groups respectively and compared with 7.7% of those from the Other ethnic group and 3.4% of the Mixed ethnic group.

Housing-related support services had been accessed by 8.8% of the sample overall and while this was the case among slightly more than one in ten of the Black and Asian groups (12.1% and 10.7% respectively), only 8.3% of the Other ethnic group had used such a service and none of the Mixed group.

The largest proportion had accessed financial advice services (17.1%) and accounted for one in five of those from the Other ethnic group (20.0%), 15.5% of the Black respondents, 13.5% of the Asian group and 7.1% of those from the Mixed ethnic group.

Table 56: Local services used

Service	All		Ethnic group							
	No.	%	Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Housing advice	56	12.3	10	9.7	18	30.0	2	6.9	26	12.3
Social services	42	9.3	14	13.5	7	11.9	1	3.4	20	7.7
Housing-related support	40	8.8	11	10.7	7	12.1	-	-	22	8.3
Financial advice	78	17.1	14	13.5	9	15.5	2	7.1	53	20.0

The use of these four services according to where respondents lived is as follows:

Housing advice – York (13.7%); Harrogate (18.3%); Craven (18.5%); Scarborough (7.2%); Selby (5.1%); Ryedale (20.8%); and Richmondshire (6.2%);

Social Services – York (14.4%); Harrogate (11.3%); Craven (14.8%); Scarborough (3.6%); Ryedale (8.7%); and Richmondshire (6.2%);

Housing-related support – York (8.2%); Harrogate (11.3%); Craven (25.9%); Scarborough (4.6%); Selby (11.8%); Ryedale (13.0%); and Richmondshire (6.2%); and

Financial advice services – York (13.5%); Harrogate (21.1%); Craven (11.1%); Scarborough (17.1%); Selby (47.1%); Ryedale (17.4%); and Richmondshire (12.5%).

In terms of where respondents found out about where to go for such services, looking firstly at housing advice, the main sources of information were: Family and friends (11 out of 57 mentioned this); the Council (11); the CAB (9); an estate agent or lettings agent (7); a housing association (3); an other agency, such as Women's Aid (2); and the Job Centre (1). Also, 13 respondents referred to other means, including the Internet, Yellow pages; the information centre; the local library; and the MS Society.

Awareness of social services was found to be via: the council (7 out of 36 mentioned this); their GP or another health professional (5); family or friends (5); social services contacting them directly (3); and the CAB (3). A number of other sources were referred to by 13 respondents, including the library, the Yellow Pages, the Internet, the police and schools.

Those who had used housing-related support services tended to find out about them from: the CAB (7 out of 29); the Council (7); family and friends (6); their landlord (2); and social services (2). Five respondents mentioned other information sources such as the MS Society, the Job Centre and the Internet.

The majority who had found out about where to go for financial advice cited: a bank or building society (51 out of 76); family or friends (6); the Council (5); the CAB (4) and other sources (10), such as solicitors, via the telephone, estate agents and the Internet.

Recreational activity

Respondents were asked to recount how many times in the last seven days they had taken part in a sport or recreational activity that lasted for at least 30 minutes on each occasion and included any activity that raises their heart and breathing rate, such as walking for recreational purpose or playing a sport. The table reveals that among the sample as a whole slightly less than half the group had not been involved in any such activity (46.3%) and this varied by ethnic group, accounting for 48.5% of the Other ethnic group, 48.4% of the Mixed group, 44.9% of the Asian community and 38.3% of the Black respondents. Those who had taken part in such activity among the Asian and Other ethnic groups tended to have been only once (23.4% and 19.2% respectively), while in the case of the Black and Mixed groups the largest proportion mentioned five or more times in the last seven days (16.7% and 16.1% respectively).

The proportion of the respondents from each local authority area who had not participated in any recreational activities within the seven day period is as follows: York (42.5%); Harrogate (21.9%); Craven (33.3%); Scarborough (57.5%); Selby (88.2%); Ryedale (58.3%); and Richmondshire (50.0%).

Table 57: Number of times taken part in a sport or recreational activity in the last 7 days

Frequency	Ethnic group									
	All		Asian		Black		Mixed		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Once	89	19.2	25	23.4	9	15.0	4	12.9	51	19.2
Twice	57	12.3	9	8.4	8	13.3	2	6.5	38	14.3
Three times	26	5.6	10	9.3	2	3.3	2	6.5	12	4.5
Four times	16	3.4	2	1.9	7	11.7	2	6.5	5	1.9
Five times	46	9.9	8	7.5	10	16.7	5	16.1	23	8.6
Other	15	3.2	5	4.7	1	1.7	1	3.2	8	3.0
None	215	46.3	48	44.9	23	38.3	15	48.4	129	48.5
Total	464	100.0	107	23.1	60	12.9	31	6.7	266	57.3

Part 2: Migrant Workers (A8 and A2)

Introduction

The second part of this report looks at the A8 and A2 migrant workers currently living in North Yorkshire. Chapter 5 provides a contextual background for the study findings by considering the existing literature on these community groups. Chapter 6 looks at the official data on migrant workers, focusing firstly on the national picture and then providing information for the respective local authorities involved in the study. The findings from the stakeholder consultation exercise undertaken across North Yorkshire is presented in Chapter 7, while Chapter 8 describes the findings from the personal interviews with migrant workers themselves.

Chapter 4: Existing Evidence Regarding Migrant Workers

Introduction

This chapter provides background information with regards to what is currently known about the experiences of migrant workers. It draws on a selection of previous research that has been carried out across different areas of the UK, highlighting some of the key issues that have emerged.

Yorkshire Futures has also recently published a comprehensive review of research on asylum seekers, refugees and new migrant communities, highlighting what some of the key issues are for migrant communities across the region⁸.

Actual and perceived impacts

Since the arrival of Jewish immigrants at the beginning of the twentieth century, immigration has been a feature of both the political and public agenda. There have always been calls to encourage or restrict entry to the UK, which have been aimed at different groups of migrants at different time periods. A common theme running throughout the debates, however, is the perceived need to defend the labour market and welfare opportunities of the domestic population, whilst balancing the need for economic growth. The arrival of migrant workers in more recent years appears to be no different in terms of the public and political debates.

One of the key issues emerging is the discrepancy between *actual* and *perceived* impacts of the arrival of migrants⁹. There have been concerns, for example, about the impact of migrant workers on the employment opportunities of the indigenous population. Previous research, however, has shown no evidence of adverse effects on either employment prospects or wage levels of native workers¹⁰, including the young and low skilled¹¹.

Furthermore, there have been concerns with regards to the potential demands placed on social housing. Research highlights, however, that migrant workers are primarily concentrated in the private rented sector, with only a small proportion of social housing being allocated to foreign nationals¹². Research suggests that those who have been in the UK for longer periods are more likely to access social housing; however, there is a general lack of awareness of housing options and entitlements, as well as a perception that the private sector is in some respects an 'easier' and

⁸ Lewis, H., Craig, G., Adamson, S. and Wilkinson, M. (2008) *Refugees, asylum seekers and migrants in North Yorkshire and Humber, 1999-2008*, Leeds: Yorkshire Futures.

⁹ IPPR (undated) *The reception and integration of new migrant groups*, London: IPPR, emphasis added

¹⁰ Coats, D. (2008) *Migration Myths: Employment, Wages and Labour Market Performance*, London: The Work Foundation; Lemos, S. and Portes, J. (2008) *The impact of migration from the new European Union Member States on native workers*, London: Department for Work and Pensions.

¹¹ Lemos, S. and Portes, J. (2008) *The impact of migration from the new European Union Member States on native workers*, London: Department for Work and Pensions.

¹² Roney, J. (2008) *Housing Report to the Migration Impacts Forum*, 16th January 2008, Sheffield: Sheffield City Council.

more flexible option¹³. Furthermore, there is evidence that migrant communities have brought 'hard to let' private rented properties back into use¹⁴.

There is currently very little information about the impact of migration on public services. Indeed, it has been highlighted that such impacts are often difficult to quantify:

*'Whilst one-off projects and small targeted initiatives are sometimes costed, pressures on mainstream services such as housing, education, information and advice services and measures to promote cohesion are, of necessity in the context of finite budgets, being absorbed by stretching other budgets, and therefore the financial impact is hidden.'*¹⁵

With regards to schools, there are a number of potential impacts that have been identified, which include the need to provide translation/interpretation services; understanding cultural differences; pressures arising from mid-term arrivals; and the lack of records and assessments¹⁶. Some research suggests, however, that the arrival of migrant worker children into primary schools has enabled some schools to remain open, which would otherwise have been forced to close¹⁷.

In recent years the government has turned attention to the impact of migration with the development of a Migration Impacts plan¹⁸. The plan focuses on how to maximise the economic benefits of migration while attempting to minimise any pressures felt by communities and local service providers. This plan outlines three key areas of work: improving statistics; helping public services respond to migration; and supporting community cohesion. The focus on the economic impact of migration has also been a feature of recent research carried out by the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) in the East of England¹⁹. The IPPR provide an analysis of economic features of the East of England and the importance of migrant workers for a number of sectors across the region. It also highlights the potential impacts of the recession. One of the issues emerging from the IPPR research is the uncertainty of how migration will be affected by the economic downturn; however, it is suggested that demand for migrant workers will continue in the future, with concerns that too few migrants with the right skills will come to the region.

Employment

What is often acknowledged is that despite the range of skills and qualifications that migrant workers often have, there is a tendency to undertake work that is not commensurate with their previous occupation or status in their home country. It has

¹³ Hunt, L., Steele, A. and Condie, J. (2008) *Migrant workers in Rochdale and Oldham*, Salford: University of Salford.

¹⁴ Pemberton, S and Stevens, C (2007) *Economic Migration to Housing Market Renewal Areas in North West England – Opportunity or Threat?*, MSIO Policy Report 4, Liverpool: Merseyside Social Inclusion Observatory (MSIO).

¹⁵ Institute of Community Cohesion (2007) *Estimating the scale and impacts of migration at the local level*, London: Local Government Association (LGA), p. 5.

¹⁶ Institute of Community Cohesion (2007) *Estimating the scale and impacts of migration at the local level*, London: Local Government Association (LGA).

¹⁷ Somerville, P. (2008) *Migrant Workers in South Lincolnshire: A report for Community Lincs*, Lincoln: University of Lincoln, Policy Studies Research Centre.

¹⁸ See <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/communities/migrationimpact>.

¹⁹ Rutter, J., Latorre, M. and Mulley, S. (2009) *Migrant Worker Availability in the East of England: An economic risk assessment*, London: IPPR.

been suggested that migrant workers are often found in low paid work, with limited occupational mobility²⁰, or what have also been described as '3-D' jobs (dirty, dangerous and degrading)²¹. This can be due to a need to find a job as soon as possible, as well as the often temporary nature of their employment, which can create a situation whereby people 'settle' for particular jobs.

A recent report by the Confederation of British Industry (CBI)²², however, suggests that the portrayal of migrant workers as working in lower-skilled and lower paid jobs may be overly simplistic. They suggest that the overall pattern is more complex, reflecting a range of demand from employers for different levels of skills. There are issues around the lack of recognition of overseas qualifications, which can create barriers to occupational mobility for migrants but also cause confusion amongst employers. Initiatives have been developed in order to recognise the skills of new migrants (including asylum seekers and refugees) and assist with occupational mobility²³. This includes *skills recognition* and *vocational adaptation pathways*, which have been piloted in five vocational areas: construction; general maintenance; social research; business administration; and health care²⁴. These projects included carrying out skills audits of migrant communities and providing vocational ESOL. In addition, research undertaken in the East of England has recommended that national and regional policy makers must find ways to better utilise the skills and resources of migrant communities. In order to retain key workers in the region there must be an increase in the opportunities available for migrants to achieve their career and educational aspirations²⁵.

Another concern that is often highlighted in relation to migrant workers is that there can be a lack of regulation and care when people are in employment, which can lead to exploitation. There are widely acknowledged concerns over the role of Gangmasters or other 'agents'. Research suggests that a number of deductions can be made to workers wages when employed through Gangmasters or agencies; for example, for accommodation, work clothes, weekly administration, and cashing cheques. Concerns about Gangmasters in particular led to the setting up of the Gangmasters Licensing Authority (GLA)²⁶. The GLA regulates those who supply labour or use workers to provide services in agriculture, forestry, horticulture, shellfish gathering, and food processing and packaging²⁷. The tragic deaths of the Chinese 'cockle pickers' in Morecambe Bay in 2004 highlights the danger posed when the proper checks and standards are not in place.

²⁰ Markova, E. and Black, R. (2007) *East European immigration and community cohesion*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

²¹ Pai, H-H. (2004) 'An ethnography of global labour migration', *Feminist Review*, 77: pp 129-136.

²² CBI (2007) *CBI evidence to House of Lords Economic Affairs Committee: the economic impact of migration*, London: CBI.

²³ Waddington, S. (2007) *Routes to integration and inclusion: new approaches to enable refugee and migrant workers to progress in the labour market*, NIACE.

²⁴ Phillimore, J., Goodson, L., Hennessy, D., and Ergün, E., with Joseph, R. and Jones, P. (2007) *Employability pathways: an integrated approach to recognising the skills and experiences of new migrants*, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

²⁵ Schneider, C. and Holman, D. (2009) *Longitudinal Study of Migrant Workers in the East of England: Interim Report*, Cambridge: Anglia Ruskin University; Rutter, J. and Latorre, M. (2008) *Migrant Worker Availability in the East of England – An Economic Risk Assessment*, IPPR.

²⁶ Audit Commission website, Internet reference: <http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/migrantworkers/concerns.asp#employment>

²⁷ GLA website, Internet reference: <http://www.gla.gov.uk/>

Research has also suggested limited Trade Union (TU) involvement amongst migrant workers²⁸. Some Trade Unions, however, are trying to address these issues²⁹ and the Trades Union Congress (TUC) published a leaflet entitled *Working in the UK: your rights*. This leaflet is available to download in all A8 languages, as well as being made available through a Portuguese language website³⁰. It covers issues such as tax and National insurance, the National Minimum Wage, working time rights, health and safety protection, and Trade Union membership³¹.

What needs to be considered, however, is that work can sometimes act as an obstacle to social cohesion. The segregation of new migrant workers into agriculture and food processing plants through poor pay, long hours and shift pattern working can limit their capacity for integration in the working environment and life outside of it³².

Language barriers

Language remains a pervasive issue for new migrant communities. Acquisition of English language affects the types of jobs people can obtain and the wages they can command. Research suggests, for example, that fluency in English can increase the average hourly occupational wage by around 20%³³.

Language is not just an issue in the work place, however, but a feature in other interactions; for example, accessing key services such as health care and education, as well as the amenities that are accessed every day, such as shops and banks. With increasing numbers of different migrant communities, there have been growing concerns about the level of ESOL provision available³⁴. According to the Learning and Skills Council (LSC), the demand for ESOL has expanded well beyond provision and funding, resulting in waiting lists across the UK³⁵. Furthermore, August 2007 saw the withdrawal of automatic fee remission from adult ESOL courses (with the exception of those who are unemployed or receiving income-based benefits).

There is, however, an intention at strategic levels in the East of England to ensure ESOL provision in the region is responsive to the needs of migrant workers and employers, that this will contribute to local economy and social cohesion and that employers will support investment into the skills of migrant workers³⁶.

²⁸ Zaronaitė, D. and Tirzite, A. (2006) *The Dynamics of Migrant Labour in South Lincolnshire*, East Midlands Development Agency; Scullion, L. and Morris, G. (2009) *Migrant workers in Liverpool*, Salford: University of Salford.

²⁹ See, for example, the GMB Southern Region (<http://www.gmb-southern.org.uk/default.asp?pageid=80&mpageid=25&groupid=4>) and UNISON (<http://www.unison.org.uk/migrantworkers/>).

³⁰ <http://www.tuc.org.uk/international/index.cfm?mins=288>

³¹ <http://www.tuc.org.uk/tuc/workingintheuk.pdf>

³² Hickman, M., Crowley, R. and Mai, N. (2008) *Immigration and Social Cohesion in the UK: The rhythms and realities of everyday life*, York: JRF

³³ Shields, M. A. and Wheatley-Price, S. (2002) 'The English language fluency and occupational success of ethnic minority immigrant men living in metropolitan areas', *Journal of Population Economics*, pp 137-160.

³⁴ Phillimore, J., Goodson, L., Hennessy, D. and Ergun, E with Joseph, R. and Jones, P. (2007) *Employability pathways: an integrated approach to recognising the skills and experiences of new migrants*, Centre for Urban and Regional Studies (CURS), Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

³⁵ LSC (2006) *Raising our game: Our Annual Statement of Priorities*, Coventry: Learning and Skills Council (LSC).

³⁶ EEDA (undated) *English Language Strategy for Migrant Workers in the East of England*, Cambridge: EEDA

Accommodation

Previous research acknowledges that accommodation affects people's health, access to work and social interaction and neighbourly relations³⁷. As highlighted earlier, the majority of migrant workers live in the private rented sector. The main issues raised in previous studies with regards to migrant workers and accommodation are people living in Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs); lack of choice with regards to location; poor conditions of accommodation; use of low demand housing; and concerns with accommodation that is tied to employment.

There is currently very little information available about homelessness amongst migrant workers. Loss of employment, combined with the restrictions on claiming benefits, can lead to homelessness particularly when accommodation is tied to employment. It is highlighted that in some areas there are instances where people drift into squatting and street drinking. This is most noticeable in London, however, where migrants from Accession countries in particular accounted for half of the bed space users in night shelters³⁸. In recent years, Peterborough has become the focus of media attention in relation to homelessness amongst migrant communities, particularly in relation to a number of what have been described as 'shanty towns' that have emerged in the city³⁹. 'Hidden homelessness', whereby individuals are relying on relatives and friends for accommodation has also emerged as a pertinent issue for some migrant workers⁴⁰.

Health

A recent report published by the East of England Strategic Migration Partnership⁴¹ has highlighted a number of key issues in relation to health service provision for asylum seekers and refugees, but also new migrant populations (including migrant workers) in the East of England. Overall, the report highlighted the difficulty of planning and delivering services to such a diverse range of migrant communities.

The report suggested a number of key issues and problems in the region, many of which apply to migrant worker communities. This included people not accessing primary care services due to lack of understanding of the UK system; language barriers reducing access to health care, leading to poor health outcomes and inappropriate care; inconsistent use of maternity services; and migrant workers suffering stress and exhaustion due to poor working conditions.

³⁷ Spencer, S., Johnson, M. R. D., Phillips, D., Rudiger, A., Somerville, W., Wintour, P. and Warren, S. (2004) *Refugees and other new migrants: a review of the evidence on successful approaches to integration*, Oxford: Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS); Spencer, S., Ruhs, M., Anderson, B. and Rogaly, B. (2007) *Migrants' lives beyond the workplace: the experience of Central and Eastern Europeans in the UK*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

³⁸ Audit Commission (2007) *Crossing Borders: Responding to the local challenges of migrant workers*, London: Audit Commission.

³⁹ Nadeem, B. (2008) 'Camped out', *Inside Housing*, 31 October 2008; O'Mara, E. (2009) 'Migrants still living in squalor a year on', *Peterborough Evening Telegraph*, 14th April 2009; Old, D. (2009) 'Council workers clear immigrants 'shanty town' rubbish', *Peterborough Evening Telegraph*, 25th April 2009.

⁴⁰ Steele, A. and Hunt, L. (2008) *Migrant workers in Bolton*, Salford: University of Salford; Hunt, L., Steele, A. and Condie, J. (2008) *Migrant workers in Rochdale and Oldham*, Salford: University of Salford.

⁴¹ Collis, A. and Stallabrass, S. (2009) *Migrant Health Scoping Report*, East of England Regional Assembly (Strategic Migration Partnership), January 2009.

Recent research in Nottingham has also highlighted a number of issues in relation to migrant communities' access to health care, suggesting that there can be difficulties in ensuring consistency of treatment, particularly with transient populations, as well as the need to provide double appointments for some migrant communities, which has resource implications⁴².

Rural migrant workers

The sections highlighted above have focused on a range of issues that could affect migrant and receiving communities across the UK. Previous research, however, has also focused on the issue from the rural perspective, acknowledging that there can be differences between the experiences of migrants living in rural and urban areas. Previous studies, for example, have highlighted that there can potentially be additional 'pressure' as a result of the arrival of migrant communities in rural areas (for example, in relation to housing markets)⁴³.

Recent research by the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) (2009), however, has focused on the importance of migrant workers for rural economies⁴⁴, highlighting a number of recommendations with regards to future policy for maintaining the presence of migrant workers in rural areas and maximising the benefits of migration. This includes continuing to facilitate the movement of agricultural workers, particularly through the new managed migration system; looking at how to develop more affordable and high quality housing in rural areas (the relatively high cost of accommodation was highlighted as a key factor that might drive migrant workers out of rural areas); reviewing the role of recruitment agencies (in the longer term migrant workers have said that they want direct employment); and extending the remit of the Gangmasters Licensing Authority (GLA) to cover all sectors characterised by vulnerable employment.

Concerns about future economic performance of rural economies are echoed by the North Yorkshire Strategic Partnership (NYSP) which has carried out a review of the impact of in-migration⁴⁵. This review suggests that the economic incentives to remain in the UK are likely to decline, with some concerns that sectors such as agriculture (but not exclusively) will be affected. In particular, there are concerns that employers may find it increasingly difficult to recruit suitable workers.

⁴² See Scullion, L. and Morris, G. (2009) *A study of A8 and A2 migrants in Nottingham*, Salford: University of Salford

⁴³ Commission for Rural Communities (CRC) (2007) *A8 migrant workers in rural areas: Briefing paper*, Cheltenham: Commission for Rural Communities.

⁴⁴ Chappell, L., Latorre, M., Rutter, J. and Shah, J (2009) *Migration and Rural Economies: Assessing and addressing risks*, London: Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR).

⁴⁵ NYSP Equalities Task Group (2008) *A Strategic Review: Impact of Inward Migration from the EU Accession States in North Yorkshire*, NYSP Equalities Task Group.

Chapter 5: Official Data on the Migrant Worker Population

Introduction

Not just in the UK, but across the whole of Europe there is increasing pressure to understand the dynamics of migration and improve measures of data collection⁴⁶. However, the difficulties of calculating the scale of migration are widely acknowledged⁴⁷, particularly when dealing with a potentially transient group of people whose migration may be intrinsically linked to employment opportunities.

What follows is a description of some of the common data sources, what they can tell us about the migrant population, as well as the caveats to using such data.

Work permit applications

Work permits are generally only issued for certain types of work and normally only when the employer has been unable to recruit a suitable employee from within the European Economic Area (EEA)⁴⁸; however, it also includes Sector Based Scheme (SBS) which currently applies to Bulgarian and Romanian nationals and covers only the Food Manufacturing Industry. They are applied for by the employer and do not contain residential information about the employee⁴⁹. Therefore, although it may provide some quantification of work permit applications, they do not specify where the recipients reside.

International Passenger Survey (IPS)

The International Passenger Survey (IPS) is a survey of a random sample of passengers entering and leaving the UK by air, sea or the Channel Tunnel⁵⁰. Over a quarter of a million face-to-face interviews are carried out each year with passengers⁵¹ and the IPS offers the only data collection technique measuring in-migration and out-migration⁵².

The IPS has been seen as an important source of information on international migration; however, it is based on a sample of 1 in 500 passengers. Its value therefore deteriorates when looking at specific requirements; for example, intended destination of migrants within the UK.

⁴⁶ Rees, P. and Boden, P. (2006) *Estimating London's new migrant population: Stage 1 – review of methodology*, London: Greater London Authority (GLA).

⁴⁷ Dudman, J. (2007) 'Getting the measure of immigrants', *Public*, November 2007; House of Commons Select Committee on Trade and Industry, Eleventh Report, 9th October 2007; Institute of Community Cohesion (2007) *Estimating the scale and impacts of migration at the local level*, London: Local Government Association (LGA).

⁴⁸ <http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/workingintheuk/tier2/workpermits/>

⁴⁹ Pemberton, S. and Stevens, C. (2006) *Supporting Migrant Workers in the North West of England*, Liverpool: Merseyside Social Inclusion Observatory.

⁵⁰ http://www.statistics.gov.uk/ssd/surveys/international_passenger_survey.asp

⁵¹ http://www.statistics.gov.uk/ssd/surveys/international_passenger_survey.asp

⁵² Rees, P. and Boden, P. (2006) *Estimating London's new migrant population: Stage 1 – review of methodology*, London: Greater London Authority (GLA).

The Census

The Census of population is a survey of all people and households in the country. It is carried out every ten years, providing details on age, sex, occupation, country of birth, ethnic group, marital status, etc. It is the only survey which provides information on the entire population.

With regards to looking at the migrant population, the last Census was carried out in 2001, which is prior to EU expansion. This means that Census data has limited use with regards to showing population flows from the A8 and A2 countries since accession, which is the time when there have been dramatic changes in population flows.

Labour Force Survey (LFS) and Annual Population Survey (APS)

The Labour Force Survey (LFS) is a quarterly sample survey of households living at private addresses in the UK, providing information on the UK labour market⁵³. It is based on a sample of around 60,000 households nationally and although it provides a regional picture of the labour force, it is not broken down at a local authority level. The LFS also excludes most communal establishments, which can under-report the number of foreign born workers⁵⁴.

Information relating to individual local authorities can be taken from the Annual Population Survey (APS), which combines information from the LFS with other local area labour force surveys. Although this can be disaggregated by local authority there is a limit to the information that can be provided given the small sample size⁵⁵.

The School Census

The School Census or Pupil Level Annual Schools Census (PLASC) records pupils who have entered state schools within each local education authority (LEA), recording information on first language and ethnicity of pupils.

Given that it is a school census, it can naturally only offer information with regards to migrants of school age⁵⁶. Furthermore, it focuses on state schools, which does not offer a complete census of school age children⁵⁷. Despite these limitations, however, comparing successive datasets can provide a picture of demographic change in a local authority area.

Electoral register/roll

The electoral register/roll lists the names and addresses of everyone who has registered to vote. Recently quoted statistics indicate that an additional one million new voters have registered over the past two years, a large number of which is

⁵³ <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/StatBase/Source.asp?vlnk=358>

⁵⁴ Clancy, G. (2008) Employment of foreign workers in the United Kingdom: 1997 to 2008, *Economic & Labour Market Review*, 2, 7: pp 18-30.

⁵⁵ This information is available from Nomis, which is a service provided by the Office for National Statistics (ONS).

⁵⁶ Pemberton, S. and Stevens, C. (2006) *Supporting Migrant Workers in the North West of England*, Liverpool: Merseyside Social Inclusion Observatory.

⁵⁷ Rees, P. and Boden, P. (2006) *Estimating London's new migrant population: Stage 1 – review of methodology*, London: Greater London Authority (GLA).

attributed to immigration particularly from Eastern Europe⁵⁸. Perhaps unsurprisingly, however, public access to the electoral register/roll is strictly controlled. The full register is available to Credit Reference Agencies, while an edited version is available to purchase for commercial uses; for example, other credit and marketing activities⁵⁹.

Worker Registration Scheme (WRS)

The Worker Registration Scheme (WRS) was introduced in 2004 for A8 migrants (i.e. those from the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovak Republic and Slovenia). It requires individuals from these countries to obtain a registration certificate for each job they have in the UK⁶⁰. Once they have been working continually for twelve months they no longer have to register and can obtain a residence permit⁶¹.

The WRS enables monitoring of which national groups are coming into the UK labour market and the type of employment they are undertaking. WRS data can be broken down by local authority area and provides information by national group in relation to:

- Age;
- Dependants;
- Gender;
- Hourly rate of pay;
- Hours worked per week;
- Industry sector;
- Intended length of stay; and
- Top ten occupations.

WRS data does not include those from the A2 countries (Bulgaria and Romania) and also excludes those who are self employed. It is also based on the postcode of the *employer* rather than the *employee*. Furthermore, an individual who has registered to work and who leaves employment is not required to deregister; therefore, some of those counted will have left the employment for which they registered⁶². Finally, the figures rely on official registration, which naturally cannot account for those who are not registered.

⁵⁸ Slack, J. (2008) 'Immigration adds a million new voters to the electoral register in just two years as total hits record 46million', Daily Mail Online 7th April 2008, *Internet reference:* <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-557878/Immigration-adds-million-new-voters-electoral-register-just-years-total-hits-record-46million.html>

⁵⁹ Rees, P. and Boden, P. (2006) *Estimating London's new migrant population: Stage 1 – review of methodology*, London: Greater London Authority (GLA).

⁶⁰ Pemberton, S. and Stevens, C. (2006) *Supporting Migrant Workers in the North West of England*, Liverpool: Merseyside Social Inclusion Observatory.

⁶¹ <http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/workingintheuk/eea/wrs/>

⁶² Home Office (2008) *Accession Monitoring Report May 2004 – December 2008*, London: Home Office.

National Insurance Registration data (NINo)

Acquiring a National Insurance Number (NINo) is a necessary step for employment/self employment purposes, as well as to claim benefits or tax credits⁶³. NINo information is available for the number of allocations to adult overseas nationals (including both A8 and A2 migrants). This can be broken down at a local authority level, providing analysis by calendar or financial year. Again, these figures rely on official registration and therefore cannot account for those who are not registered.

What the data tells us

It must be recognised that available data cannot be aggregated to provide a definitive answer with regards to the size of the local migrant worker population. However, some of the sources listed above can provide useful information with regards to changes in characteristics of the population in recent years.

Information from the WRS and NINo does not provide a 'net' measure of migration and the figures are unable to show movement of people *within* the UK or how many people have returned home. However, we would advocate using these sources as a *starting point* to providing some information nationally and for North Yorkshire specifically. Furthermore, the Audit Commission identify these as the 'best' sources of information with regards to migrant workers⁶⁴. Analysis of these sources can enable us to describe the characteristics of the migrant worker population and identify any changes in national groups over the past few years. What follows is a brief description of what the data tells us.

The national picture

According to the Accession Monitoring Report May 2004 – December 2008⁶⁵, around 965,000 applicants have applied to register on the WRS between May 2004 and December 2008. Of this total, around 926,000 initial applications were approved. The figures show that nationals from A8 countries are continuing to come to the UK and register for work; however, there has been a downward trend in numbers since towards the end of 2007. The approved number of applications in 2008, for example, was 156,295, compared to 210,800 in 2007 and 227,875 in 2006. The Accession Monitoring Report attributes this downward trend primarily to the fall in the number of Polish applications.

Tables 58 and 59 below provide a breakdown of approved applications by nationality for both WRS and NINo.

Looking at Table 58, it can be seen, the majority of applications are from Polish nationals (66%). This is followed, in much lower numbers, by Slovakian (11%) and Lithuanian (9%) nationals. The figures indicate that, since 2007, there has been a reduction in the number of applications from Poland, Slovakia, Lithuania, Czech Republic and Estonia (albeit based on very low numbers for the latter), while

⁶³ Rees, P. and Boden, P. (2006) *Estimating London's new migrant population: Stage 1 – review of methodology*, London: Greater London Authority (GLA).

⁶⁴ <http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/migrantworkers/data/nationaldata.asp>

⁶⁵ Home Office (2008) *Accession Monitoring Report May 2004 – December 2008*, London: Home Office. Please note that these were the most up to date figures at the time of writing.

Hungary, Latvia and Slovenia have seen an increase (again, based on very low numbers for the latter). Of these three countries, Hungary has seen the biggest increase in the number of applicants since 2007.

With regards to National Insurance number (NINo) data Table 59 below shows that there have been 1,195,140 UK NINo registrations for A8/A2 nationals between January 2004 to September 2008. Similar to WRS data, Polish registrations dominate (62%), followed by Slovak (9%) and Lithuanian nationals (8%), while Estonian and Slovenian nationals are only a small percentage of the total. The data also highlights, perhaps unsurprisingly, that registrations by Bulgarian and Romanian nationals have increased since Q1 2007.

Table 58: UK WRS approved applicants by quarter and year of application, May 2004 – December 2008

Period	Poland	Slovakia	Lithuania	Latvia	Czech Rep	Hungary	Estonia	Slovenia
2004	71,025	13,020	19,270	8,670	8,255	3,620	1,860	160
2005	127,325	22,035	22,990	12,960	10,575	6,355	2,560	175
2006	162,495	21,755	17,065	9,490	8,345	7,060	1,475	185
2007 Q1	35,800	4,835	3,740	1,835	1,825	1,965	275	45
Q2	37,290	5,600	3,690	1,635	1,800	2,085	210	40
Q3	41,195	6,235	3,715	1,545	1,990	2,305	275	50
Q4	35,970	5,775	3,115	1,270	1,900	2,520	210	55
2007	150,255	22,450	14,265	6,285	7,510	8,880	965	190
2008 Q1	32,355	5,445	2,765	1,450	1,735	2,620	205	50
Q2	28,605	5,405	3,100	1,750	1,850	2,785	245	60
Q3	25,050	4,570	2,965	1,805	1,720	2,640	250	50
Q4	15,845	2,690	2,505	1,720	1,135	2,660	225	40
2008	101,855	18,115	11,335	6,720	6,440	10,705	925	195
Total	612,955	97,375	84,925	44,125	41,125	36,620	7,785	905
% ⁶⁶	66	11	9	5	4	4	1	<1

Source: Accession Monitoring Report May 2004 – December 2008

Note: These figures are rounded up to the nearest 5

⁶⁶ Please note that *all* percentages have been rounded up or down accordingly throughout the report; therefore not all totals will add up to 100%.

Table 59: NINo registrations to A8/A2 nationals, January 2002 – September 2008

Period	Poland	Slovakia	Lithuania	Czech Republic	Latvia	Hungary	Estonia	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Total
2002	4,740	880	1,420	1,050	340	680	160	230	3,710	1,570	14,780
2003	9,480	1,270	3,140	1,170	580	850	190	200	4,330	2,630	23,840
2004 Q1	4,000	470	1,380	370	290	360	90	80	2,000	1,170	10,210
Q2	4,970	700	1,720	550	450	370	120	210	1,640	1,010	11,740
Q3	11,960	2,400	3,100	1,540	1,290	710	340	180	1,080	680	23,280
Q4	17,510	3,280	4,520	2,210	1,670	1,120	500	200	1,000	760	32,770
2004	38,440	6,850	10,720	4,670	3,700	2,560	1,050	670	5,720	3,620	78,000
2005 Q1	26,680	4,730	6,210	3,060	2,910	1,610	730	220	800	840	47,790
Q2	32,210	6,100	7,740	3,170	3,630	1,830	750	150	890	700	57,170
Q3	44,190	7,270	8,200	3,510	3,760	1,990	890	120	850	820	71,600
Q4	41,660	6,610	6,950	3,290	3,200	2,270	630	90	570	640	65,910
2005	144,740	24,710	29,100	13,030	13,500	7,700	3,000	580	3,110	3,000	242,470
2006 Q1	53,020	7,530	8,050	3,280	3,800	2,480	760	130	520	720	80,290
Q2	38,190	5,530	5,250	2,300	2,580	1,870	460	120	450	540	57,290
Q3	49,700	6,620	5,440	2,620	2,510	2,060	420	100	410	560	70,440
Q4	51,300	6,550	5,460	2,760	2,530	2,510	520	110	560	610	72,910
2006	192,210	26,230	24,200	10,960	11,420	8,920	2,160	460	1,940	2,430	280,930
2007 Q1	81,240	9,910	7,760	3,970	3,410	4,300	650	200	1,430	2,260	115,130
Q2	48,050	6,370	4,840	2,470	2,120	2,850	350	100	2,960	5,530	75,640
Q3	63,370	8,400	5,040	3,140	2,000	3,130	350	150	5,050	6,270	96,900
Q4	49,880	7,410	4,590	2,720	1,790	3,590	320	130	2,810	5,110	78,350
2007	242,540	32,090	22,230	12,300	9,320	13,870	1,670	580	12,250	19,170	366,020
2008 Q1	49,370	7,820	4,550	2,810	1,880	3,740	350	160	3,140	6,050	79,870
Q2	40,750	7,710	4,210	2,530	2,050	3,820	360	140	4,420	6,730	72,720
Q3	40,530	7,570	4,500	3,360	2,090	3,900	400	150	5,870	6,760	75,130
Total	762,800	115,130	104,070	51,880	44,880	46,040	9,340	3,170	44,490	51,960	1,233,760

Source: Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) (2009)

Note: These figures are rounded to the nearest 10.

Table 60 below provides a geographical breakdown of figures for A8 nationals.

Table 60: Geographical distribution of registered workers, May 2004 – December 2008

Region⁶⁷	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Total	%
Anglia	21,920	29,930	31,690	29,925	23,940	137,405	15
Midlands	11,710	26,755	33,155	29,795	21,960	123,375	13
London	25,470	23,460	21,495	21,135	18,220	109,780	12
North East	9,060	21,405	25,460	21,995	15,210	93,130	10
Central	13,885	20,640	21,315	19,595	15,035	90,470	10
North West	7,675	19,135	23,875	21,085	13,145	84,915	9
South West	9,700	18,150	21,360	19,375	14,150	82,735	9
Scotland	8,150	15,895	19,055	19,560	14,665	77,325	8
South East	11,200	13,670	13,325	12,980	10,520	61,695	7
Northern Ireland	3,660	8,845	8,970	8,500	5,755	35,730	4
Wales	2,430	5,490	6,875	6,010	3,470	24,275	3

Source: Accession Monitoring Report May 2004 – December 2008.

Note: These figures are rounded up to the nearest 5.

As can be seen, Anglia, the Midlands and London has had the greatest number of registered workers.

Detailed information from the WRS and NINo for each of the seven local authorities involved in the study is presented in Appendix 2.

⁶⁷ The Accession Monitoring Report defines regions according to the Post Office's Postal Address Book regions, based on the first two letters of the postcode.

Chapter 6: The Needs & Experiences of Migrant Workers: Stakeholder Feedback

Introduction

This chapter is about the needs and experiences of migrant workers living in the county, but from the perspective of stakeholder groups. It is divided into four parts: employers and recruitment agencies; ESOL providers; housing; and other community groups.

Employers and recruitment agencies

Numbers and nationalities

The employers and recruitment agencies that were interviewed varied the total numbers of people they employed from around 50 to 2500. The proportion of these which are EU nationals also varied from 5% up to as many as 80%, though the employer which quoted this figure said that half of their EU migrant workers were Brazilians who had entered on an Italian passport.

Other employers said that they had recruited a lot of Polish people but also some from Slovakia, Czech Republic, Latvia, Hungary and Romania. Non A8 and A2 countries included Germans who were highly skilled workers and Italian.

Employers responded quite differently to one another when asked if the numbers of migrant workers that they employed had changed recently. Some of them said that they were employing less and this was simply because there is not as much work around, while one said numbers remained steady and another that they had been employing a few more.

One employer had noticed a change in the qualities of the workers recently:

'At first we were getting employees with good skill, they were reliable and they applied themselves to the job... but now the quality of some of the workers we are getting just isn't as good.'

Levels of employment

Migrants have obtained jobs with these employers at all levels. Some are employed as highly qualified professionals (such as medical staff), some have professional roles (e.g. nursing), and skilled and semi-skilled roles (joinery), but a lot of the work seems to be at the low skilled and unskilled levels (picking, packing and labouring). Migrants are employed in a variety of roles and responsibilities in the service sector such as management, chefs, porters and waiters.

Problems

Some of the employers said there were no problems at all in employing migrant workers, especially if stringent criteria are in place for checking passports and WRS, for example. Some suggested that language can be a problem though they may get around this by providing English classes in partnership with the local college or by

arranging staff in teams whereby one skilled English speaker can interpret on behalf of the others.

Reasons for employing migrant workers

Most respondents said that there are no specific reasons for employing migrant workers:

'They are the ones who have applied for the work, and they are the best people individually to do it.'

However, one of them did say that they found them to be very good workers, reliable and hardworking with a good work ethic. Some sectors such as the food industry cannot get English people to do the work. One employer commented that:

'English people tend to be either over-skilled or under-skilled... there is a skills gap in Britain for the kind of semi-skilled employees that we require.'

An example of a semi-skilled job is what one respondent referred to in his organisation as "production line joinery" and he is far more likely to find suitably skilled workers in Poland than in England.

Accommodation

Employers are generally not involved in the provision of accommodation except hospital accommodation which is available to all their staff and a hotel which has a large house on their grounds and one in a local village. One respondent had observed that private landlords were reluctant to let to migrants who are new to the country as they have no capital funds and can only acquire temporary work.

Gangmasters

Respondents were asked if they were aware of the presence of gangmasters in the area. The recruitment agencies possess the Gangmasters Licence themselves while another procures staff from an agency that is licensed. Other respondents are not involved with gangmasters.

Future Needs

Employers were asked what they thought the future demand for the services of migrant workers would be. One of them replied that they simply could not predict what future demand from customers would be so they were unable to make a guess about the demand for the numbers of workers they would need. Another said that work was starting to pick up again but whoever does it will depend on who applies for the jobs.

One employer believed that the demand for semi-skilled workers will continue due to a skills shortage in the UK, while another referred to shortages across the continent:

'We will be looking farther afield from the EU... our staffing needs cannot even be met within Europe.'

ESOL providers

Numbers and nationalities

Among the A8 and A2 nationals that ESOL is being provided for are Polish, Lithuanian, Hungarian, Slovak and Czech. However, they also have other European students who are French, German, Turkish, Russian and Ukrainians, and non-Europeans including members of the settled Asian community, Thai, Nepalese, Chinese, Bangladeshi, Iraqi Kurds, Laotians and Iranians.

Generally speaking, there was a large increase in demand for ESOL classes after the accession of EU countries in 2004. However, the numbers have dropped over more recent years with one respondent suggesting that the decline began as far back as 2006. A number of reasons have been cited for this drop off in demand. Firstly, the introduction of fees was felt by one to have put the affordability of classes beyond many migrants, though another had found that it had not affected demand at all.

There was also mixed opinions as to whether changes in the UK's economy had affected ESOL demand as some had observed that some of their students who had been made redundant, or workers in particular sectors such as construction, were no longer attending their classes. Another reason suggested by a respondent was that even those who have stayed may not need the classes as much as they used to:

'Particularly for parents, they may have learned enough by now to get by and can pick up more through their children.'

Promotion of classes

There are a number of ways in which ESOL providers promote their classes. These are by publishing an annual prospectus, by targeting specific employers, leaflet drops, posters, attending cultural event, adverts in local libraries and information points, and by word of mouth. One respondent said that they had found it very difficult engaging the community groups:

'It is hard to market to them and we are wondering if there is even a market there.'

Employers

Some interviewees said that they had provided classes in conjunction with employers. If they do this then it is necessary to take a more individual approach. Classes have been arranged around work patterns and employers have been supportive. It has helped to improve customer service, hospitality, small businesses, manufacturing and wider professions. One respondent said that an employer put a stop to ESOL classes at the workplace as they did not want staff to stop working for an hour.

Barriers to ESOL classes

Interviewees identified a number of barriers for migrant workers to accessing ESOL classes in North Yorkshire. First of all, the timing of the classes is important. Many migrants are involved in shift work which means that their ability to attend classes on a regular weekly basis is limited. This is also sometimes linked in part to the

geographical and transport issues which affect many students. If they do not have their own transport then they are restricted to public transport provision which may not be available when classes are scheduled.

Another barrier to classes could be the cost that is involved now. Even if it is not the cost itself which disincentives migrants, if they are on low pay then paying for classes may not be their priority. Also, one respondent said:

'Having to pay the full cost up front can be a problem. We are hoping to amend our system so that students can pay in instalments.'

Lack of interest from employers has been cited by one respondent as a difficulty for migrants to access ESOL. Clearly, if they were to create time for ESOL into the working day then more people would be able to take it up. Lastly, lack of awareness of the classes may be a barrier as some might not know that they are available and prospectuses are only published in English.

Awareness of services

Respondents disagreed as to whether they thought migrants were aware of the full range of services that are available to them. Those that thought that they might not reasoned that this was because so much information is in English - if they cannot understand it then they will not know what they can access. Even if leaflets in minority languages are available then they will still find it difficult when they are talking to someone.

A couple of respondents suggested that migrants are adept at finding things out depending on what their needs are at the time. They are used to different systems but they network well and rely on each other, but when they need to find out about something they make it their job to do so.

Problems accessing services

One respondent thought that migrant workers do have some problems accessing mainstream services. For example, migrants may register with GP's or dentists, but they also go to their home country for their health care to the people that they know. It has also been observed by one interviewee that:

'Some migrants become more 'Anglicised' than others and their first few months are key to how their future will develop. If they have had a bad experience then they will find it much harder to integrate.'

Housing

One interviewee was knowledgeable about the housing conditions of migrant workers through his professional role. Approximately 5–10% of his client group are migrant workers, mainly Polish but also Czech, Slovak and Estonian, and he was able to give some insight on the housing conditions that they are living in.

Housing conditions

Single males tend to live in HMO's or single one bedroom flats. Often two same sex adults will share a room and there are other overcrowding issues. Properties are usually in reasonable/poor repair and a poor decorative state. There may be minor repair issues such as damp/mould and some issues caused by occupation such as removing self closers on fire doors and covering detection. There can be issues with refuse within the flats and to the bin storage areas. Poor domestic hygiene is often evident within the flats.

Properties of couples and families tend to differ significantly from those of single men and although they tend to live in one bedroom flats the property is better maintained, decorated and well kept.

Reasons for these conditions

With regard to the reasons for why migrant workers tend to live in poor and overcrowded housing conditions, the respondent said that:

'The cost of renting in the lowest sector is hyper inflated by the amount of housing benefits available, therefore, those not able to claim housing benefit must still match the amount a landlord can receive from letting to persons in receipt of housing benefit.'

This means the cost of renting is quite high and the migrant community seem to minimise the cost of renting by using small units of accommodation for occupation by many people.

Also, there does tend to be general low level repair issues which are not attended to, such as penetrating damp and cracked/broken window panes. This may be due to the tenants not notifying landlords of issues or of the landlords failing to act once notified. The respondent suggested that:

'The mentality seems to be generally among single men that work long hours to not really concern themselves with the state of the property, as it is merely somewhere to sleep.'

However, this is not the mentality when couples or families have been encountered. Additionally, the issues relating to refuse are in part due to the increased occupancy, resulting in increased refuse and also a poor understanding of the recycling scheme.

The risks to occupants

Overcrowding can result in a loss of personal space and overloading of the facilities which can have an effect on matters such as personal, domestic hygiene and even pest issues. The major potential risk with the multi occupancy stock is a lack of fire provisions (alarms and fire doors) and adequate maintenance. Alterations made to the property can cause some problems too:

'Some properties which house migrant workers have had the fire safety provisions defeated, for example, removal of the self-closers off doors and covering of smoke/heat detectors with tape. This may be due to not

understanding the purpose or their particular lifestyle, making certain things a burden, for instance, self closers on doors are difficult in overcrowded properties as they restrict space and should many people be cooking or smoking, alarm systems will often have false alarms.'

Furthermore, fire provisions in a building are tailored for the number of occupiers and additional occupiers can result in higher risks which have not been accounted for, for example, some forms of escape may not be suitable for a high number of people.

Occupier's awareness of supporting services

Migrants may have a lack of knowledge of the services available to them, which is made more difficult because of the language barrier, the potentially precarious situation of the occupancy in relation to both eviction by landlord and the local authority discovering overcrowding. However, in contrast to this, one private housing provider believed that tenants were aware of the services that are available to them as they are given CAB and solicitors' information if they encounter legal or financial difficulties.

Other issues

The housing needs of migrants could be better addressed if they were provided with more information in the relevant languages and if there were additional workshops and drop-in centres which are publicised more widely in the relevant communities.

Also, there can be difficulties if occupants have to be evicted immediately from a property that has been deemed too dangerous. Under these circumstances, said the interviewee:

'It can be difficult to explain to them what is happening even if they do have good English, it is difficult to offer alternative accommodation as they do not leave contact details, and they will not be recognised within the homelessness legislation which restricts their financial power when acquiring new accommodation. In turn, the lack of a safety net means that they are less likely to complain about poor housing conditions.'

Other community groups

Changes in numbers

One stakeholder, a church, said that they had observed a rise in the number of Eastern Europeans arriving in the area at around 2005/6. There was a gradual decline from 2007-8 and so decided to integrate their services rather than having a separate Polish mass. One stakeholder has observed that the Polish nationals seem to have been replaced by Filipinos. In contrast, another stakeholder said that migrant workers have not been seen to be leaving the area.

ESOL

ESOL classes were well attended when they were free, observed one stakeholder. Another pointed out that the cost of ESOL is problematic for migrant workers who are often time-poor as well.

Housing

One stakeholder commented that migrants in their area tend to live in private sector housing. Another pointed out that the housing supply stock was low for the whole area and knows of migrants who are living in caravans.

The future

Service providers need to become more knowledgeable and informed to meet the needs of migrant workers, according to one stakeholder. Public service providers need to be brought together and briefed about what is happening. Some of them are simply not seeing migrants. They may be present at housing offices, the CAB, hospitals and transport hubs but there are other frontline services where attention is needed. There are issues around housing, safety and employment and service providers need to have a better understanding of migrant workers.

Engagement / Publicity

The main mechanisms of engagement are through word of mouth, churches, bi-lingual information, Saturday morning schools and through ESOL classes. It has been noted that there is a mistrust of authority which is making it difficult to break down barriers. Fire and Rescue Services are known to have been trying to build bridges with the migrant community and have even been trying to recruit them into their staff. There have also been community events in some areas where non-uniformed police officers have attended in order to try and alter the perceptions of the police that migrant workers may have.

Polish book scheme

Some areas of North Yorkshire have benefited from the introduction of a Polish book scheme to their libraries. This was initialised in 2005 when it was noticed that there were more non-English people using the libraries. Following a successful trial which ended in 2007 the scheme was rolled out to four of the largest libraries in the county. There has been a slight decrease in the number of loans since the recession began indicating a fall in the number of migrant workers in the area. However, it is believed there is a strong enough demand to justify an extension of current services into a larger number of languages.

Problems encountered by migrant workers

One stakeholder said that in their area they found that migrants were putting their two pin plugs into a three pin socket with a knife, but since this was discovered the fire services have been distributing three pin adaptors.

Another problem they have is that they do not know what their rights are, or how to access information. The most effective method is by word of mouth, for example, if the wrong information gets out about how to fill out a tax credits form then a lot more people will be doing it, but if the correct information gets put out into the community then this will spread also.

One respondent offered a reason for why some migrants do not want to “come together”. They suggested that among the Lithuanian community they know of, there are people that want to become more active and known in the wider community but they are afraid that a higher profile will draw the attention of what they consider to be the criminal elements among their own nationals.

Finally, there seems to be an assumption among the host community that all the migrants are Polish. This is particularly annoying for other European nationals.

Chapter 7: Findings from the Interviews with Migrant Workers

Introduction

A total of **323** interviews were carried out with A8 and A2 migrants who were living in North Yorkshire.

Section 1: Information about the Respondents

This first section presents information about the characteristics of these respondents, including nationality and ethnicity; year of arrival; age and gender; religious beliefs; marital status and number of dependants.

Nationality and ethnicity

Table 61 below shows the nationality of the respondents who were interviewed for the study.

Table 61: Nationality of respondents

Nationality	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Polish	216	67	88	61	70	68	7	64	19	59	12	100	13	93	7	100
Latvian	11	3	5	3	1	1	-	-	5	16	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lithuanian	13	4	10	7	2	2	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Czech	9	3	2	1	5	5	-	-	2	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Slovak	2	2	7	10	7	7	1	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hungarian	20	6	8	6	10	10	1	9	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Romanian	15	5	5	3	5	5	2	18	3	9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bulgarian	17	5	12	8	3	3	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	7	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

As would be expected, the majority of respondents were Polish (67%). This was followed by Slovak and Hungarian nationals (7% and 6% respectively), with smaller numbers of people from the remaining A8/A2 countries. As can be seen, the majority of respondents were currently living in York (45%), followed by Harrogate (32%) and Scarborough (10%). The respondents interviewed in these three local authority areas also came from a range of countries. Unfortunately, we were unable to identify any respondents in Hambleton to take part in the study.

What is important to note is that, albeit in smaller numbers, there are a potentially wide range of nationalities currently residing across the study area. The community interviewers were able to access respondents from all national groups, with the exception of Estonia and Slovenia. This sample, however, is a reflection of the language skills of community interviewers and the ability to access certain nationalities, rather than an indication of an absence of particular nationalities. As highlighted in the methodology section, accessing migrant communities for a study such as this requires a pragmatic approach with regards to sampling and identifying participants.

Given the smaller numbers of the other nationalities represented in the sample, this report will look at the sample as a whole rather than analysing the data by nationality, unless referring to specific cases. The analysis, however, will break the figures down by local authority area, acknowledging that in some areas the sample size is very small.

With regards to ethnicity, we wanted to identify if any of the respondents were from a Roma background. Taking the sample as a whole, just six respondents (2%) indicated that they were Roma. These individuals were living in York, Harrogate, Scarborough and Richmondshire. Three were Lithuanian, one Polish, one Bulgarian and one Romanian. Interestingly, none of the Czech or Slovak respondents identified themselves as Roma.

Year of arrival

Table 62 below shows the year the respondents arrived in the UK.

Table 62: Year of arrival in the UK

Year	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1992	1	<1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
1996	3	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	7	-	-
1998	1	<1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
1999	1	<1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2000	1	<1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2001	2	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2002	7	2	3	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	14	-	-
2003	15	5	10	7	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	7	-	-
2004	42	13	15	10	15	15	3	27	4	13	1	8	2	14	2	29
2005	89	28	41	28	31	30	1	9	6	19	5	42	5	36	-	-
2006	67	21	31	22	21	20	3	27	10	31	2	17	1	7	-	-
2007	59	18	29	20	16	16	2	18	3	9	4	33	2	14	3	43
2008	32	10	11	8	13	13	2	18	4	13	-	-	1	7	1	14
2009	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	6	-	-	-	-	1	14
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

The majority of respondents (67%) came to the UK between 2005 and 2007. As can be seen, a small number of people indicated that they had arrived prior to EU Accession in 2004, coming to the UK between 1992 and 2003. None of the respondents in Craven, Richmondshire or Selby had arrived in the UK prior to 2004.

Age and gender

Table 63 below shows the age range of the respondents.

Table 63: Age of respondents

Age	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
11 – 17	1	<1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
18 – 24	56	17	23	16	19	18	-	-	11	34	-	-	1	8	2	29
25 – 39	211	66	99	69	61	59	11	100	15	47	11	92	9	75	5	71
40 – 49	36	11	14	10	16	16	-	-	4	13	1	8	1	8	-	-
50 – 59	12	4	5	3	5	5	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	8	-	-
60 +	5	2	3	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	321	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	12	100	7	100

Note: excludes two missing cases

As can be seen, the majority of the sample (94%) were aged 18 – 49, with most respondents (66%) falling within the 25 – 39 age range. Just 4% of the sample were over the age of 50, with five respondents over 60. In Craven, Richmondshire and Selby the respondents were nearly all under the age of 40, while the remaining areas included a wider range of ages.

With regards to gender, 61% of the respondents interviewed were female and 39% were male (see Table 64 below).

Table 64: Gender of respondents

Age	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male	124	39	47	33	47	46	6	55	11	34	1	8	7	58	5	83
Female	195	61	97	67	55	54	5	45	21	66	11	92	5	42	1	17
Total	319	100	144	100	102	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	12	100	6	100

Note: excludes four missing cases

The high proportion of female community interviewers offers one explanation as to the higher proportion of female respondents. The high proportion of female respondents in Selby relates to the interviews being carried out through a local primary school which assisted with introductions to parents (primarily mothers).

Religion

We asked respondents about their religious beliefs through an open ended question (see Table 64 below).

Table 65: Religious beliefs

Religion	No.	%
Catholic	218	70
Christian	37	12
No religion	33	11
Orthodox	19	6
Buddhist	3	1
Protestant	2	1
Total	312	100

Note: excludes eleven missing cases

As can be seen, the majority of respondents were Christian (89%). Within this, people made specific reference to being '*Catholic*', '*Orthodox*', and '*Protestant*'. The majority of the sample identified themselves as Catholic (70%), while 11% of respondents stated that they had no religious beliefs. Three people identified themselves as Buddhist; two were Polish and one Czech.

Marital status and number of dependants

With regards to marital status, 26% of the sample were currently living with a spouse, while 24% were living with a partner. The remaining respondents (50%) were single (i.e. not living with a spouse/cohabiting). It needs to be taken into account, however, that the survey explored who the respondents were living with in the UK and some respondents may have had spouses/partners who were living in their home country.

Table 66: Number of respondents living with spouse/partner

	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Husband/wife	85	26	38	26	25	24	2	18	10	31	5	42	4	29	1	14
Partner	77	24	34	24	29	28	1	9	4	13	5	42	4	29	-	-
Single	161	50	72	50	49	48	8	73	18	56	2	16	6	42	6	86
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

We also wanted to explore how many respondents had their children with them in North Yorkshire. A total of 60 respondents (19% of the sample) were currently living with their children (see Table 67 below).

Table 67: Number of respondents living with their children

	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Living with sons/daughters	60	19	18	13	12	12	4	36	10	39	11	92	4	21	1	14

The number of children that people had ranged from one to three.

In addition, we wanted to explore the total number of children (under the age of seventeen) that were currently living with the respondents. Across the sample as a whole, there were 100 children. The majority of children were under five years old (42%), followed by eleven to seventeen years old (35%).

Table 68: Number of sons/daughters living with respondents in North Yorkshire

Number	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0 – 5	42	42	12	41	12	55	2	29	5	33	6	30	4	67	1	100
6 – 10	23	23	7	24	6	27	1	14	2	13	7	35	-	-	-	-
11 – 17	35	35	10	34	4	18	4	57	8	53	7	35	2	33	-	-
Total	100	100	29	100	22	100	7	100	15	100	20	100	6	100	1	100

Section 2: Migration Experiences

Introduction

This section aims to provide some information on the respondents' migration experiences, focusing specifically on their migration within the UK as well as the reasons given for coming to North Yorkshire.

Migration patterns prior to North Yorkshire

We asked all respondents if they had lived anywhere else in the UK prior to their local authority area (see Table 69 below).

Table 69: Have you lived anywhere else in the UK prior to this local authority area?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	76	24	39	27	20	19	3	27	6	19	1	8	4	29	3	43
No	247	76	105	73	83	81	8	73	26	81	11	92	10	71	4	57
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Nearly a quarter of respondents (24%) indicated that they had lived somewhere else in the UK prior to their current town/city. The respondents interviewed in Selby were least likely to have lived somewhere else (8%).

The respondents had moved to their local areas from a range of different places. London was mentioned most frequently; however, a number of people indicated that they had moved within the Yorkshire and the Humber region (a full list of towns/cities is included in Appendix 3 of this report).

Reasons for living in North Yorkshire

We asked all respondents to indicate, from a range of options, the main reason they had chosen to live in the area they were living rather than another town or city (see Table 70 below).

Table 70: Reasons for living in particular town/city

Reason	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Family/partner already living in area	90	28	32	22	32	31	2	18	10	31	9	75	3	23	2	29
Friends already living in area	75	23	41	28	25	24	1	9	5	16	1	8	1	8	1	14
Hear about area from other people	6	2	4	3	1	1	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Had a job to come to in the area	109	34	42	29	37	36	7	64	10	31	1	8	8	62	4	57
Heard there were job opportunities	19	6	9	6	5	5	-	-	3	9	1	8	1	8	-	-
Had no choice	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	21	7	16	11	3	3	1	9	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	322	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	13	100	7	100

Note: excludes one missing case

Over a third of respondents (34%) indicated that they moved to the study area because they had a job to come to in the area. This percentage was highest amongst those interviewed in Craven, Ryedale and Richmondshire (64%, 62% and 57% respectively).

Social networks, however, were also vital in the decision to move to North Yorkshire; for example, 28% already had family or a partner living there, while 23% already had friends living there.

With regards to those who indicated 'Other' reasons for coming to North Yorkshire the most common reasons given were to study; for money; and to learn English.

The data also shows that two respondents indicated that they had no choice in their decision to move to North Yorkshire. When asked to elaborate on why this was the case, one respondent said that their parents had made the decision and they had to follow. The remaining respondent did not provide an answer.

Frequency of home visits

Finally, we wanted to explore how often people visited their home country (see Table 71 below).

Table 71: How often do you visit your home country?

Frequency	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Once a month	4	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	29
Once every two months	5	2	1	1	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Once every three months	34	11	16	11	13	13	-	-	1	3	1	8	-	-	3	42
Twice a year	150	46	67	47	51	50	5	45	10	31	6	50	9	64	2	29
Once a year	94	29	42	29	24	23	5	45	14	44	4	33	5	36	-	-
Never	8	2	2	1	1	1	1	9	3	9	1	8	-	-	-	-
Other	28	9	15	10	9	9	-	-	4	13	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Looking across the sample, the majority of people (75%) visited their home country once or twice a year. Smaller numbers of people visited home more frequently (once a month or once every two months), while 11% visited quarterly. As can be seen, eight respondents stated that they never visited their home country.

With regards to those who indicated 'Other', a number suggested that they visited about three times a year, while others indicated visiting with less frequency: '*once in three years*', '*once in four to five years*'.

Section 3: Education & Qualifications

Introduction

This section focuses on the respondents' education, training and qualifications, including exploring people's English language skills.

Qualifications

The respondents were asked to provide information about their highest level of educational qualification, from a range of options, including both academic and vocational qualifications. The list of qualifications ranged from no formal qualifications through to postgraduate degrees (see Table 72 below).

Table 72: Highest level of educational qualification

Qualification	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Postgraduate Degree	96	30	52	36	28	27	4	36	4	13	3	25	4	29	1	25
Undergraduate Degree	61	19	30	21	17	17	2	18	7	22	3	25	2	14	-	-
Technical High School ⁶⁸	88	28	37	26	33	32	3	27	8	25	3	25	2	14	2	50
Non Technical High School	56	18	19	13	23	23	1	9	8	25	2	17	3	21	-	-
Basic school	10	3	3	2	1	1	-	-	3	9	1	8	2	14	-	-
No formal qualifications	7	2	2	1	-	-	1	9	2	6	-	-	1	7	1	25
Total	318	100	143	100	102	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	4	100

Note: excludes five missing case

⁶⁸ Technical high school, non technical high school and basic school were included after consultation with community interviewers at the community interviewer training session. Technical high school relates to those who have taken a vocational route, ending with a high-school diploma (for example, mechanic). Basic school relates to those who are not strong enough to pass exams to high school. These individuals can finish basic school, which prepare them to go into industry (for example, assistant car mechanic). Non technical high school is aimed at preparing people for higher education.

In line with previous research carried out with migrant workers, the people who were interviewed in North Yorkshire had a range of qualifications. Nearly half of the sample (49%) indicated that they had degree level qualifications (either undergraduate or postgraduate), with 30% having postgraduate qualifications. With regards to the postgraduate courses that people had undertaken, this included archaeology; biology; biomedical science; business studies; dental surgery; economics and marketing; engineering; geography; geology; history; international business management; international relations; language and literature; law; mathematics; nursing and midwifery; psychology; and sociology. The undergraduate courses included accountancy; business administration; economics; English; fashion design; finance; hospitality and tourism; hotel management and tourism; information technology; marketing; nursing; social work; and speech therapy.

The technical high school courses that people referred to included administration; building surveying; catering; construction; furniture design; marketing; mechanics; pharmacy technician; and tourism.

As can be seen, just seven respondents (2%) stated that they had no formal qualifications, while 3% had basic schooling.

English language skills

Level of English

We asked respondents to rate their English language skills on a scale of very good to very poor. English language skills were broken down to include:

- Ability to speak English;
- Ability to write English;
- Understanding of spoken English; and
- Understanding of written English.

Table 73: Ability to speak English

Rating	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very good	86	27	50	35	23	22	1	9	9	28	1	8	2	14	-	-
Good	125	39	45	31	46	45	7	64	13	41	7	58	5	36	2	29
Neither good nor poor	75	23	33	23	19	18	2	18	8	25	2	17	6	43	5	71
Poor	29	9	14	10	10	10	1	9	1	3	2	17	1	7	-	-
Very poor	8	2	2	1	5	5	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Table 74: Ability to write English

Rating	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very good	72	22	40	28	23	22	2	18	6	19	-	-	1	7	-	-
Good	118	37	48	33	37	36	5	45	16	50	7	58	3	21	2	29
Neither good nor poor	69	21	30	21	21	20	1	9	5	16	3	25	7	50	2	29
Poor	36	11	15	10	11	11	3	27	2	6	1	8	1	7	3	42
Very poor	26	8	11	8	11	11	-	-	1	3	1	8	2	14	-	-
Don't know	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Table 75: Understanding of spoken English

Rating	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very good	105	33	57	40	32	31	1	9	10	31	2	17	2	14	1	14
Good	144	45	55	38	46	45	9	82	19	59	5	42	7	50	3	43
Neither good nor poor	56	17	25	17	18	17	1	9	2	6	4	33	3	21	3	43
Poor	17	5	7	5	6	6	-	-	1	3	1	8	2	14	-	-
Very poor	1	<1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Table 76: Understanding of written English

Rating	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very good	105	33	57	40	30	29	4	36	9	28	2	17	2	14	1	14
Good	128	40	51	35	42	41	5	45	16	50	5	42	7	50	2	29
Neither good nor poor	58	18	26	18	18	17	1	9	3	9	4	33	4	29	2	29
Poor	22	7	6	4	10	10	1	9	2	6	-	-	1	7	2	29
Very poor	9	3	3	2	3	3	-	-	2	6	1	8	-	-	-	-
Don't know	1	<1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

On the whole, there were relatively small numbers of people who thought that their English language skills were poor or very poor. As can be seen, the respondents rated their ability to *understand* spoken and written English the highest (78% and 73% respectively indicated that they were good or very good at this), while being able to *write* English was the language skill that people appeared to have most difficulty with (19% of respondents felt they were poor or very poor at this).

Completion of language courses

Finally, we asked people to indicate, from a range of options, what their current situation was in relation to studying English (see Table 77 below).

Table 77: English language courses - which of the following apply to you?

Statement	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
I do not need an English language course	48	15	26	18	15	15	-	-	5	16	1	8	1	7	-	-
I have already completed an English language course	74	23	30	21	27	26	3	27	9	28	3	25	2	14	-	-
I am currently doing an English language course	49	15	15	10	18	17	1	9	6	19	2	17	5	36	2	29
I am on the waiting list for an English language course	13	4	3	2	1	1	-	-	2	6	2	17	3	21	2	29
I would like to study, but am not currently enrolled	102	32	45	31	37	36	7	64	7	22	4	33	1	7	1	14
I am not interested in an English language course	21	7	11	8	4	4	-	-	2	6	-	-	2	14	2	29
Other	16	5	14	10	1	1	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

As can be seen, over half of the sample (53%) stated that they were either currently studying, had already completed one or did not need an English language course. A small number of people (4%) were also on the waiting list for a course.

Nearly a third of the sample (32%) indicated that they would like to study on an English language course but were not currently enrolled, while 7% stated that they were not interested in a course. When asked to elaborate on why they were not currently enrolled, or why they were not interested in an English language course, the two main reasons given were having no time to undertake a course or not being able to attend because of working hours or shift patterns, both of which were often related to each other:

'Available courses are only in my working hours.'

'Because of work hours there is nothing suitable for me.'

'[I] don't have time, [I am] working all day.'

'I am working for [an] agency and always waiting for [them to] call. [I] never have [the] same day or time free.'

'I have two jobs - one in [a] hotel and other in the evenings. [I] don't have time for English courses.'

Some respondents also made reference to cost being an issue:

'I am not currently enrolled because the price of the English course is too expensive.'

'[I] don't have enough time or money.'

With regards to those who indicated 'Other', the following comments were made:

'[I] currently get private tuition paid by [my] employer.'

'I started but did not complete [the] English course.'

'[I] had a few lessons [on a] free course, but didn't complete.'

Two people indicated that they had already completed an English course but would like to do another.

Section 4: Employment

Introduction

This section explores the data in relation to issues of employment. It focuses on respondents' previous employment in their home country and their current employment, offering comparisons between the two. It also looks at other issues relating to their current employment such as official registration, rates of pay and hours worked.

In order to provide a more robust analysis of employment (both prior to and since coming to the UK), the information in relation to employment has been reclassified using the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC), which was revised in 2000⁶⁹ and provides a hierarchical classification of occupational skill. The relevant guidance has been used in relation to the application of these classification systems to the data gathered in North Yorkshire.

Previous employment in home country

This section explores people's employment situation prior to coming to the UK.

Trade or skill from home country

Before focusing on respondents' previous employment, we wanted to identify if they had a particular trade or skill (see Table 78 below).

⁶⁹ See ONS, *Internet reference:*
http://www.statistics.gov.uk/methods_quality/ns_sec/downloads/SOC2000_Vol1_V5.pdf

Table 78: Do you have a particular trade or skill?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	195	61	83	58	66	64	9	81	18	56	6	50	9	64	4	67
No	127	39	61	42	37	36	2	19	14	44	6	50	5	36	2	33
Total	322	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	6	100

Note: excludes one missing case

As can be seen, 61% of the sample indicated that they had a particular trade or skill from their home country. This percentage was highest amongst the respondents interviewed in Craven (81%, albeit based on a small sample size). When asked to elaborate on what this particular trade or skills was, the following responses were given:

- Accountant
- Archaeologist
- Baker
- Beautician
- Biomedical scientist
- Bookkeeping
- Builder
- Bus driver
- Business manager
- Butcher
- Car mechanic
- Carpenter
- Chef
- Chemical analyst
- Computer programmer
- Counsellor
- Dentist
- Doctor
- Dressmaker
- Driver
- Economist
- Electrician
- Electronic engineer
- Engineer
- English teacher
- Fabric designer
- Fashion designer
- Hairdresser
- IT technician
- Lab Technician
- Landscape gardener
- Lecturer (University)
- Librarian
- Metal work
- Midwifery
- Nurse
- Pharmacist
- Photographer
- Physiotherapist
- Real estate manager
- Sensory integration therapist
- Ski instructor
- Social worker
- Teacher
- Truck driver

In terms of how long people had spent in these trades or using these skills, this ranged from never using them to ten or more years (see Table 79 below).

Table 79: How long have you spent in this trade/using these skills?

Time period	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
None	20	10	12	14	4	6	2	22	1	6	-	-	1	11	-	-
Less than 1 year	16	8	8	10	5	8	2	22	1	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
1 – 3 years	58	30	21	25	22	33	1	11	8	44	1	17	3	33	2	50
4 – 6 years	35	18	15	18	13	20	1	11	3	17	2	33	1	11	-	-
7 – 9 years	12	6	3	4	6	9	-	-	1	6	1	17	-	-	1	25
10 or more years	54	28	24	29	16	24	3	33	4	22	2	33	4	44	1	25
Total	195	100	83	100	66	100	9	100	18	100	6	100	9	100	4	100

Previous job

We wanted to explore how many people were in employment prior to coming to the UK (see Table 80 below).

Table 80: Employment rates prior to coming to the UK

	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Employed	192	59	79	55	63	61	9	82	19	59	7	58	11	79	4	57
Self employed	20	6	9	6	8	8	1	9	1	3	1	8	-	-	-	-
Unemployed	29	9	13	9	9	9	-	-	3	9	1	8	2	14	1	14
Full time student	75	23	41	28	21	20	1	9	9	28	-	-	1	7	2	29
Homemaker/carer	7	2	2	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	3	25	-	-	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Nearly two thirds of the sample (65%) indicated that they were employed (including self employment) prior to coming to the UK, while 9% were unemployed. The respondents interviewed in Craven and Ryedale were most likely to have been employed prior to coming to the UK (91% and 79% respectively, although based on a small sample). In addition, just under a quarter of respondents (23%) were in full time education.

Table 81 below shows the job that people had prior to coming to the UK, based on the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC).

Table 81: Last job in home country (Standard Occupational Classification, SOC)

Occupation	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Managers and Senior Officials	11	5	4	5	5	7	-	-	1	6	1	14	-	-	-	-
Professional Occupations	36	17	19	22	16	23	-	-	1	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Associated Professional and Technical Occupations	41	20	20	23	8	11	4	40	4	22	3	43	2	20	-	-
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	14	7	3	3	6	8	1	10	2	11	1	14	-	-	1	25
Skilled Trades Occupations	26	13	7	8	8	11	1	10	6	33	-	-	4	40	-	-
Personal Service Occupations	12	6	5	6	2	3	1	10	2	11	1	14	1	10	-	-
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	29	14	11	13	15	21	1	10	-	-	1	14	1	10	-	-
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	12	6	5	6	5	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	10	1	25
Elementary Occupations	25	12	12	14	6	8	2	20	2	11	-	-	1	10	2	50
Total	206	100	86	100	71	100	10	100	18	100	7	100	10	100	4	100

Note: excludes six missing cases

As can be seen, the respondents were drawn from a range of occupational levels with 42% previously working in the three highest classifications (managers and senior officials; professional occupations; and associated professional and technical occupations). What is interesting to note is that just 12% were working in elementary occupations.

Table 82 below shows the occupational level by gender.

Table 82: Last job in home country (Standard Occupational Classification, SOC) by gender

Occupation	Male		Female	
	No.	%	No.	%
Managers and Senior Officials	5	6	6	5
Professional Occupations	8	9	28	24
Associated Professional and Technical Occupations	8	9	33	28
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	3	3	10	9
Skilled Trades Occupations	18	21	7	6
Personal Service Occupations	4	5	7	6
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	13	15	16	14
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	11	13	1	1
Elementary Occupations	16	19	9	8
Total	86	100	117	100

Note: excludes nine missing cases

The male respondents were more likely to have previously worked in skilled trades occupations (21% compared to 6% of female respondents), elementary occupations (19% compared to 8% of female respondents) or as process, plant and machine operatives (13% compared to 1% of female respondents).

The female respondents, on the other hand, had a higher percentage of nearly all of the remaining occupational levels, with professional occupations and associated professional and technical occupations being the most notable difference (52% compared to 18% of male respondents).

Employment experiences in North Yorkshire

This section focuses on people's employment experiences in the UK, including current levels of pay and hours worked, levels of official registration, information on recruitment, as well as looking at how respondents' current occupation compared to previous occupational classification and qualifications.

Employment rate

Table 83 below indicates the percentage of respondents who were currently in paid employment. As can be seen, there were high employment rates with 95% of the sample indicating that they were in paid employment. Of those not currently in paid employment, two respondents indicated that they were studying full time.

Table 83: Currently in paid employment

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	307	95	138	96	100	97	11	100	31	97	7	58	13	93	7	100
No	14	4	6	4	2	2	-	-	-	-	5	42	1	7	-	-
No – full time student	2	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

The length of time that people had been without paid employment varied from those who had been without employment for less than a month to those who had never worked in the UK. The majority of respondents, however, had been without paid employment for less than six months (see Table 84).

Table 84: How long have you been without paid employment?

Time period	Local Authority													
	All		York		Harrogate		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Less than 1 month	2	13	-	-	1	33	-	-	-	-	1	100		
1 – 3 months	3	19	2	33	-	-	-	-	1	20	-	-		
4 – 6 months	5	31	2	33	1	33	-	-	2	40	-	-		
7 – 12 months	1	6	1	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
More than 12 months	2	13	1	17	1	33	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Never worked in UK	3	19	-	-	-	-	1	100	2	40	-	-		
Total	16	100	6	100	3	100	1	100	5	100	1	100		

As can be seen, the sample in Selby appeared to have a higher unemployment rate; however, all of those without employment in Selby were female with dependant children. Looking at their marital status shows that the majority of them were married or had a partner, which could also suggest that they were dependent upon their husband or partner.

Current employment

Table 85 below shows the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) of the job that people currently held in North Yorkshire.

A full list of people's current job can be found in Appendix 4 of this report. This list is based on the specific responses given in the interviews.

Table 85: Current job (Standard Occupational Classification, SOC)

Occupation	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Managers and Senior Officials	10	3	6	4	1	1	-	-	3	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional Occupations	11	4	5	4	4	4	1	9	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Associated Professional and Technical Occupations	15	5	5	4	7	7	3	27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	4	1	-	-	3	3	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Skilled Trades Occupations	27	9	12	9	7	7	1	9	3	10	1	14	1	8	2	29
Personal Service Occupations	67	22	25	18	27	27	1	9	7	23	2	28	5	42	-	-
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	39	13	22	16	8	8	1	9	5	17	-	-	-	-	3	43
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	19	6	5	4	12	12	-	-	-	-	1	14	-	-	1	14
Elementary Occupations	112	37	57	42	31	31	4	36	10	33	3	43	6	50	1	14
Total	304	100	137	100	100	100	11	100	30	100	7	100	12	100	7	100

Note: excludes three missing cases

As can be seen, the respondents worked in a range of occupations; however, there was a concentration of respondents in elementary (37%), personal service (22%) and sales and customer service occupations (13%). None of the respondents in Ryedale, Richmondshire or Selby were currently employed in the top three classifications.

Comparison between home country and current occupation

The data indicates a shift in occupational level from home country employment to current employment in the UK. For example, the percentage of people employed in elementary occupations has increased from 12% to 37%, while those working in personal service occupations has increased from 6% to 22%. The percentage of people occupying the highest three levels has decreased from 42% to 12% (see Table 86).

Table 86: Comparison between home country and current job (SOC)

	Home country		Current	
	No.	%	No.	%
Managers and Senior Officials	11	5	10	3
Professional Occupations	36	17	11	4
Associated Professional and Technical Occupations	41	20	15	5
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	14	7	4	1
Skilled Trades Occupations	26	13	27	9
Personal Service Occupations	12	6	67	22
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	29	14	39	13
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	12	6	19	6
Elementary Occupations	25	12	112	37
Total	206	100	304	100

Comparing current occupation with highest level of qualification shows that 28% of those with postgraduate degree level qualifications and 22% of those with undergraduate degree qualifications were working in elementary occupations.

Travelling to current employment

The majority of respondents were less than five miles from their current employment. The furthest that anyone travelled to their current employment was sixty miles. This respondent was currently living in Harrogate.

We also wanted to explore how people travelled to their current job (see Table 87).

Table 87: Method of travelling to work

Method	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
On foot	113	37	52	38	34	34	3	27	17	55	2	29	1	8	4	57
Bicycle	24	8	13	9	5	5	1	9	2	6	1	14	2	15	-	-
Car/van	119	39	49	36	41	41	4	36	8	26	4	57	10	77	3	43
Bus (public transport)	31	10	13	9	13	13	2	18	3	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
Train	5	2	3	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transport provided by employer	5	2	2	1	2	2	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	10	3	6	4	3	3	1	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	307	100	138	100	100	100	11	100	31	100	7	100	13	100	7	100

The majority of people travelled to work by car or van (39%) or by foot (37%). This was followed by using public transport (10% of respondents). This appeared to be similar for respondents across the different local authority areas. A small number of respondents indicated that they travelled by train or had transport provided by their employer.

With regards to those who indicated 'other', two people stated that they got lifts from their friends, while the remainder indicated that they did not need to travel as they lived within their workplace (for example, hotel).

Recruitment

We also wanted to explore how people had found their current job in the UK.

Table 88: How did you find your current job?

	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Through friends/relatives already here	134	44	66	48	42	42	3	27	12	39	3	43	6	46	2	29
Contacted employer when I arrived in the UK	47	15	22	16	17	17	1	9	4	13	1	14	1	8	1	14
Contacted employer while in my home country	14	5	5	4	2	2	2	18	3	10	-	-	1	8	1	14
Job Centre Plus	23	7	9	7	7	7	1	9	2	6	2	29	2	15	-	-
Employment/recruitment agency in home country	16	5	9	7	3	3	1	9	2	6	-	-	1	8	-	-
Employment/recruitment agency in UK	34	11	14	10	12	12	1	9	5	16	1	14	-	-	1	14
Other	39	13	13	9	17	17	2	18	3	10	-	-	2	15	2	29
Total	307	100	138	100	100	100	11	100	31	100	7	100	13	100	7	100

As can be seen, the majority of respondents had found their current job through family or friends (44%). This was followed by those who had contacted employers themselves in the UK (15%) and those who had found employment through a UK agency (11%).

With regards to those who indicated 'other' methods of finding employment, the most common responses were internet (31%) and newspaper advert (26%). People also made reference to being self employed, finding work through 'word of mouth' and shop window adverts.

Security of employment

Table 89 below shows the level of security of people's current employment.

Table 89: Security of employment

	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Temporary	38	12	17	12	9	9	2	18	7	23	-	-	1	8	2	29
Permanent	249	81	113	82	87	87	8	73	20	65	6	86	12	92	3	42
Fixed term contract	9	3	4	3	2	2	1	9	1	3	1	14	-	-	-	-
Seasonal/Ad hoc	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	29
Don't know	5	2	2	1	1	1	-	-	2	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	3	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	306	100	137	100	100	100	11	100	31	100	7	100	13	100	7	100

Note: excludes one missing case

As can be seen, the majority of respondents (81%) indicated that they had a permanent contract in their current employment, while 12% had a temporary contract. Interestingly, five respondents currently did not know what type of contract they had (three were working in elementary occupations, one in personal service and one in sales and customer service).

With regards to the respondents who indicated 'other', one person was self employed, while the two remaining respondents indicated that they had jobs for an undetermined period (one of whom was employed through an agency).

Official registration

We asked those who were currently working to indicate whether or not they were currently registered on the Worker Registration Scheme (WRS) (only applicable to A8 nationals).

Table 90: Official registration (WRS)

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	219	79	95	81	83	90	4	44	16	59	10	83	10	77	1	14
No	38	13	14	12	5	5	4	44	6	22	2	17	1	8	6	86
Don't know	21	8	9	8	4	4	1	11	5	19	-	-	2	15	-	-
Total	278	100	118	100	92	100	9	100	27	100	12	100	13	100	7	100

As can be seen, 79% of respondents indicated that they were currently registered on the Worker Registration Scheme (WRS), while just 13% were not. Twenty-one respondents stated that they did not know.

We asked the respondents from Bulgaria and Romania if they had authorisation to work (i.e. an Accession Worker Card). The majority (94%) indicated that they had authorisation to work; however, two respondents indicated that they did not know.

Table 91: Official registration (A2 nationals)

Response	Local Authority											
	All		York		Harrogate		Carven		Scarborough		Ryedale	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	30	94	17	100	7	88	1	50	4	100	1	100
No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	2	6	-	-	1	12	1	50	-	-	-	-
Total	32	100	17	100	8	100	2	100	4	100	1	100

We also asked all respondents if they had registered for payment of National Insurance contributions.

Table 92: Official registration (NINo)

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	303	95	137	96	98	97	8	73	29	91	10	83	14	100	7	100
No	14	4	5	4	3	3	2	18	3	9	1	8	-	-	-	-
Don't know	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	9	-	-	1	8	-	-	-	-
Total	319	100	142	100	101	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Note: excludes four missing cases

The majority of respondents had registered for a National Insurance number, with 4% indicating that they had not and two people who did not know.

Hours and pay

The majority of respondents worked between thirty and forty hours per week (54%) followed by between forty-one and fifty hours per week (19%) see (Table 93 below).

Table 93: Number of hours per week

Hours	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
16 hrs or less	24	8	12	9	6	6	-	-	3	10	2	29	1	7	-	-
17 – 29	39	13	21	15	9	9	1	9	5	17	2	29	1	7	-	-
30 – 40	166	54	74	54	57	57	7	64	14	47	2	29	8	57	4	57
41 – 50	59	19	18	13	24	24	2	18	8	27	1	14	4	29	2	29
51 – 60	13	4	10	7	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
61 – 70	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	14
71 hrs or more	2	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	307	100	138	100	100	100	11	100	30	100	7	100	14	100	7	100

Nineteen people suggested that they worked more than fifty hours per week, with two people indicating that they worked more than seventy-one hours per week (these individuals were currently working in personal service and sales and customer service occupations). There was no discernible pattern, however, between occupation and number of hours worked, with a range of different hours worked across the occupational classifications.

Respondents' weekly wages ranged from £100 or less to £451 or more (see Table 94 below).

Table 94: Current weekly pay

Amount	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
£100 or less	25	8	10	7	6	6	1	10	5	17	1	14	-	-	2	28
£101 – £150	26	9	14	10	6	6	-	-	3	10	2	28	1	7	-	-
£151 – £200	47	16	31	23	9	9	1	10	3	10	-	-	2	14	1	14
£201 – £250	82	27	38	28	26	27	-	-	10	34	3	43	5	36	-	-
£251 – £300	59	20	21	15	27	28	5	50	4	14	-	-	1	7	1	14
£301 – £350	21	7	8	6	7	7	1	10	2	7	-	-	2	14	1	14
£351 – £400	20	7	7	5	8	8	1	10	-	-	1	14	2	14	1	14
£401 – £450	4	1	1	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	14
£451 or more	16	5	7	5	5	5	1	10	2	7	-	-	1	7	-	-
Total	300	100	137	100	96	100	10	100	29	100	7	100	14	100	7	100

Note: excludes seven missing cases

Nearly half of respondents (47%) were earning between £200 and £300 per week, with less than a quarter of people (20%) earning over £300 week. The majority (88%) of the respondents earning less than £100 per week were currently working less than twenty-nine hours per week; however, three individuals were working between thirty and fifty hours a week. The lowest paid individual was currently being paid £101 – £150 per week for working between fifty-one and sixty hours. This individual was therefore earning between £1.68 and £2.94 per hour. Eighteen respondents were currently earning below the national minimum wage⁷⁰; however, given that a range was offered to respondents for both wages and hours per week, this number may be higher. For example, twenty-nine people were currently working thirty to forty hours per week and earning somewhere between £151 – £200 per week. These respondents could therefore be earning anywhere between £3.78 and £6.66 per hour.

With regards to who was paying them (i.e. employer, agency, etc.), the majority of respondents (90%) were being paid directly by their employer, while the remainder were being paid by an agency/labour provider, with the exception of one respondent in Ryedale who indicated that the money they received was statutory maternity pay.

We also wanted to explore if any deductions were made from people’s wages, from a range of options.

Table 95: Deductions from pay

	No.	%
Accommodation	23	7
Transport to/from work	8	3
Food (during work)	11	4
Clothing/equipment	12	4
Tax/National Insurance	285	93
Other	21	7

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the most common deduction made from people’s wages, was Tax/National Insurance (93% of respondents). Twenty-three people had deductions made for accommodation. A small number of people also had deductions made for clothing or equipment that were needed at work (4%), food during work (4%) and transport to and from work (3%).

With regards to the ‘other’ deductions that people referred to, this included pension contributions; Trade Union membership; Student Loan payments; and personal accident insurance.

⁷⁰ £5.73 per hour for persons over the age of twenty-two.

Section 5: Housing

Introduction

This section looks at the respondents' accommodation experiences in North Yorkshire. It focuses specifically on their current housing situation, as well as looking at future accommodation preferences and aspirations.

Housing experiences in North Yorkshire

The following section looks at the data for North Yorkshire in terms of number of homes; current property type/tenure; property size; levels of overcrowding; conditions; and rent levels.

Previous accommodation

We asked people to indicate how many different homes they had lived in since they had been in North Yorkshire, including their current property. The number of properties people had lived in ranged from one to six different properties (see Table 96).

Table 96: Number of homes

Number	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One	68	21	27	19	18	17	5	45	11	34	4	33	2	14	1	17
Two	85	26	27	19	38	37	3	27	7	22	3	25	5	36	2	33
Three	94	29	47	33	24	23	3	27	10	31	5	42	2	14	3	50
Four	37	11	22	15	11	11	-	-	1	3	-	-	3	21	-	-
Five	16	5	9	6	4	4	-	-	2	6	-	-	1	7	-	-
Six	22	7	12	8	8	7	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	7	-	-
Total	322	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	6	100

Note: excludes one case

The majority of people (76%) had lived in one to three different homes since their arrival in North Yorkshire, with three homes being the most common response. The respondents interviewed in York, Harrogate, Scarborough and Ryedale showed a higher percentage of people who had lived in a number of different properties; for example, 29% of the respondents in York had lived in four or more properties.

Current accommodation type and tenure

Table 97: Accommodation type

Accommodation type	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Detached house	19	6	8	6	8	8	1	9	1	3	-	-	-	-	1	14
Semi-detached house	64	20	26	18	19	18	2	18	7	22	3	25	4	29	3	43
Terraced house	99	31	45	31	30	29	4	36	9	28	7	58	3	21	1	14
Detached bungalow	1	<1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other bungalow	4	1	3	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Flat (purpose built block)	63	20	33	23	13	13	3	27	10	31	1	8	3	21	-	-
Flat (converted house)	55	17	16	11	28	27	-	-	4	13	1	8	4	29	2	29
Caravan/mobile structure	1	<1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	17	5	12	8	3	3	1	9	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

As can be seen, the most common type of accommodation was living in a flat, either purpose built or in a converted house (37% of respondents). This was followed by living in a terraced house (31% of respondents). One respondent indicated that they were currently living in a caravan.

With regards to those who indicated 'Other', individuals made reference to the following: 'block with single dorms'; 'letting a room', 'room in shared accommodation'; 'staff house'; and 'staff accommodation in hotel'. With regards to the latter comment, there were five people who indicated that they currently lived at a hotel.

Table 98: Current tenure

Tenure type	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Owns without a mortgage	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	2	14	-	-
Owns with a mortgage	20	6	10	7	3	3	-	-	4	13	2	17	1	7	-	-
Council rented	3	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	7	-	-
HA rented	1	<1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private rented – landlord	164	50	73	51	48	47	9	82	18	56	2	17	8	57	6	86
Private rented – letting agent	95	29	42	29	39	38	-	-	5	16	8	66	-	-	1	14
Rented from friends/family	12	4	6	4	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Provided by employer	15	5	8	6	3	3	2	18	2	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bed & Breakfast	1	<1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	9	3	2	1	3	3	-	-	2	6	-	-	2	14	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

In line with previous research with migrant workers, the sample in North Yorkshire shows a dominance of the private rented sector, with half of the sample renting from a private landlord and a further 29% renting a property through a letting agency. Just three respondents across the whole sample indicated that they were living in a property rented from the council (these were living in York, Harrogate and Ryedale) and only one was living in a housing association property (again, in York).

With regards to those who indicated 'Other', the comments included the following: '*living in hotel*'; '*rented from my boss*'; '*accommodation provided by my husband's employer*'; '*rented from the estate*'; and '*temporarily rent from acquaintance*'.

We asked those who were currently living in some form of rented accommodation if they had a tenancy agreement; 79% of respondents indicated that they did, 19% did not, while 3% did not know.

Looking at the tenure of respondents shows that all of the socially rented tenants had a tenancy agreement. With regards to those living in private rented accommodation, 83% of those renting from a private landlord and 94% of those renting through a letting agency had a tenancy agreement. None of the people renting from family/friends had a tenancy agreement, while just 20% of those accommodated by their employer had a tenancy agreement.

The people who did not know whether they had a tenancy agreement or not were currently living in accommodation provided by their employer and accommodation rented from a private landlord.

For those that had a tenancy agreement, we also wanted to know if they understood it; 80% indicated that they fully understood it, while 12% said they partly understood it. The remaining respondents were divided between those who had not read it (6%) and those who did not understand it (2%).

We also wanted to ascertain how people had found their current home in North Yorkshire, from a range of options including both formal and informal methods (see Table 99).

Table 99: How did you find your current home in North Yorkshire?

	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Arranged for me before I arrived in the UK	14	4	5	3	4	4	1	9	2	6	2	17	-	-	-	-
Friends/family already living in area	123	38	59	41	43	42	2	18	8	25	3	25	3	21	5	71
UK employer arranged it for me	14	4	9	6	1	1	2	18	1	3	-	-	-	-	1	14
Via local newspaper	35	11	12	8	12	12	3	27	7	22	1	8	-	-	-	-
Via local estate agent	48	15	18	13	17	17	-	-	6	19	3	25	4	29	-	-
Via a letting agent	48	15	18	13	16	15	1	9	7	22	3	25	2	14	1	14
Other	40	12	22	15	10	10	2	18	1	3	-	-	5	36	-	-
Total	322	100	143	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Note: excludes one missing case

People's social networks clearly play a key role in finding accommodation with 38% of people finding their current home through friends or family. There were, however, a wide range of other methods referred to; for example, 30% had found accommodation through an estate or letting agent and 11% through local newspapers. In addition, fourteen people indicated that their accommodation had been arranged by their UK employer.

With regards to those who indicated 'Other', the most frequent response (40%) was '*Internet*'; however, the other comments included: '*window advertisement*'; '*connected with the estate*'; '*council*'; and '*work colleagues*'.

Rent or mortgage payments

Table 100 below show the rent or mortgage levels being paid per month by the respondents in North Yorkshire.

Table 100: Rent or mortgage level paid per month

Amount	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than £200	33	10	21	15	5	5	1	10	1	3	-	-	2	14	3	50
£201 - £250	45	14	27	19	9	9	2	20	6	20	1	8	-	-	-	-
£251 - £300	30	10	12	8	8	8	2	20	4	13	-	-	3	21	1	17
£301 - £350	23	7	12	8	5	5	-	-	2	7	1	8	2	14	1	17
£351 - £400	26	8	10	7	10	10	1	10	5	17	-	-	-	-	-	-
£401 - £450	27	9	7	5	10	10	1	10	3	10	2	17	3	21	1	17
£451 - £500	36	11	11	8	18	18	2	20	2	7	3	25	-	-	-	-
£501 - £550	26	8	10	7	10	10	-	-	2	7	3	25	1	7	-	-
£551 - £600	29	9	12	8	11	11	-	-	3	10	-	-	3	21	-	-
£601+	29	9	16	11	11	11	-	-	-	-	2	17	-	-	-	-
Don't know	3	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't pay	8	3	4	3	3	3	1	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	315	100	143	100	100	100	10	100	30	100	12	100	14	100	6	100

Note: excludes eight missing cases

The rent or mortgage payments people were making varied from less than £200 per month to more than £600, with no particular amount standing out as most common. Perhaps unsurprisingly, those who were buying their own home paid more per month; however, there was overall no discernible pattern between amount paid and tenure, with a number of people living in private rented accommodation paying a relatively high level of rent.

Of the respondents who were currently paying rent, a quarter indicated that the amount paid also included fuel bills.

With regards to how fuel bills were paid, 57% of respondents divided the cost equally between family/housemates, 37% indicated that they paid the full cost themselves, while 6% indicated that family/housemates contributed but not necessarily equally.

Living arrangements

In order to explore respondents current living arrangements we asked them to indicate how many people were sharing each bedroom within their property and whether or not they were family members. The maximum number of people within a household who were currently sharing a bedroom was three people, with eleven instances of this occurring.

In 10% of cases, people indicated that they were sharing bedrooms with people who were not their family member or partner. All of the respondents who were currently sharing with non-family members, were sharing with one other person. The respondents who were sharing with two other people, were all sharing with family members.

We also wanted to explore the bedroom size of those who were currently sharing. Twenty-one of the respondents who were sharing bedrooms indicated that these were single rooms (two of these were sharing with two other people).

Finally, we asked people to indicate whether or not their current accommodation gave them enough space (see Table 101 below).

Table 101: Does your accommodation have enough space?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	251	79	104	73	85	83	9	82	26	84	9	75	12	86	6	86
No	63	20	36	25	15	15	2	18	5	16	3	25	2	14	-	-
Don't know	5	2	2	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	14
Total	319	100	142	100	102	100	11	100	31	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Note: excludes four missing cases

As can be seen, 20% of respondents stated that they did not have enough space in their current home. We asked those who did not currently have enough space to elaborate on why this was the case. The main reasons given included the rooms or the property

generally being too small; needing additional rooms; and; too many people living in the property. The following are some of the comments that were made:

*'...we are four adults, we don't have dining area and very small kitchen and living room.'
[It] could have one more bedroom and in general the flat could be bigger.'*

'Four people share [a] bathroom and toilet.'

'I don't have enough space for my belongings.'

'We've got two bedrooms and now we have four people.'

'We need an extra bedroom because we use the living room as a bedroom.'

Overall satisfaction with accommodation

We wanted to explore people's overall satisfaction with their current accommodation (see Table 102 below).

Table 102: Overall satisfaction with current accommodation

Satisfaction level	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very satisfied	120	38	58	41	29	28	5	45	11	35	7	58	8	57	2	29
Fairly satisfied	135	42	49	34	56	55	5	45	12	39	4	33	5	36	4	57
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	36	11	21	15	8	8	1	9	5	16	-	-	-	-	1	14
Fairly dissatisfied	21	7	11	8	6	6	-	-	3	10	1	8	-	-	-	-
Very dissatisfied	8	3	4	3	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	7	-	-
Total	320	100	143	100	102	100	11	100	31	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Note: excludes three missing cases

The majority of the sample stated that they were fairly or very satisfied with their current accommodation (80%), with 10% indicating that they were dissatisfied. None of the respondents interviewed in Craven or Richmondshire suggested that they were dissatisfied with their current property (albeit based on smaller sample sizes)

The respondents who were dissatisfied with their current property were primarily living in private rented accommodation (either through a landlord or letting agent) or living in accommodation provided by their employer.

General housing problems and issues

We asked respondents if they had experienced any problems with housing while living in North Yorkshire; 84% of respondents indicated that they had not. The people who had experienced problems referred to the following, in order of frequency: problems with landlords (including bonds not being returned); problems with housemates; poor conditions; overcrowding; financial problems (in relation to being able to afford a bond); and difficulty getting references. These were some of the comments that were made:

'As a newcomer it is difficult to pay the deposit and to provide a reference for the letting agencies.'

'Before, when I was alone I lived with roommates. It was very noisy. Landlord did not want to improve anything.'

'[My] ex-landlord tried to refurbish my room for six months and I had to stay in living room which I shared with his Chinese worker.'

'Landlord didn't give me bond back and there was no reason why.'

'Landlord increased payment for rent which was simply too much considering the state of the flat.'

'One letting agency refused to show some houses because of being Polish!'

Respondents were also asked where they would go for general housing advice. Interestingly, the most common response was the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) (21% of respondents). This was followed by the council (19%) or a letting agent (15%). An additional 15% of respondents said that they did not know where they would go for housing advice. Individuals also made reference to employers, church, university and solicitors.

Understanding of entitlement

We also wanted to explore if people felt that they understood their rights and entitlement in relation to housing (see Table 103 below).

Table 103: Do you understand your rights/entitlement in relation to housing?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	173	54	75	53	51	50	5	45	18	56	9	90	12	92	3	43
No	145	46	67	47	52	50	6	55	14	44	1	10	1	8	4	57
Total	318	100	142	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	10	100	13	100	7	100

Note: excludes five missing cases

As can be seen, the sample was divided fairly evenly between those who understood their housing rights/entitlement and those who did not. This was common across the sample with the exception of Ryedale and Selby where the majority of respondents understood their entitlement (albeit based on smaller sample sizes).

Homelessness/rough sleeping

The survey also sought information in relation to any experiences of homelessness. This included sleeping rough but also staying with friends/family because they had nowhere else to live.

In total, ten people indicated that they had experienced homelessness/rough sleeping since living in North Yorkshire (eight were interviewed in York, one in Harrogate and one in Scarborough). This section looks at the causes of this and what support they received.

Causes of homelessness/rough sleeping

With regards to the main causes of people's homelessness/rough sleeping, four people stated that their homelessness/rough sleeping was caused by them arriving with no planned accommodation; one person had experienced the non-violent breakdown of a relationship with a partner; one indicated that they had become homeless as a result of racially motivated harassment against them; and one had been evicted due to rent arrears. Two respondents also provided additional reasons:

'Bad atmosphere, violent behaviour between other tenants.'

'Finished tenancy agreement before another became available.'

Help and support to come out of homelessness

Six respondents indicated that they sought help when they were homeless/sleeping rough; four from family/friends and two from their local council. Those who indicated that they did not seek support referred to managing the situation on their own.

When asked how they came out of being homeless six people said that they moved into private rented accommodation, while one moved into socially rented accommodation. One respondent indicated that they moved in with a British family as an au pair. The remaining two respondents did not provide an explanation of how they came out of this situation.

We also asked them what could have prevented them from becoming homeless. Nine of the ten respondents provided an answer. The responses included:

'Better choice of place to live in the first place.'

'Cheaper rent and bonds.'

'Extending my tenancy agreement.'

'Finding a property before moving out.'

'Finding accommodation before [I] came to [the] UK.'

'More information about private accommodation on [the] internet.'

One respondent indicated that nothing could have prevented their situation, while another said that they did not know.

Finally, we asked all respondents to indicate what help and support they would expect to receive from their local council if they became homeless. The responses, in order of frequency, included: *'accommodation'*; *'temporary shelter'*; *'advice on where to find a home'*; *'financial help'*; and *'help to find a job'*. Some respondents also indicated that they did not know, or that they would not expect any help.

Accommodation intentions and aspirations

This final section focuses on respondents' future accommodation intentions, particularly in relation to whether they will move in the future and what type of property they would want to move to.

Intentions to move to a new property

Table 104 below shows how many respondents intended moving to a different property in the next three years.

Table 104: Do you think you will move to a different property in the next three years?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	177	55	86	60	58	57	1	9	16	50	3	25	9	64	4	57
No	63	20	21	15	28	27	3	27	5	16	5	42	1	7	-	-
Don't know	62	19	31	22	13	13	5	45	6	19	2	17	3	21	2	29
I am happy where I am	19	6	5	3	3	3	2	18	5	16	2	17	1	7	1	14
Total	321	100	143	100	102	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Note: excludes two missing cases

Over half of the sample (55%) indicated that they intended to move to a different property over the next three years. This percentage was highest amongst the respondents interviewed in York (60%). As can be seen, a number of people indicated that they did not know if they would move (19% of respondents). Just over a quarter of the sample (26%) did not intend moving; however, just 6% actually stated that they were 'happy where they were'.

We also asked those who intended to move, what type of accommodation they would like.

Table 105: Future accommodation preference

Tenure type	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Council rented	16	9	6	7	5	9	-	-	2	13	2	67	1	11	-	-
HA rented	8	5	3	3	1	2	-	-	1	6	-	-	2	22	1	25
Private rented	80	45	43	50	25	43	-	-	8	50	-	-	3	33	1	25
Owner occupation	39	22	16	19	12	21	-	-	5	31	1	33	3	33	2	50
Shared ownership	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	22	12	14	16	7	12	1	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know the housing options	11	6	3	3	8	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	177	100	86	100	58	100	1	100	16	100	3	100	9	100	4	100

The majority of respondents (45%) indicated that their future preference was to live in private rented accommodation. This was followed by those who wanted to buy their own home (22%). Only one person stated that they would like a shared ownership option (perhaps suggested a lack of understanding in relation to this tenure), with 14% across the sample wanting to live in socially rented accommodation. Eleven respondents (6%) indicated that they did not know the housing options available to them.

With regards to the respondents who indicated 'other', just over a third (36%) stated that they would be going back to their home country, while 23% indicated that they would live in a property rented through a letting agency (again indicating a preference for private rented accommodation). The remaining respondents gave a number of responses, some of which related to cost being a key issue:

'I would like cheaper renting as my wage is minimum.'

'Whatever is the cheapest - renting from [the] council maybe.'

One respondent indicated that they would be moving to university accommodation, while another said they would be moving to another property provided by their employer:

'My employer will send me to another property which I am going to live in and restore.'

Respondents were asked to elaborate on why they had a particular preference. With regards to those who wanted a council property, the responses related to affordability and conditions:

'As I'm in York it's the most affordable option, private renting or buying is too expensive.'

'Council has cheaper houses than private landlords.'

'Council would take better care of the property.'

Those who wanted to live in the private rented sector also referred to affordability; however, respondents also talked about the perceived ease and flexibility of the sector:

'Because I can't afford my own flat; council housing is too much paper work.'

'Because you don't have to pay agency fee or other extra costs.'

'Easiest and quickest way.'

The people who had aspirations to buy their own home primarily referred to investment and stability issues:

'Because owning a property is a good investment.'

'Because we are going to stay in the UK for good.'

'Because I want to stay in the UK and buy my own property.'

Section 6: Community & Neighbourhood

Introduction

This section offers some insight in relation to respondents' lives in North Yorkshire outside the workplace. In particular it looks at issues of community relations, focusing on people's views on living and working in North Yorkshire, sense of involvement with the local community and perceptions of safety and security in the study area.

Views on their specific neighbourhood

Before exploring people's views on their neighbourhood we wanted to find out the reason they lived in that particular neighbourhood. Respondents were able to select all responses that applied from the list of options shown in Table 106 below.

Table 106: Reasons for living in their specific neighbourhood

Reasons	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Family living in this neighbourhood	38	12	10	7	16	16	2	18	4	13	2	17	2	14	2	29
Friends living in this neighbourhood	104	32	39	27	42	41	3	27	9	28	6	50	4	29	1	14
It is near work	129	40	51	35	46	45	4	36	13	41	2	17	8	57	5	71
I have no choice	41	13	19	13	10	10	2	18	4	13	3	25	2	14	1	14
Other	84	26	43	30	30	29	2	18	7	22	-	-	2	14	-	-

Social networks were important in people's decisions to live in a particular neighbourhood; for example, 44% of respondents indicated that they had either friends or family living in the neighbourhood. Proximity to work was also a key factor (40%).

As can be seen, just over a quarter (26%) indicated 'other' reasons. When asked to elaborate on these other reasons, people primarily referred to it being a 'good area' or 'near to local facilities and amenities'. A small number of respondents also referred to affordability and availability.

In addition, 13% said that they had no choice about where to live. The reasons given for having no choice related to the affordability and availability of properties in those areas.

We also asked people to indicate to what extent they were satisfied or dissatisfied with their local area on a scale from very satisfied to very dissatisfied (see Table 107 below).

Table 107 : Level of satisfaction with local area

Satisfaction level	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very satisfied	145	45	68	47	45	44	6	55	12	38	5	42	8	57	1	14
Fairly satisfied	148	46	62	43	47	46	5	45	17	53	7	58	5	36	5	71
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	26	8	13	9	9	8	-	-	3	9	-	-	-	-	1	14
Fairly dissatisfied	3	1	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	7	-	-
Very dissatisfied	1	<1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

The majority of respondents (91%) were either fairly satisfied or very satisfied with their local area, while less than 2% suggested that they were dissatisfied. None of the respondents interviewed in Craven, Scarborough, Richmondshire or Selby said that they were dissatisfied with their local area.

The respondents who were dissatisfied with their local area made reference to anti-social behaviour as the reason for their dissatisfaction:

'Council flats in [the] area make problems and people are anti-social.'

'People in [the] neighbourhood are noisy, [they] don't work, partying all the time.'

'Too loud, too busy.'

Aspirations to move to a different area

Finally, we asked respondents if they would like to move out of their neighbourhood and to another area; 18% of respondents indicated that they would like to move (see Table 108 below).

Table 108: Would you like to move to another area?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	58	18	34	24	13	13	1	9	6	19	1	8	1	7	2	29
No	191	59	77	53	72	70	6	55	18	56	9	75	6	43	3	43
Don't know	74	23	33	23	18	17	4	36	8	25	2	17	7	50	2	29
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

We asked those who wanted to move to another area what was stopping them from moving. The majority of people indicated that lack of money was currently preventing them; however individual respondents also made reference to being tied into a contract at their current accommodation; being close to work; not being able to find anything suitable; and not wanting to move away from friends.

Community engagement

This section will look at the data in relation to contact and sense of cohesion with members of the wider community.

Sense of cohesion

We wanted to explore to what extent respondents felt that their local neighbourhood was a place where people from different backgrounds mixed well together (see Table 109 below).

Table 109: Do you agree/disagree that your neighbourhood is a place where people from different backgrounds mix well together?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Definitely agree	114	35	52	36	33	32	5	45	11	34	5	42	4	31	4	57
Tend to agree	132	41	54	38	45	44	5	45	14	44	5	42	6	46	3	43
Tend to disagree	15	5	6	4	3	3	-	-	4	13	1	8	1	8	-	-
Definitely disagree	5	2	4	3	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	39	12	25	17	9	9	1	9	2	6	1	8	1	8	-	-
Too few people in the local area	5	2	-	-	3	3	-	-	1	3	-	-	1	8	-	-
The people are from the same background	12	4	3	2	9	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	322	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	13	100	7	100

Note: excludes one case

As can be seen, three quarters of respondents (76%) agreed that their neighbourhood was an area where people from different backgrounds mixed well together. Just 7% disagreed (none in Craven or Richmondshire), while 12% stated that they did not know.

Contact with other people

We wanted to explore how much contact the respondents in our sample had with people from their home country, as well as with British people (see Tables 110 and 111).

Table 110: Contact with people from home country

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A lot	122	38	63	44	36	35	3	27	6	19	9	75	4	29	1	14
Quite a lot	99	31	41	28	35	34	2	18	14	44	1	8	4	29	2	29
A little	88	27	35	24	28	27	6	55	8	25	2	17	6	43	3	43
None at all	14	4	5	3	4	4	-	-	4	13	-	-	-	-	1	14
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Table 111: Contact with British people

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A lot	133	41	63	44	47	46	4	36	11	34	1	8	6	43	1	14
Quite a lot	117	36	51	35	35	34	4	36	14	44	6	50	6	43	1	14
A little	67	21	27	19	19	18	3	27	7	22	4	33	2	14	5	71
None at all	6	2	3	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	1	8	-	-	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Interestingly, respondents were more likely to have contact with British people than people from their home country; for example, 77% had ‘a lot’ or ‘quite a lot’ of contact with British people compared to 69% who had ‘a lot’ or ‘quite a lot’ of contact with people from their country. Fourteen respondents had no contact with people from their home country, compared to six people who had no contact with British people (these respondents were living in York, Harrogate and Selby). With regards to the respondents who currently had no contact with British people, three people gave the following reasons:

‘English people don’t want to interact with Polish.’

‘Nobody has offered me their friendship so far.’

‘Not enough free time for rest and social life.’

Perceptions of safety and security

This section focuses on respondents' experiences of crime, as well as overall feelings of safety in their local area.

Experiences of crime and hate crime

We wanted to establish the extent to which people or members of their family had been the victim of any crime (including hate crime) while living in North Yorkshire. In total, ninety respondents (28%) indicated that they had experienced some form of crime or anti-social behaviour.

Table 112: Experiences of crime

Experience of crime	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Crime against property	37	11	19	13	12	11	-	-	2	6	1	100	3	21	-	-
Crime against person	14	4	10	7	2	2	-	-	2	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hate crime	33	10	15	10	15	15	-	-	2	6	-	-	1	7	-	-
Anti-social behaviour	41	13	18	13	17	17	2	18	3	9	-	-	-	-	1	100
Other	7	2	3	2	3	3	1	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

As can be seen, 13% of the sample indicated that they had experienced some form of anti-social behaviour. Thirty-three people had experienced hate crime (10%). These respondents were primarily living in York and Harrogate, with two living in Scarborough and one in Ryedale. Just one respondent in Richmondshire and one in Selby had experienced any type of crime or anti-social behaviour.

With regards to those who indicated 'other', one person indicated that their bike had been stolen and one had had their car scratched. Two people said that their children had experienced bullying in schools. The remaining respondents did not elaborate on what other type of crime they had experienced.

We also wanted to ascertain whether or not people sought help when they had been victims of crime or anti-social behaviour (see Table 113 below).

Table 113: Did you go to anyone for support/assistance?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	46	52	25	60	19	59	-	-	1	14	-	-	1	33	-	-
No	43	48	17	40	13	41	3	100	6	86	1	100	2	67	1	100
Total	89	100	42	100	32	100	3	100	7	100	1	100	3	100	1	100

Note: excludes one missing case

The sample was divided fairly evenly between those who had sought assistance when they had experienced crime or anti-social behaviour and those who had not.

Overall feelings of safety

Linking in with the issues raised above, we also wanted to ascertain if migrant communities felt safe or unsafe when outside in their local area during the day and after dark (see Tables 114 and 115 below).

Table 114: How safe or unsafe do you feel when outside in your local area during the day?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very safe	236	73	102	71	84	82	9	82	19	59	9	75	9	64	4	57
Fairly safe	76	24	34	24	19	18	1	9	12	38	3	25	5	36	2	29
Neither safe nor unsafe	6	2	3	2	-	-	1	9	1	3	-	-	-	-	1	14
Fairly unsafe	2	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very unsafe	1	<1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	2	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

A small number of respondents (three) indicated that they felt unsafe in their local area during the day. These were all living in York.

Table 115: How safe or unsafe do you feel when outside in your local area after dark?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very safe	113	35	43	30	45	44	5	45	9	28	4	36	5	36	2	29
Fairly safe	136	42	64	44	33	32	5	45	17	53	7	64	8	57	2	29
Neither safe nor unsafe	42	13	17	12	16	16	-	-	6	19	-	-	1	7	2	29
Fairly unsafe	21	7	13	9	6	6	1	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	14
Very unsafe	4	1	2	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	6	2	5	3	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	6-	-	-	-
Total	322	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	11	100	14	100	7	100

Note: excludes one missing case

None of the people interviewed in Scarborough, Ryedale or Selby indicated that they felt unsafe in their local areas after dark.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, people were more likely to feel safe in their local area during the daytime (97% felt very or fairly safe during the day, compared to 77% after dark). The number of people feeling very safe saw the biggest decrease from 73% during the day to 35% after dark.

Finally, we wanted to explore if people felt safe in their home at night.

Table 116: Do you feel safe in your home at night?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Very safe	210	65	99	70	70	68	9	82	13	41	5	45	10	77	4	57
Quite safe	89	28	29	20	31	30	1	9	15	47	7	64	3	23	3	43
Not so safe	6	2	3	2	2	2	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not safe at all	3	1	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Never alone at home at night	12	4	8	6	-	-	1	9	3	9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	1	<1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	321	100	143	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	13	100	7	100

Note: excludes two missing cases

The majority of people (93%) felt very or quite safe in their home at night. Three respondents indicated that they did not feel safe at all in their own home. They were currently living in York.

Section 7: Access to Goods, Services & Facilities

Introduction

This section looks at people's level of engagement with and use of local facilities and services. This focused on what facilities people were currently accessing, including health care, schools, etc. as well as looking at issues such as benefit take-up.

Access to health care

This section focuses on people's use of health care services, as well as any particular health care needs that they, or members of their family had.

Services used

Respondents were asked if they currently used/accessed any of the following health care services: GP/Doctor; dentist; Accident and Emergency (A & E); health visitor; midwife; NHS walk-in centre; and NHS Direct.

A GP/Doctor was the most common service that was currently being used (81% of respondents), followed by a dentist (see Table 117 below). The sample shows that a number of people were also using Accident and Emergency (A & E), walk-in centres and NHS Direct.

Table 117: Use of health services

Service	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
GP/Dr	263	81	111	77	88	85	10	90	26	81	10	83	14	100	4	57
Dentist	78	24	38	26	16	16	3	27	10	31	2	17	8	57	1	14
Accident and Emergency (A & E)	61	19	29	20	20	19	-	-	5	16	3	25	4	29	-	-
Health Visitor	26	8	8	6	8	8	-	-	4	13	1	8	5	36	-	-
Midwife	25	8	8	6	6	6	1	9	2	6	1	8	7	50	-	-
Walk-in Centre	60	19	48	33	3	3	1	9	3	9	1	8	4	29	-	-
NHS Direct	64	20	28	19	17	17	1	9	8	25	6	50	2	14	2	29
Other	11	3	2	1	6	6	1	9	1	3	-	-	1	7	-	-

The level of registration with a Dr/GP appeared to be highest amongst the respondents in Craven (90% of those interviewed) and Ryedale (all of the respondents interviewed).

The 'Other' health services that people were currently using included: '*baby clinic*'; '*BUPA*'; '*family planning clinic*'; '*optician*'; and '*occupational therapist*'.

We asked those who currently did not access a GP/Doctor or dentist to indicate where they would go if they had any health or dental problems. The majority of respondents indicated that they would return to their home country, particularly for dental treatment. A small number of people stated that they would use a walk-in centre, the local hospital or register with a GP if they ever had any health problems.

Particular health needs

We also asked respondents if they, or any members of their family who were living with them, had any particular health problems or disabilities.

Table 118: Do you or any of your family living with you have any health problems?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	25	8	9	6	12	12	1	9	3	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	289	91	132	94	88	86	9	82	28	90	12	100	14	100	6	86
Don't know	4	1	-	-	2	2	1	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	14
Total	318	100	141	100	102	100	11	100	31	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Note: excludes five missing cases

Just 8% of respondents indicated that they, or members of their family, had a particular health problem or disability. The health problems that were referred to were: allergies; asthma; back pain; diabetes; eczema; hearing problems; kidney disease; and heart disease.

Section 8: Education for Children

Introduction

This section will explore whether or not respondents' children (who were of school, nursery or college age) were attending local schools, nurseries or colleges and what additional support children received, if required.

School/nursery/college attendance

Across the sample, a total of thirty-six people (11%) had children attending a local school/college/nursery. The respondents were from all local authority areas, with the exception of Richmondshire. Seven respondents had nursery aged children, but did not send their children to nursery. These respondents all indicated that it was too expensive.

Learning support in schools

Of the respondents whose children were attending school/college/nursery, eleven (31%) stated that their children received additional support to help with their learning. Three respondents did not know if their children received additional support, while the remaining respondents said they did not. When asked to elaborate on what type of help or support their children received, the most common response was assistance with English language, in particular people made reference to additional language tuition.

Section 9: Benefit Take-Up

Introduction

This section explores the level of benefit take-up amongst the respondents, including looking at people's understanding of their entitlement.

Levels of take-up

The data shows that a quarter of the sample (25%) were currently accessing some form of benefit in the UK. Looking at this in greater detail reveals that benefits that were taken up most frequently were those relating to children; for example, Child Benefit (19% of respondents) and Child Tax Credits (15% of respondents). Very few people were currently claiming Job Seekers Allowance (three respondents), with just one person claiming Income Support. (see Table 119 below).

Table 119: Benefit take-up

Benefit	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Housing Benefit	13	4	4	3	4	4	-	-	2	6	3	25	-	-	-	-
Child Benefit	62	19	15	10	18	17	3		9	28	12	100	4	29	1	14
Job Seekers Allowance	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	2	17	-	-	-	-
Income Support	1	<1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Council Tax Benefit	15	5	7	5	1	1	-	-	2	6	4	33	-	-	1	14
Sickness & Incapacity Benefit	3	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Child Tax Credits	48	15	13	9	10	10	2		8	25	9	75	5	36	1	14
Working Tax Credit	29	9	10	7	5	5	2		5	16	4	33	2	14	1	14

Understanding of entitlement

We also wanted to explore if people felt that they understood their rights and entitlement in relation to benefits (see Table 120 below).

Table 120: Do you understand your rights/entitlement in relation to benefits?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	177	55	81	56	51	50	5	45	18	56	11	92	9	64	2	29
No	146	45	63	44	52	50	6	55	14	44	1	8	5	36	5	71
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Similar to people's understanding of entitlement to housing (see Table 103 earlier), the sample was divided fairly evenly between those who did and those who did not understand their entitlement to benefits. Again the respondents interviewed in Selby had a greater level of awareness.

Section 10: Other Goods, Services & Facilities

Introduction

This section looks at respondents' use of a range of other different goods and services, including local facilities and financial services.

Local facilities/services

Respondents were asked if they currently used/accessed any of the following local services or facilities: community centre/social club; libraries; local church/place of worship; children's centres; sports facilities; public transport; job centres; shops; and colleges.

Table 121 below shows the level of use of such services.

Table 121: Use of selected services

Service	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Community centre/social club	64	20	33	23	14	14	2	18	5	16	4	33	4	29	2	29
Libraries	239	74	103	72	84	82	8	73	21	66	10	83	11	79	2	29
Local church/place of worship	145	45	63	44	52	50	3	27	12	38	6	50	9	64	-	-
Children's centres	47	15	18	13	10	10	-	-	6	19	7	58	6	43	-	-
Sports facilities	170	53	67	47	66	64	5	45	22	69	2	17	7	50	1	14
Public transport	246	76	113	78	87	84	9	82	23	72	2	17	10	71	2	29
Job Centres	169	52	71	49	57	55	6	55	20	63	4	33	9	64	2	29
Shops	306	95	141	98	101	98	11	100	30	94	4	33	13	93	6	96
Colleges	64	20	15	10	27	26	3	27	7	22	3	25	7	50	2	29

Perhaps unsurprisingly, shops were being accessed the most (95%). Public transport (76%) and libraries (74%) were also commonly being accessed. Just under half of the sample were currently attending a local church or place of worship, while 20% accessed a community centre or social club. Children's centres were accessed the least (15% of respondents). This percentage was higher in Ryedale and Selby (43% and 58% respectively, albeit based on smaller sample sizes).

With regards to those who indicated that they were at college, when asked what they were studying the majority of respondents referred to English language courses; however, respondents also made reference to currently being at University, as well as referring to individual courses such as accountancy, AutoCAD, business management, health care and music.

Council services

In addition to the services and facilities outlined above, 38% of the sample also indicated that they had had contact with their local council (see Table 122 below).

Table 122: Have you had contact with your local council?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	122	38	44	31	40	39	2	18	15	47	11	92	8	57	2	29
No	194	60	99	69	63	61	7	64	15	47	1	8	6	43	3	42
Don't know	7	2	1	1	-	-	2	18	2	6	-	-	-	-	2	29
Total	323	100	144	100	103	100	11	100	32	100	12	100	14	100	7	100

Interestingly, seven people indicated that they did not know if they had contact with their local council.

Those who currently had no contact with their local council were asked to indicate the reason why they had no contact, from a range of options (see Table 123 below).

Table 123: Why have you had no contact with your local council?

Why no contact	No.	%
Never needed to	175	90
Language barriers	17	9
They are only open during 'office hours'	12	6
Didn't know where to go	6	3
Difficulty finding/contacting the right person	4	2

As can be seen, people primarily felt that they had no reason to contact the council, with smaller numbers of people making reference to issues around language barriers and access to council services.

With regards to those who had contact with their local council, the most common reasons for having contact with the council were: housing; benefits; schools; council tax; and refuse collection.

We also asked those who had contact with their local council if they had experienced any problems with this contact.

Table 124: Problems with contacting local council

Problems	No.	%
Language barriers	11	9
They are only open during 'office hours'	8	7
Difficulty finding/contacting the right person	4	3
Didn't know where to go	2	2

A relatively small number of people made reference to language barriers and access issues. With regards to those who had problems because of 'office hours', the majority indicated that they would like to be able to contact someone at evenings and weekends.

Section 11: Future Intentions

Introduction

This section provides information with regards to respondents' future intentions and aspirations. It focuses specifically on how long people anticipate staying in North Yorkshire, whether or not they will return to their home country, as well as any intentions to be joined by other family members.

Intended length of stay in North Yorkshire

Table 125 below shows how much longer people intended to stay in North Yorkshire.

Table 125: Intended length of stay in North Yorkshire

Length of stay	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than 6 months	16	5	6	4	6	6	1	9	1	3	-	-	-	-	2	29
6 months – 1 year	18	6	10	7	6	6	-	-	2	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
1 – 2 years	26	8	8	6	11	11	2	18	3	10	-	-	1	8	1	14
2 – 3 years	18	6	11	8	5	5	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	1	14
3 – 4 years	4	1	3	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4 – 5 years	8	3	5	3	2	2	-	-	-	-	1	8	-	-	-	-
5 years or more	36	11	12	8	12	12	4	36	4	13	1	8	3	23	-	-
Indefinitely	55	17	16	11	26	25	-	-	6	19	3	25	4	31	-	-
Don't know	139	43	72	50	34	33	4	36	14	45	7	59	5	38	3	43
Total	320	100	143	100	103	100	11	100	31	100	12	100	13	100	7	100

Note: excludes three missing cases

As can be seen, 17% of respondents intended to stay in North Yorkshire indefinitely. This percentage was much higher amongst the respondents interviewed in Harrogate, Ryedale and Selby (the latter two albeit based on smaller sample sizes). An additional 11% of

respondents indicated that they intended to stay for five years or more. A quarter of respondents (25%) intended leaving within the next three years. As can be seen, however, the majority of people (43%) did not know how long they would stay in North Yorkshire.

Future destination

For the respondents who gave a time specific answer in relation to how long they intended to stay, we wanted to explore where they expected to go once they left North Yorkshire (see Table 126 below).

Table 126: Future destination

Destination	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Home country	72	62	31	58	28	67	3	50	4	50	1	100	2	67	3	75
Another country	23	20	15	28	6	14	-	-	2	25	-	-	-	-	-	-
Another part of the UK	22	19	7	13	8	19	3	50	2	25	-	-	1	33	1	25
Total	117	100	53	100	42	100	6	100	8	100	1	100	3	100	4	100

Note: excludes nine missing cases

The majority of people stated that they would be returning to their home country (62%). When asked why this was the case, the two main responses related to missing family and friends, or more generally missing their home country:

'Because my whole family and close friends still live in my home country and that is my only 'real home'.'

'[I] want to live in Poland because [I am] missing friends, family, etc.'

'I have home, friends and family in Bulgaria.'

Interestingly, some respondents wanted to return home because they perceived opportunities in their home country to be improving. This was particularly the case amongst the Polish respondents:

'I feel it's better in Poland now.'

'[There are] more career opportunities in Poland.'

Looking at Table 126 above, it can be seen that 20% of those who intended to leave North Yorkshire stated that they would be going to another country. When asked which countries people intended to move to, a range of responses were given including Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand and Spain.

When asked why they intended to go to another country, the most frequent responses were wanting new experiences; having friends or family already living in these countries; and the perception that there were more opportunities in these countries.

Returning to the table, 19% of respondents indicated that they would be moving to another part of the UK. In terms of where people were going, again a range of responses were given including Cambridge, the Lake District, London and Scotland. Over a quarter of those asked, however, did not know where they were going to move to, although some indicated that they wanted to move to a bigger city or would go where the opportunities were:

'[A] bigger city, [I] haven't decided yet.'

'Possibly London, Manchester, Newcastle or Leeds.'

'[It] depends on job opportunities.'

When asked to elaborate on why they were moving to another part of the UK, the responses again included the perception that there were better opportunities:

'I would like to try something new and I think there are bigger chances to do what I want.'

'[It] offers more opportunities.'

One respondent wanted to move to be nearer to the major airports.

Family reunification

We wanted to explore whether or not any of the respondents in our sample would be joined by other members of their family (see Table 127 below).

Table 127: Will you be joined by other family members?

Response	Local Authority															
	All		York		Harrogate		Craven		Scarborough		Selby		Ryedale		Richmondshire	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	34	11	11	8	12	12	1	9	5	16	-	-	2	17	3	43
No	235	75	110	77	74	74	10	91	20	65	12	100	8	67	1	14
Don't know	46	15	21	15	14	14	-	-	6	19	-	-	2	17	3	43
Total	315	100	142	100	100	100	11	100	31	100	12	100	12	100	7	100

Note: excludes eight missing cases

The majority of respondents (75%) indicated that they would not be joined by other family members, while 11% said that they would. The remaining respondents indicated that they did not know.

We asked the thirty-four people who suggested that they would be joined by family members when this was likely to happen. The majority (53%) said that they would be joined by family over the next two years. A further 12% would be joined by family over the next two to five years. Over a third (35%) did not know when their family would join them.

In terms of how many family members would be joining them, the majority of respondents (79%) indicated that they would be joined by just one other family member, with the remainder indicating more than one (for example '*wife and child*'). With regards to which family members would be joining them, perhaps unsurprisingly, people most frequently referred to siblings, spouses, parents and children. A small number of people also referred to other family members such as cousins.

Chapter 8: Emerging Themes & Recommendations

Introduction

This final chapter of the report draws together the key findings from the range of evidence gathered for the study and identifies a number of key recommendations. Given the different sample sizes from each of the participating local authorities it is difficult in many cases, to link directly individual recommendations with each authority. In many cases the proposed recommendations are relevant to all seven local authorities and the City of York.

The evidence from the study confirms that the BME community within North Yorkshire is ethnically diverse and is dynamic as a result of the influx of new asylum seeker and refugee communities and inward migration from Central and Eastern Europe and further afield. Hence, this study can only represent a snap-shot of the issues facing the community at this point in time. What is evident from the study, however, is that the issues facing the 'new' communities, as opposed to the more established ones, are on one hand, especially in terms of awareness of services provision, universal, while on the other, distinctive and reflecting the economic and social characteristics of the individual groups. A second significant feature, highlighted in the introduction to this report is that the A8 and A2 migrant worker groups do not necessarily perceive themselves as belonging to the wider BME community. This has important implications for service providers in terms of the way in which they promote their services: this distinction needs to be addressed in the way marketing strategies for the 'BME community' are developed and implemented.

The first part of this chapter considers the main issues derived from the BME community research and the proposed recommendations are grouped around the following core themes: language and language support needs; awareness and use of services; housing needs and aspirations; social isolation and personal safety; sense of place; unmet housing-related support needs; health-related support; and specialist accommodation.

Part two of this chapter will focus on the A8 and A2 migrant research findings.

BME Community: Emerging Issues & Recommendations

Language and support needs

Evidence from the research suggests that there are a significant number of BME households within the study area where at least one member was unable to either read or write in English or speak English (around one in four) and this was found to be a particular issue among those from the Other ethnic group. At the same time, access to translation and interpretation services was seen as problematic either due to a lack of awareness of the availability of such services or where to go to access them. As a consequence, there was a heavy reliance on 'informal' means of translation/interpretation by other family members or friends. The message from the stakeholders consulted also emphasised the lack of 'routine' translation services being available within some localities. While it was suggested that Language Line was available, this was not necessarily promoted widely in minority languages. Also, some of the voluntary and community organisations expressed concern about the costs associated with using this service. The lack of information provided in minority languages by some service providers, while at the same time, around three out of ten within the BME community wanted to have written information provided in their own minority language, can act as a major barrier to accessing services within North Yorkshire.

It is recommended that:

- ***All service providers ensure that they have access to translation and interpretation services and that such availability is promoted within the BME communities in their minority languages; and***
- ***All councils should consider supporting the voluntary and community organisations within their locality to access appropriate translation and interpretation services where the agency provides services complementary to that of the statutory sector.***

Awareness and use of services

Not only was concern expressed by some of the service providers about the level of awareness of local services among the BME community, but the survey evidence would seem to confirm this. First, there was quite limited use of specific services by the community such as financial advice, housing advice, social services and particularly, housing-related support. Secondly, one third of the community and especially those living in Selby and Scarborough, requested support or help to enable them to access local services. It should also be noted that there was a strong tendency among the community to find out about such services from family and friends rather than the individual service providers themselves. The reliance on more 'informal' means of dissemination could result in misinformation being communicated, further reducing access to such services. The impact of the lack of information about these services provided in minority languages has been noted above.

It is recommended that:

- ***The Council and its partners develop a common approach to ethnic monitoring which all service providers in the Borough should be encouraged to use to monitor the take-up of specific services;***
- ***Service providers review the extent to which information about the services they provide is reaching members of the BME community; and***
- ***Those Councils and their partners who do not currently provide a resource pack which summaries the range of services and agency contact details within the Borough and which is targeted at the different BME communities should be encouraged to do so. Those Councils that have already produced such pack need to ensure that it is being targeted at those communities most in need of such information.***

Housing needs and aspirations

There are important tenure differences between the various BME community groups and this is reflected nationally: especially the relatively high level of home ownership among the Asian community and the reliance on the social housing sector by the Black community. However, unlike other parts of the country, the study highlighted that a large proportion of the BME community within North Yorkshire are reliant upon the private rented sector and tied accommodation. This does not necessarily reflect their choice of tenure: among the potential mover group (this in itself is a high figure (50.0%) and could also reflect a desire to move to a different tenure) there was an aspiration for home ownership, with the proportion wanting to live in either the private rented sector or in tied accommodation lower than current actual levels. It was also found that the demand for social housing was greater than the current level and taking into account the relatively high proportion noted above who wanted support to access housing advice, the current comparatively low level of occupancy in the social housing sector could reflect a general lack of understanding about how to access this tenure. The study also found that the BME residents in particular parts of North Yorkshire are more likely to live in specific tenures. For example, there is a very large reliance on tied accommodation among Selby residents (8 out of 10) while around four out of ten of those from York and Scarborough are in the private rented sector. Hence given the point made earlier about lack of awareness of services and particularly housing advice, it is likely that private renting or tied accommodation is not necessarily the tenure of choice.

A second issue identified by the research is the sense among one quarter of the community that they have insufficient space for their households needs and this was found to be most marked among those from Selby and Craven. In addition, slightly more than one fifth of those consulted felt that they were living in overcrowded conditions and this perception ranged by local authority area, although a common element was that overcrowding was a particular problem among those living in tied accommodation followed by those renting privately.

A small group (less than 1 in 10) also felt that their current accommodation did not meet their cultural or religious needs, such as the lack of a defined area within their home for prayers or additional reception rooms for visitors.

It is recommended that:

- ***Attention is given to ensuring that the BME community is fully aware of all the housing options available within the locality;***
- ***Specific policies are developed by the council to tackle the level of overcrowding among the BME community;***
- ***Action is taken to regulate the private rented sector and tied accommodation in line with new national guidance to ensure that it is of an appropriate standard and size; and***
- ***Cultural and religious needs are taken into account in assessing the housing needs of those looking to rent in the social housing sector.***

Social isolation and personal safety

There is significant evidence that some BME households experience a high level of social isolation having little or no contact with friends, other family members not living with them or indeed neighbours. This is not necessarily relevant to those living in the more rural parts of North Yorkshire, although geography will have a bearing. This sense of social isolation is further re-enforced by the fact that one third of those consulted wanted help or support to enable them to meet up with other members of their ethnic group. Also, there was felt to be a need for support to enable them to access community-based activities and a place of worship. It should also be noted that one third wanted support to find out more about British social and cultural norms, suggesting that they had little exposure to the wider community. The lack of social networks has an impact on awareness of local services, especially as was noted above, the heavy reliance on family and friends to find out about such services.

The BME community has experience of different types of crime to various degrees, with experience of hate crime (15%) and anti-social behaviour (23%) being particularly evident. The findings also show that those from the Mixed community are the most likely to experience such crimes and in terms of geography, those from York were the most likely to be victims. This was also found to be the case in terms of those who were the most fearful of being a victim of crime and especially hate crime and anti-social behaviour (primarily an issue for those from the Mixed community and York). Within this context it is perhaps not surprising that firstly, nearly one fifth of the respondents did not feel safe outside in their neighbourhood after dark and there was an identifiable demand for a range of home security features, such as a burglar alarm, as well as a perceived need for more community safety measures, such as a greater police presence and the installation of CCTV. It must be noted, however, that many BME households could live in the more undesirable areas which already experience relatively high levels of crime and other forms of anti-social behaviour. It was also suggested that greater emphasis should be given to promoting better relations between community members/neighbours.

It is recommended that:

- ***Practical measures are identified by the Council and its partners to promote greater social integration both within and between the different ethnic groups;***

- ***Targeted publicity is made available to the BME community regarding community events that they may wish to participate in especially among those living in more rural areas;***
- ***Opportunities are identified which encourage members of the BME community to interact with people from different cultural backgrounds and hence, learn more about British norms and customs;***
- ***The Council and its partners develop practical support to those who are a victim of crime including hate crime and anti-social behaviour;***
- ***The Council and its partners publicise the availability of home security measures; and***
- ***The Council and its partners look to develop specific community safety initiatives in areas where the BME community reside to improve the sense of personal and community safety.***

Sense of place

Despite concerns about personal and community safety, the vast majority of the BME community consulted were positive about their local area and this was particularly the case among those from Craven and Harrogate. However, a significant group had little or no sense of belonging or attachment to their area and this was especially found to be the case among those from Selby. This could reflect the fact that they have little social interaction with other people within the vicinity (e.g. neighbours) and/or having only been at their current property for a relatively short period of time (although this does not preclude them having moved home within an area). This could also be a contributing reason why a relatively high proportion (as noted above) expressed an aspiration to move home. The potential impact of this lack of a sense of belonging is that they may not fully participate in community-based activities which can contribute to a sense of social and cultural isolation.

It is recommended that:

- ***Specific neighbourhood-based activities are developed which are attractive to the local BME community and which encourage a greater sense of involvement and attachment to the area; and***
- ***The Council and its partners should review current community-based activities and groups to ensure that they are accessible to all members of the local community.***

Unmet housing-related support needs

A small number of households were currently in receipt of some form of external support and the vast majority of these felt that this support met their needs. However, there was a degree of unmet need for support among some of the households with undertaking everyday household tasks, such as cleaning although in most cases the level of support required was described as 'a little.' While the level of documented unmet demand for housing-related support services is relatively low, it must be seen within the context that many among the BME community have not traditionally

accessed such services, such support being provided by their extended family or own community. As awareness of the availability of services increases, coupled with a declining reliance upon informal family care, the level of demand for such services is likely to increase.

In addition, between one out of ten and two out of ten felt that they needed support with claiming benefits dealing with correspondence and generally accessing services. Lack of English language skills and awareness of what services are available locally are likely to contribute significantly to this support need.

In addition to the recommendations concerning translation and interpretation services and increased promotion of local services available within the BME community the following specific recommendation is suggested:

It is suggested that:

- ***Where current support is provided informally by family members, such individuals are made aware of the type of support they can receive to assist them with this role; and***
- ***More target promotion of housing-related support services needs to be undertaken and specifically increase the awareness of such services among the BME community.***

Health-related support

A range of health problems were identified among the BME respondents and their families, most notably arthritis, high blood pressure and diabetes. In the majority of cases they were in receipt of treatment for such ailments. A small minority of households (around 4%) contained someone who was an informal full-time carer and one third of this group suggested that this individual required external support in the sense of a financial contribution and the availability of culturally sensitive support services.

While some properties have already been adapted for a household member with a long-term health problem or disability, there was demand for a range of property adaptations, such as a downstairs toilet, bathroom grab rails and access ramps outside and inside the property. However, there was some confusion about identifying and installing the most appropriate types of adaptations for their own circumstances (13% need support to do this) and over one quarter of those who felt that they needed such adaptations did not know which agency to contact for advice or guidance.

It is recommended that:

- ***Additional support services are targeted at supporting current informal carers within the family; and***
- ***The range of property adaptations is promoted widely among the BME community and advice on how to organise such installations.***

Specialist accommodation

On the basis of the findings from the study there is evidence of a small need for some forms of specialist accommodation, especially accommodation with an emergency alarm (5%), accommodation without stairs (93%) and wheel-chair accessible accommodation. However, given the comments above generally concerning lack of awareness of services it is likely that the level of knowledge among the BME community of the various forms of specialist accommodation available locally is quite low. Hence, the level of identified need is likely to reflect low levels of awareness more so than it does the actual need within the community.

It is suggested that:

- ***Providers of specialist accommodation undertake a promotional campaign targeted at the BME community which explains the range of accommodation available.***

Migrant Worker Community: Emerging Issues & Recommendations

Introduction

The aim of this element of the study was quite wide ranging focusing specifically on employment, housing, education, community integration, access to selected services and future intentions. Naturally, given the broad spectrum of issues covered the study raises a number of pertinent issues which may require further investigation. The study covered a range of nationalities from seven of the eight local authority areas and as noted above, it should be noted in relation to the BME community, the migrant worker community is also dynamic, with migration patterns and experiences not only influenced by the UK and more specifically the local economy but also by the economic situation in their home country and other European countries. Hence, this study while providing a range of baseline information about these communities in North Yorkshire will need updating in the future to reflect these potential future migration patterns.

The main issues identified by the research and associated recommendations are grouped under the following headings: employment; language barriers; accommodation; homelessness; community cohesion and involvement; access to services; and future intentions.

Employment

There are a number of issues to highlight in relation to employment. Firstly, in line with previous research, the A8 and A2 migrant workers interviewed in North Yorkshire were diverse in terms of their skills and experiences. This ranged from those with degrees and higher degrees (49%) to a minority with no formal qualifications (2%). In addition, 61% of people indicated that they had a particular skill or trade, many of whom had been using this skill or trade for a number of years. Looking at the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC), people were drawn from a range of different occupations, from elementary occupations through to professional, managers and senior officials. Comparing previous and current employment however, shows a shift downwards in occupational level with the majority now employed in elementary occupations. This is also evidence of limited occupational mobility. There is therefore a 'mis-match' between people's skills and qualifications and appropriate jobs and this in part is likely to reflect a lack of recognition by employers in the North Yorkshire of overseas qualifications.

The second issue to highlight is the potential exploitation of lack of rights that migrant workers experience (e.g. legal minimum wage levels and 'normal' hours of work).

Thirdly, in contrast to similar research elsewhere in the country, the vast majority of migrant workers were in some form of paid employment and very few were unemployed, an important feature given the currently increasing jobless rate nationally. Some employers still regard migrant workers as an important labour force due to their reliability, work ethic and skill level.

The research evidence does suggest that some migrant workers are not registered on the WRS or NINO, suggesting that the official figures of the number of migrant workers in the North Yorkshire area could be an under-estimation.

It is recommended that:

- ***Agencies providing advice in relation to employment need to offer comprehensive guidance in relation to what employment opportunities are available to migrant workers according to their qualifications and skills;***
- ***Local employers should be encouraged to adopt ‘best practice’ in terms of migrant workers as advocated by organisations such as the Migrant Workers North West which has produced a ‘Minimum Standards Charter’; and***
- ***Greater attention should be given to ensuring that migrant workers are aware of their rights and entitlements under employment.***

Language barriers

Perhaps unsurprisingly, acquisition of English language remains a key issue for migrant communities. There is a clear link between language and employment for example, with English language being vital for occupational mobility. There is also a huge body of research which highlights the importance of English language in terms of settling into communities and community integration.

Both migrant workers themselves and the stakeholders consulted made reference to language barriers. For example, 11% of the migrant workers felt that they were poor at speaking English and 19% poor at writing in English. There is also an unmet need for English language tuition (32%) with a general lack of time on the part of the migrant worker and long working hours prohibiting accessibility to English tuition. Information provided by some of the employers suggests that some will ‘use’ migrant workers with good English language skills as informal translators/interpreters in the workplace a situation which will simply reinforce the low level of language skills that people possess.

An understanding of English is also crucial to finding out about local services and the study suggests that the lack of interpretation services and information provided in minority languages impacts adversely on their awareness and use of particular services. For example, language barriers were one of the reasons given for not contacting their local council. At the same time, it should be recognised that not all migrant workers are willing to formerly learn English which has an implication for the level of demand for such language tuition.

It is recommended that:

- ***English language tuition is extended and available at more convenient times for migrant workers (i.e. provision of flexible learning opportunities);***
- ***Local employers are encouraged to identify ways of improving the English language skills of migrant workers, such as working in partnership with local colleagues and adult education providers, and mentoring within the workplace; and***

- ***Service providers need to have access to translators and interpreters with the relevant migrant worker minority languages and publicise to the community the availability of Language Line or a similar service.***

Accommodation

This research like previous studies has shown an overwhelming dominance of migrant workers living in the private rented sector. This is perhaps to be expected given that the majority of people find their accommodation through family and friends or other people from their home country who are themselves living in this tenure. The tenure is generally characterised as being very accessible and 'affordable' but at the same time, of variable quality. Research from other recent studies in Bolton, Nottingham and Peterborough suggest that many migrant workers have low expectations of their housing when they come to this country. This reflects the lower priority given to housing compared with their desire to earn a good living and improve their English skills and their housing experience in their home country, which in many cases, by comparison, is of a poorer standard. However, evidence suggests that many migrant workers have limited knowledge of their housing options and therefore are unable to make an informed choice about their housing. There are four specific issues to highlight in relation to accommodation.

First, there is an issue around accommodation standards and possible exploitation in relation to housing. The study suggests that a number of people are living in Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and sharing bedrooms with non-family members. Around 15% were unsure where to go for housing advice. Although this has been highlighted in a number of previous studies, it remains a pervasive issue.

Second, a number of migrant workers are living in tied accommodation and monies are deducted from their wage/salary to pay for this. However, little is known about the standard of this accommodation and the extent to which they are 'required' to occupy such accommodation as a pre-requisite of their job.

Third, there is evidence that a number of migrant workers have experience of homelessness (3%), especially when they first arrive in the area and have not secured accommodation. While some of this group have sought advice from a number of local services, others have had to manage themselves. There is a view that the Councils need to provide more information about the housing options available to them to help them avoid becoming homeless.

Fourth, there is a need to consider the implications of people's future accommodation aspirations. Although only a minority are currently living in the social rented sector (less than 2%), 14% would prefer to live in this tenure in the future. There are implications to explore in terms of a potential increase in demand for socially rented accommodation in future years. There are also potential community cohesion issues that may arise from this, particularly as there is often a misguided perception that migrants receive preferential treatment with regards to housing.

It is recommended that:

- ***A review is undertaken of the private rented sector to ensure that accommodation standards are appropriate;***

- ***A resource pack is produced which highlights the range of housing options available to migrant workers in the vicinity as well as advice and support agencies who can assist them with accessing housing;***
- ***Further investigation is undertaken to examine the standard and role of tied accommodation for migrant workers;***
- ***Homeless providers ensure that the information about the services they provide is targeted at the migrant worker community; and***
- ***Social housing providers need to promote the awareness of this sector to migrant workers.***

Community cohesion and involvement

This research has highlighted two issues around community cohesion and integration. The first is the level of hate crime and anti-social behaviour experienced by migrant workers (10% and 13% respectively) and more specifically, the fact that nearly half of those who were victims of such crimes did not seek support or assistance. Experience of such crimes is also likely to impact on an individual's sense of personal safety and 8% reported that they did not feel safe in the area where they lived at night.

Second, the majority of migrant workers were more likely to have contact with British people than people from their own national group, while the majority felt that the area where they lived people from different backgrounds mixed well together. However, for a small minority (7%) this was not the case.

It is recommended that:

- ***Greater encouragement is given to migrant workers to report hate crime and anti-social behaviour and increase their awareness of the types of services available to support victims of such crimes; and***
- ***Initiatives need to be developed which promote a sense of belonging for migrants and increase social interactions with local communities and, where required, with members of their own national group.***

Access to services

Access to and use of services varied according to the type of service in question. The findings do suggest that some migrant workers are reliant on emergency health care provision (such as attending the A&E department, using NHS Direct) rather than registering with a GP. Similarly, there was relatively low registration with local dentists, in part explained by the desire to return home for dental work. There was also a lack of awareness of benefit entitlement (45%). An underlying theme is the lack of information for migrant workers on local services. Some local authorities have produced Welcome packs for new arrivals: the Improvement and Development Agency for Local Government (IDeA) has produced a whole series of guides for local authorities entitled 'Integrating New Migrants: Communicating Important Information.' In addition to the provision of printed information, there is also a need to look at wider service provision issues. In other areas of the UK, local authorities have developed

single access points to provide information to migrant workers (examples being *Support for the Changing Community* in Crewe and *The New Link* in Peterborough). These services not only offer a sign-posting service but act as a focal point for engaging with migrant workers and identifying the types of issues they are experiencing. In recognition of the importance of Information Communication Technologies (ICT) and specifically the Internet to migrant workers to enable them to communicate with family and friends in their home country and given their familiarity with such technology, this could provide a very useful medium for community information generally about the services available within a particular locality.

It is recommended that:

- ***All service providers review the extent to which information about their service is reaching migrant worker communities;***
- ***There is a need for the greater co-ordination of services within each local authority area that currently provide assistance to migrant workers to ensure that appropriate information is being disseminated and so services can share information about their local migrant workers;***
- ***Councils should consider developing a local migrant worker forum with the aim of encouraging the exchange of information about the local services provided and needed. Membership should include migrant workers and representatives from service providers in the statutory, voluntary and community sectors; and***
- ***The opportunities for exploiting the use of the Internet and other ICTs for disseminating local information about services should be explored.***

Future intentions

Unfortunately, it is difficult to predict future intentions, particularly with regard to a population whose migration is intrinsically linked to economic opportunities. This research provides a 'snap shot' of the current population and a number of the people interviewed in this survey were unsure about their future intentions. Given the diverse and fluid nature of migrant worker communities, agencies need to be ensuring that they are monitoring which nationalities are using their services and any changes in population at a local level.

This survey suggests that the current economic climate may be affecting the employment opportunities available to some migrant workers in North Yorkshire, while consultation with stakeholders has suggested a slowing in the number of arrivals. Furthermore, the restrictions on full free movement of 'new' EU members across the other EU countries are being removed and will be complete by 2011 (for those from the A8) and by 2014 (for those from the A2). This may provide a greater choice for migrant workers in terms of where they can migrate to. What needs to be recognised is that people are adaptive, making use of social networks and responding to the opportunities available to them. Decisions on whether or not to remain in North Yorkshire may be based on a combination of factors including economic considerations, but also their overall experience of life in the county.

It is recommended that:

- ***The Council and its partners develop appropriate mechanisms (such as ethnic/nationality monitoring) to capture information about those migrant workers using local services; and***
- ***Emphasis is given to monitoring changes in the local migrant worker population by collating a number of existing indicators (such as crime statistics, applications for social housing, ESOL and school enrolment) on a regular basis.***

Further Research

As noted above, this study represents a snap-shot of the experiences and issues facing the BME and migrant worker communities in North Yorkshire. However, the low number of secured interviews with both traditional BME households and migrant workers in some of the local authority areas means that it is not possible to document the local circumstances of these communities in such areas. Despite attempts to increase the participation of community members through various means, this must be seen as a shortcoming of the study and one which needs to be addressed. It is suggested therefore, that the relevant local authorities look to initiate greater links with their BME and migrant worker communities and instigate a range of engagement opportunities designed to elicit the type of information covered by this study. This will ensure that a more comprehensive picture about these communities across the County as a whole.

Secondly, the decision was taken by the Project Steering Group to undertake a study which covered a relatively wide range of issues and some interesting results have been identified. It is suggested that each local authority should consider develop its understanding of the issues pertinent to its settled BME and migrant worker community by undertaking more qualitative research in the short to medium term.

Appendix 1: Questionnaires Household Interviews

**Housing & Housing Related support Needs of the BME
Community in North Yorkshire**

Introduction

Good morning/afternoon. My name is (*show ID badge*). The University of Salford is undertaking a study to identify the housing and housing related support needs of people from the Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) community in North Yorkshire. You have been selected completely at random. All the information you provide will be kept completely confidential. No details concerning you or your family will be passed on to a third party. It is important that we gather the views of as many different people as possible. The interview should last no more than 20 minutes. Would you be happy for me to interview you?

Address: _____

Postcode _____

Date of interview: _____

Interviewer name _____

Language interview undertaken in: _____

SECTION A: HOME & COMMUNITY

Can I start by asking you about your home?

Q1. What type of property do you live in? **Tick ✓ one only**

- Detached house
 - Semi-detached house
 - Terraced house
 - Bungalow
 - Flat/apartment/maisonette
 - Sheltered housing
 - Other (**please specify below**)
-

Q2. Do you? **Tick ✓ one only**

- Own your own home (without a mortgage)
 - Own your own home (with a mortgage)
 - Shared ownership
 - Rent from the Council
 - Rent from a Housing Association
 - Rent from a private landlord
 - Accommodation provided by employer
 - Other (**please specify below**)
-

Q3. And how long have you lived at this address? **Tick ✓ one only**

- Less than 6 months
- 6 months or more but less than 12 months
- 1 year or more but less than 3 years
- 3 years or more but less than 5 years
- 5 years or more but less than 10 years
- 10 years or more but less than 20 years
- 20 years or more but less than 30 years
- 30 years or more
- Don't know/can't remember

Q4. Would you say you have enough space in this home

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Q5. If **NO**, please give details why? _____

Q6. How many bedrooms does your property have? **Tick ✓ one only**

1	2	3	4	5	6+
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q7. Do you feel that you are living in overcrowded conditions

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q8. Does your home meet your cultural or religious needs?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q10
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q9

Q9. If **NO**, why not? _____

Q10. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your home as a place to live? **Tick ✓ one only**

Very satisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fairly satisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fairly dissatisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>
Very dissatisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q11. And how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your local area as a place to live?

Very satisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fairly satisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fairly dissatisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>
Very dissatisfied	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q12. How strongly do you feel you belong to your immediate neighbourhood?

Tick ✓ one only

- Very strongly
- Fairly strongly
- Not very strongly
- Not at all strongly
- Don't know

Q13. Do you think you will move to a different property in the future?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- I am happy where I am

Q14. If yes, what housing option would you like?

- Renting from the Council
 - Renting from a Housing Association
 - Renting from a private landlord
 - Buying your own home
 - Share ownership
 - Other **(please specify below)**
-

Q15. Does anyone in your household receive support in undertaking any day-to-day tasks either from other family members or someone outside the family?

- Yes **Go to Q16**
- No **Go to Q20**

Q16. What type of support do they receive? _____

Q17. Who provides the support? _____

Q18. Does the support received meet the support needs of the individual?

- Yes
- No

Q19. How could the support received be improved (if at all)?

Q20. Is there anyone in your household who:

- a. Needs help or support to undertake the following daily tasks?
- b. How much help do they need?

Daily task	Q20a	
	Help needed	
	Yes	No
Cleaning		
Cooking		
Shopping		
Laundry/ironing		
Using appliances		
Personal hygiene		

Q20b			
A little help	A lot of help	Can't do without help	Don't know

Q21. Do you or other members of your household need any other type of support or help to manage your home?

- Yes **Go to Q22**
- No **Go to Q23**
- Don't know **Go to Q23**

Q22. If **YES**, what type of help/support? _____

Q23. Do you or any member of your household feel that you need help or support with:

	Yes	No	Don't know
Managing household bills			
Dealing with debt			
Claiming benefits			
Dealing with correspondence			
Accessing services			
Maintain accommodation and avoid eviction			
Maintaining or development of independence/independent living skills			

SECTION B: SOCIAL ISOLATION & SAFETY ISSUES

Q24. Do you have any close friends or family near by, who you feel look out for you?

- Yes **Go to Q25**
 No **Go to Q26**

Q25. Please state their relationship to you:

Q26. How frequently would you say that you meet up with your friends, family and neighbours?

	Every day	Every week	Every month	Less than once a month	Never/ NA
Friends					
Family members not living with you					
Neighbours					

Q27. Do you feel that you need help or support to:

	Yes	No
Meet up regularly with people from your own ethnic group?		
Attend the local place of worship/mosque?		
Attend community-based activities or groups?		
Access local services?		
Understand the 'British culture'?		

Q28. Have you or a member of your family experienced any of the following in the area where you live?

	Yes	No
Crime against your property (e.g. burglary)		
Crime against the person (e.g. mugging)		
Hate crime (i.e. racial harassment)		
Anti-social behaviour		

Q29. Do you currently fear being a victim of any of the following:

	Yes	No
Crime against your property (e.g. burglary)		
Crime against the person (e.g. mugging)		
Hate crime (i.e. racial harassment)		
Anti-social behaviour		

Q30. How safe do you feel safe when outside in your local area after dark?

Tick ✓ one only

- Very safe
- Quite safe
- Not so safe
- Not safe at all
- Never go out alone
- Don't know

Q31 And ,how safe do you feel when outside in your local area during the day?

Tick ✓ one only

- Very safe
- Quite safe
- Not so safe
- Not safe at all
- Never go out alone
- Don't know

Q32. Security features

- a. Do you have any of the following security features in your home?
- b. Do you feel you need any of them?

Security feature	Q32a		Q32b	
	Have	Don't have	Need	Don't need
Burglar alarm				
Window locks				
Burglar bars on windows				
Dog for security				
Chain on door				
Spy hole in door				
Smoke alarm				
Other (please specify below)				

Q33. Can you think of any way in which you or any other member of your household could be supported to feel more safe in the community?

SECTION C: HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE

Q34. Now could you tell me how many people in your household are disabled or suffer ill-health as a result of:

		None	1 person	2 people	3+ people
Ill-health/disability		0	1	2	3
A	Visual impairment				
B	Deaf or hard of hearing				
C	Mobility problems				
D	Learning difficulty				
E	Mental or emotional distress (e.g. depression)				
F	Frailty (elderly)				
G	Confusion/senile dementia (elderly)				
H	Living with HIV/AIDS				
I	Drug and alcohol problems				
J	Arthritis				
K	Diabetes				
L	Heart disease				
M	High blood pressure				
N	Sickle Cell Disease or Thalassaemia				
O	Stroke				
P	Other illness or disability (please specify below)				

If answered '0' for all go to Q39

If answered '1, 2 or 3' for any go to Q35

Q35. Does he/she or they receive support or treatment for their health problem?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Person 1			
Person 2			
Person 3			

Q36. Please describe the type of support/treatment

Person 1: _____
 Person 2: _____
 Person 3: _____

Q37. Do you feel that he/she may need help getting treatment or accessing services for any of their health problems?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Person 1			
Person 2			
Person 3			

Q38. Please describe the type of help

Person 1: _____

Person 2: _____

Person 3: _____

Q39. Are you or is anyone else living in the household a full-time carer for a member of your household?

Yes **Go to Q40**

No **Go to Q42**

Don't know **Go to Q42**

Q40. Do you/this person need support for this role?

Yes **Go to Q41**

No **Go to Q42**

Don't know **Go to Q42**

Q41. Do you have any ideas on the type of support required?

Q42. Adaptations to home:

- a. Which of these alterations to your home do you already have?
 b. Which of them do you need?

Adaptation	Q34a	Q34b	
	Already have	Don't have but do need	Don't have & don't need
	1	2	3
A walk-in shower or accessible bath			
Access ramps outside your home			
Access ramps inside your home			
Tap adaptations			
A handrail on the stairs			
A stair lift			
A bathroom grab rail			
Fixed hoist			
Portable hoist			
Commode			
Downstairs toilet			

Other facilities you already have (please describe these in the space opposite)	
Other facilities you don't have, but do need. (Please describe these in the space opposite)	

If answered '2' to any of above go to Q43

If answered '1 or 3', go to Q46

Q43. Do you need support to identify or carry out adaptations or aids to your home which you need?

- No **Go to Q45**
 Yes – but don't receive **Go to Q45**
 Yes – and already receive **Go to Q44**
 Other **(please describe below)** **Go to Q45**

Q44. If support is already received, who provides this support?

Q45. Where would you go to seek advice on aids and adaptations to your home? **Tick ✓ one only**

- Council
 - Housing association
 - Social services
 - GP/Health Centre
 - Citizens Advice Bureau
 - Care and Repair
 - Community groups (Black & Minority Ethnic)
 - Other **(please describe below)**
-
- Don't know

Q46. Would you say that you or any members of your household need any of these forms of housing?

Forms of housing	Yes	No
Accommodation without stairs		
Accommodation suitable for a wheelchair		
Accommodation with an on-site warden		
Accommodation with an emergency/alarm call system		
Accommodation with a visiting warden		
Day time staff on site with Emergency Call Out		
Live in landlady/landlord		
A larger property so a carer can stay overnight		
Family providing support		
Other supported accommodation		
None of these		
Don't know		

Q47. Where would you go to seek advice on these forms of housing?

- 1st mentioned _____
- 2nd mentioned _____
- 3rd mentioned _____

SECTION D: ACCESS TO SERVICES

Q48. Service access:

- a. Have you used any of the following services in [North Yorkshire]?
- b. How did you find out about them

Service	Q40a		
	Yes	No	Don't know
Housing advice			
Social services			
Housing-related support			
Financial advice			

Q40b
How find out

Q49a. How many times in the last 7 days have you taken part in a sport or recreational activity that lasted for at least 30 minutes on each occasion? This includes any activity that raises your heart and breathing rate, such as walking for recreational purposes or playing badminton.

- Once
- Twice
- Three times
- Four times
- Five times
- Other (please specify below)

All above go to Q50

None

Go Q50

Q49b. What type of sport or activity was this?

SECTION E: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

I would be grateful if you would answer the following questions.

Q50. How many people are there in your household? _____

Q51. How would you describe the composition of your household?

Tick ✓ one only

One adult under 60

One adult aged 60 or over

Two adults both under 60

Two adults at least one over 60

Three or more adults aged 16 or over

1 parent family with child/ren at least one under 16

2 parent family with child/ren at least one under 16

Other (**please describe below**)

(including 3 generation families with children under 16 & adults 60+)

Q52. How many people living here are aged 16 or under? _____

Q53. How many people living here are aged 60 or over? _____

Q54. What language would you normally read or write in?

Q55. What language would you normally speak?

Q56. Is there an adult in your household who is unable to read or write in English?

Yes

No

Q57. Is there an adult in your household who is unable to speak English?

Yes

No

Q58. Do you/they have access to interpretation services?

- | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q55 |
| No | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q59 |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q60 |

Q59. If **NO**, why not?

Q60. If you were to receive written information from service providers, what language would you want it to be in?

Q60. Could you please tell me about the **people that you live with in [North Yorkshire]**? We need to know their ages, whether they are male or female and their relationship to you. **Please begin with yourself as ‘number 1 household member’.**

Interviewer: please ensure that only one box is ticked regarding the relationship to the interviewee.

AGE	HOUSEHOLD MEMBER									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0 – 5 years										
6 – 10 years										
11 – 17 years										
18 – 24 years										
25 – 39 years										
40 – 49 years										
50 – 59 years										
60 – 74 years										
75 – 84 years										
85 years +										
Unknown										
GENDER										
Male										
Female										
RELATIONSHIP										
Husband/wife										
Boyfriend/girlfriend										
Son/daughter										
Mother/father										
Sister/brother										
Cousin										
Friend										
Work colleague										
Housemate (who is not a friend or work colleague)										

Q61. How would you describe your ethnic background?

Q62. Are any members of your household from a different ethnic background?

Yes (**please describe below**)

No

NOTE: Is the respondent or anyone else in the household aged 55 or over?

Yes **Go to Q63**

No **End interview, Go to back page**

If older person available to be interviewed, interview them if not continue with the interview with respondent.

I would like to ask you a few questions about the type of housing older people from the BME community/yourself would like now or in the future.

Q63. Do you think that you/older BME people would be interested in moving to a housing scheme which catered specifically for the needs of older people?

Yes **Go to Q65**

No **Go to Q64**

Don't know **Go to Q65**

Q64. If **NO**, why not?

Q65. Would you /older people prefer such a scheme to provide housing for older people from different ethnic groups or the same ethnic groups?

Different ethnic groups

Same ethnic group

Don't know

Q66. In terms of the long-term care of older people in your community:

- a. What do you think would be your/their preference?
- b. What do you think is likely to happen?

Tick ✓ one box only for each question	Q60a	Q60b
	Preference	Likely to happen
To be looked after by immediate family		
To live in a dedicated older peoples home/scheme		
To live independently with support in own home		
Other (please describe below)		

Q67. In terms of the number of self-contained flats for older people in the scheme, what should be the maximum size?

- 1-5 flats
- 6-10 flats
- 11-15 flats
- 16-20 flats
- 21-25 flats
- 26-30 flats
- 31 or more flats

Q68. Why do you say that?

Q69. What specific facilities would you/they want to see included within a housing scheme for older people (**list 3**)

- 1.

- 2.

- 3.

Q70. What would influence your choice of where to live? **Tick ✓ 5 only**

	Factors	Tick ✓
A	Price/affordability	
B	Area/location	
C	Housing provider (i.e. Council, Private, RSL)	
D	Proximity of family	
E	Rent	
F	Opportunity to buy	
G	Ethnic mix of community	
H	Size of rooms	
I	Number of bedrooms	
J	Number of living rooms	
K	Local facilities (shops, place of worship, transport links)	
L	Remaining independent	
M	Quality of interior design	
N	Quality of exterior design	
O	Garden	
P	Other on-site services (e.g. health/social care, social activities, office space, warden)	
Q	Other factors (please state below)	

Further Contact

1. If Salford University needed to contact you again to ask for additional information would you be happy for them to do so?

Yes Name: _____
Tel no.: _____

No

2. If [North Yorkshire] Council or North Yorkshire County Council wanted to contact you for additional information, would you be happy for them to do so?

Yes No

3. Would you like a copy of the final report when the study is completed?

Yes **(please ensure their address is clearly written on the front of the questionnaire)**

No

Prize Draw

4. Do you wish to be entered into our prize draw with a chance to win £150?

Yes Name: _____
Tel no.: _____

No

Agreement and signature

This form is to be signed by the respondent to state that they saw your identification badge and were left with a letter explaining the survey.

I (respondent) confirm that **(please tick the boxes)**:

- I saw the Identification Badge of the person who interviewed me.**
- I was given a copy of the letter from the University of Salford explaining the survey.**

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Thank you very much for your time

North Yorkshire Migrant Worker Study Questionnaire

Introduction

My name is and I work for the University of Salford in Manchester (show badge). We have been asked by North Yorkshire and York Councils to speak to people who have come from other countries to live and work in North Yorkshire (sometimes known as migrant workers). We are hoping to gain a greater understanding of the experiences of this group in the community and the type of help or assistance they need now or in the future.

We are completely independent of any local council or the government. Would you be willing to talk to me? If you agree it will probably take about 20 minutes. I have a number of questions I would like to ask but I would like to hear about anything else you feel is relevant. I will be writing down your answers but the interview will be confidential and no one will be identified in any report that we write, and there is no way that anyone will be able to trace any particular answer back to you. You can only take part if you are aged 16 or over.

If you would like more information about this survey please contact Andy Steele on 0161 295 2174

Address of respondent: _____

Postcode: _____

Area/Ward: _____

Date of interview: _____

Interviewer name: _____

Language of interview: _____

SECTION A: Migration history

Q1. When did you first arrive in the UK? _____ / _____
(month) / (year)

Q2. Other than [North Yorkshire], have you lived anywhere else in the UK?
Yes **Go to Q 3** No **Go to Q 4**

Q3. If **YES**, where? (list the 2 most recent places)

1. _____
2. _____

Q4. Why did you decide to come to [North Yorkshire]? **Tick ✓ one only**

- I had family/partner already living in [North Yorkshire]
- I had friends already living in [North Yorkshire]
- I had heard about [North Yorkshire] from other people
- I had a job to come to in the area
- I had heard that there were job opportunities in [North Yorkshire]
- I had no choice (**please explain below**)

Other (**please explain below**)

Q5. How often do you go back to your home country for a visit?
Tick ✓ one only

- Once a week
- Once every two weeks
- Once a month
- Once every two months
- Once every three months
- Twice a year
- Once a year
- Never
- Other (**please specify below**)

SECTION B: Employment, education and training

Q6. How would you rate your English language skills?

(a) Your ability to speak English (Tick ✓ one only)

- Very good
- Good
- Neither good nor poor
- Poor
- Very poor
- Don't know

(b) Your ability to write English (Tick ✓ one only)

- Very good
- Good
- Neither good nor poor
- Poor
- Very poor
- Don't know

(c) Your understanding of spoken English (Tick ✓ one only)

- Very good
- Good
- Neither good nor poor
- Poor
- Very poor
- Don't know

(d) Your understanding of written English (Tick ✓ one only)

- Very good
- Good
- Neither good nor poor
- Poor
- Very poor
- Don't know

Q7. Thinking about English language courses which of the following applies to you?

Tick ✓ one only

I do not need an English language course **Go to Q 9**

I have already completed an English language course **Go to Q 9**

I am currently doing an English language course **Go to Q 9**

I am on the waiting list for an English language course **Go to Q 9**

I would like to study on an English language course, but am not currently enrolled **Go to Q 8**

I am not interested in an English language course **Go to Q 8**

Other (**please specify below**) **Go to Q 9**

Q8. Why are you not currently enrolled? **or** Why are you not interested in a course?

Q9. What is your highest level of educational qualification?

Tick ✓ one only

Postgraduate degree (i.e. PhD, MA, MSc)
(**please specify what course?**) _____

Undergraduate degree (i.e. BA, BSc)
(**please specify what course?**)

Technical high school
(**please specify what course?**)

Non technical high school

Basic school

No formal qualifications

Q10. Do you have a particular trade or skill from your home country?

Yes **Go to Q 11**

No **Go to Q 13**

Q11. What is this trade or skill?

Q12. How many years have you spent in this trade/using these skills?
Tick ✓ one only

- None
- Less than 1 year
- 1 – 3
- 4 – 6
- 7 – 9
- 10 or more

Q13. Before coming to the UK, were you: **Tick ✓ one only**

- Employed **Go to Q 14**
- Self-employed **Go to Q 14**
- Unemployed **Go to Q 15**
- Full time student **Go to Q 15**
- Unemployed homemaker/carer
(e.g. looking after children/other relatives) **Go to Q 15**

Q14. What was the last job you had in your home country, just before coming to the UK?

(a) Job title

(b) Main duties

Q15. Are you currently in paid work? **Tick ✓ one only**

- Yes **Go to Q 17**
- Yes, but not started yet **Go to Q 17**
- No **Go to Q 16**
- No (I am a full or part time student) **Go to Q 16**

Q16. If **NO**, how long have you been without a job?

Tick ✓ one only

- | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Less than 1 month | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 22 |
| 1 – 3 months | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 22 |
| 4 – 6 months | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 22 |
| 7 – 9 months | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 22 |
| 10 – 12 months | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 22 |
| More than 12 months | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 22 |
| Never worked in this country | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 22 |

Q17. What is your current job?

(a) Job title

(b) Main duties

(c) Qualifications required for job

(d) What does this company do? (i.e. manufactures clothes)

(e) Where is your current job?

(Interviewer: record employer name and postcode)

Q18. How do you travel to your current job?

On foot

Bicycle

Car/van

Motorbike/scooter

Bus (public transport)

Train

Transport provided by employer **(please specify what)**

Other **(please specify below)**

Q19. How far do you travel to your job? **(in miles/km/etc).**

Q20. How did you find your current job?

Tick ✓ one only

Through friends/relatives already here

Contacted employer myself when I arrived in the UK

Contacted employer myself while still in my home country

Job Centre Plus

Employment/recruitment agency in home country
(please specify which)

Employment/recruitment agency in UK
(please specify which)

Other **(please specify below)**

Q21. Is your current job? **Tick ✓ one only**

Temporary

Permanent

Fixed term contract

Seasonal/ad hoc

Don't know

Other **(please specify below)**

Q22. Are you currently on the Worker Registration Scheme (WRS)? **(for A8 nationals only, not those from Romania and Bulgaria)**

Yes

No

Don't know

Q23. Do you have authorisation to work (i.e. Accession Worker Card)? **(for people from Romania and Bulgaria only)**

Yes

No

Don't know

Q24. Are you currently registered for payment of National Insurance contributions? **(applies to all workers)**

Yes

No

Don't know

If not currently in paid work go to Q29

Q25. How much are you currently paid per week for your job? **(Before tax and National Insurance) Tick ✓ one only**

£100 or less

£101 - £150

£151 - £200

£201 - £250

£251 - £300

£301 - £350

£351 - £400

£401 - £450

£451 or more

Q26. Who pays you? **Tick ✓ one only**

Employer

Recruitment agency/labour provider

Other **(please specify below)**

Q27. Are deductions taken from your pay for any of the following?
If **YES**, how much? **Tick ✓ all that apply**

		How much per week?
Housing/accommodation	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Transport to and from work	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Food (during work)	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Clothing/equipment for work	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Tax/National Insurance	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Other (please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

Q28. How many hours do you work per week? (**Basic hours**) **Tick ✓ one only**

- 16 hours or less
- 17 – 29
- 30 – 40
- 41 – 50
- 51 – 60
- 61 – 70
- 71 or more

Section C: Housing

Q29. Could you please tell me about the **people that you live with in [North Yorkshire]**? We need to know their ages, whether they are male or female and their relationship to you. **Please begin with yourself as ‘number 1 household member’.**

Interviewer: please ensure that only one box is ticked regarding the relationship to the interviewee.

AGE	HOUSEHOLD MEMBER									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0 – 5 years										
6 – 10 years										
11 – 17 years										
18 – 24 years										
25 – 39 years										
40 – 49 years										
50 – 59 years										
60 – 74 years										
75 – 84 years										
85 years +										
Unknown										
GENDER										
Male										
Female										
RELATIONSHIP										
Husband/wife										
Boyfriend/girlfriend										
Son/daughter										
Mother/father										
Sister/brother										
Cousin										
Friend										
Work colleague										
Housemate (who is not a friend or work colleague)										

Q30. What type of property do you live in at the moment?

Tick ✓ one only

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Detached house | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Semi-detached house | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Terraced house | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Detached bungalow | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other bungalow | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Flat (in a purpose built block) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Flat (in a converted house) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Caravan/mobile temporary structure | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify below) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
-

Q31. Do you own or rent the property?

Tick ✓ one only

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Owns without a mortgage | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 34 |
| Owns with a mortgage | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 34 |
| 'Shared ownership' property (where you own part of the property and pay rent to a Housing Association on the rest) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 32 |
| Rented from the Council | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 32 |
| Rented from a Housing Association | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 32 |
| Rented from a private landlord | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 32 |
| Rented from a letting agency | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 32 |
| Rented from friends/family | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 32 |
| Accommodation provided by employer | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 32 |
| Bed & Breakfast | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 34 |
| Other (please specify below) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 34 |
-

Don't know **Go to Q 34**

Q32. Do you have a tenancy agreement?

- | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 33 |
| No | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 34 |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 34 |

Q33. Do you understand your tenancy agreement?

Yes, fully

Yes, partly

No, not at all

No, never read it

Q34. How did you find your current home in [North Yorkshire]?
Tick ✓ one only

Arranged for me before I arrived in UK

(please specify who by)

From friends/family already living in [North Yorkshire]

UK employer arranged it for me

Via local newspapers

Via local estate agents

Via a letting agent

Employment agency

Other **(please specify below)**

Q35. What does your rent and/or mortgage cost per month for your current home?
Tick ✓ one only

Less than £200

£201 - £250

£251 - £300

£301 - £350

£351 - £400

£401 - £450

£451 - £500

£501 - £550

£551 - £600

£601 or more

Don't know

Don't pay rent/mortgage

Q36. If you pay **rent**, does this include fuel bills (i.e. **gas/electricity/wood/coal/oil bills**)?

- Yes **Go to Q 39**
- No **Go to Q37**
- Don't know **Go to Q37**

Q37. How much are you fuel bills? (i.e. **gas/electricity/wood/coal/oil bills**)
(Please indicate whether per week/month/quarter)

- Gas _____
- Electricity _____
- Wood _____
- Coal _____
- Oil _____

Q38. Please can you tell me how the fuel bills are paid? **Tick ✓ one only**

- I pay it all myself
- It is divided up **equally** between housemates/family living in the property
- My housemates/family contribute to the cost (please specify how much they contribute below)

Q39. Could you please tell me about the rooms within your property, how many people share each room, whether the occupants are family members/partner, and whether the rooms are single or double? (**including the person being interviewed**)

	Number of people sharing?	Are they family members/partner?		Are the rooms single or double?	
		Yes	No	Single	Double
Bedroom 1					
Bedroom 2					
Bedroom 3					
Bedroom 4					
Bedroom 5					
Bedroom 6					
Bedroom 7					
Bathroom 1					
Bathroom 2					
Bathroom 3					
Kitchen 1					
Kitchen 2					
Kitchen 3					

Q40. Would you say you have enough space in this home?

- Yes **Go to Q 42**
 No **Go to Q 41**
 Don't know **Go to Q 42**

Q41. If **NO**, please give details of why?

Q42. Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your home as a place to live?

Tick ✓ one only

- Very satisfied
 Fairly satisfied
 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
 Fairly dissatisfied
 Very dissatisfied

Q43. Why do you say this?

Q44. Since you first arrived in [North Yorkshire] how many homes have you lived in?
(including current home)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6 or more

Q45. Have you had any problems with housing in [North Yorkshire]? (i.e. accessing housing, issues with landlords, being forced to leave a property, etc.)

Q46. Where would you go to for general housing advice?

We are now going to ask a few questions about homelessness and rough sleeping. Homelessness is living or sleeping in something which is not normally considered to be suitable accommodation (such as vehicles, derelict buildings, train/bus stations, outside, etc) or staying with friends/family because you have nowhere else to live.

Q47. Do you consider yourself to have been homeless since arriving in this Country?

- Yes **Go to Q 48**
- No **Go to Q 53**
- Don't know **Go to Q 53**

Q48. Do you mind me asking what caused you to sleep rough/be homeless/stay with family friends? **Tick ✓ all that apply**

- Violent breakdown of relationship with partner
 - Non violent breakdown of relationship with partner
 - Violent breakdown of relationship with associated persons (e.g. housemates)
 - Asked by friends or family to leave
 - Racially motivated violence against you
 - Racially motivated harassment against you
 - Eviction for rent arrears (e.g. not being able to pay rent)
 - Eviction without justification (where a tenancy agreement exists)
 - Eviction without justification (where no tenancy agreement exists)
 - Leaving hospital
 - Loss of tied accommodation
(Tied accommodation is accommodation which you can only live there if you have a particular job)
 - Arrived with no planned accommodation
 - Other (**please specify below**)
-

Q49. Did you seek help either before you became homeless or when you actually were homeless/rough sleeping?

- Yes
- No

Q50. If **YES**, who or where did you seek help from? If **NO**, why did you not seek help?

Q51. How did you come out of being homelessness? **Tick ✓ one only**

- I moved into a property from the council/housing association
 - I rented a property from a private landlord
 - I moved into accommodation provided by my employer
 - I moved in with friends and family
 - I moved into a Bed and breakfast
 - I moved into hostel accommodation
 - Other (**please specify below**)
-

Q52. What could have prevented you from becoming homeless?

Q53. What help would you expect to get from [North Yorkshire] Council if you became homeless?

Q54. Do you think you will move to a different property in the next 3 years?

- Yes **Go to Q 55**
- No **Go to Q 57**
- Don't know **Go to Q 57**
- I am happy where I am **Go to Q 57**

Q55. If **YES**, what housing option would you like? **Tick ✓ one only**

- Renting from the Council **Go to Q 56**
 - Renting from a Housing Association **Go to Q 56**
 - Renting from a private landlord **Go to Q 56**
 - Buying your own home **Go to Q 56**
 - A shared ownership house/flat (where you own part of the property and pay rent to a housing association on the rest of the property) **Go to Q 56**
 - Other (**please specify below**) **Go to Q 56**
-

I don't know the housing options in [North Yorkshire] **Go to Q 57**

Q56. Why would you like this type of housing option?

Section D: Community and Neighbourhood

Q57. Why do you live in this particular neighbourhood of [North Yorkshire]?
Tick ✓ all that apply

- I have family living in this neighbourhood
- I have friends living in this neighbourhood
- It is near work
- I have no choice (**please explain below**)

- Other (**please explain below**)

Q58. To what extent do you agree or disagree that your local neighbourhood is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together? **Tick ✓ one only**

- Definitely agree
- Tend to agree
- Tend to disagree
- Definitely disagree
- Don't know
- There are too few people in the local neighbourhood
- The people are all from the same background

Q59. How much contact do you have in [North Yorkshire] with people from your own country? **Tick ✓ one only**

- A lot **Go to Q 60**
- Quite a lot **Go to Q 60**
- A little **Go to Q 60**
- None at all **Go to Q 61**

Q60. Are there particular places you meet with people from your own country? (i.e. work, pubs, social clubs, church)

Q61. How much contact do you have with people not from your own country? **Tick**
✓ **one only**

- A lot **Go to Q 63**
- Quite a lot **Go to Q 63**
- A little **Go to Q 63**
- None at all **Go to Q 62**
- Don't want contact with British people **Go to Q 62**

Q62. If you have **no contact** or **don't want contact**, why is this the case?

Q63. Overall, how satisfied/dissatisfied are you with this neighbourhood as a place to live? **Tick** ✓ **one only**

- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Q64. Why do you give this rating?

Q65. Would you like to move to another area?

- Yes **Go to Q 66**
- No **Go to Q 68**
- Don't know **Go to Q 68**

Q66. If **YES**, why would you like to move and where to?

Q67. What is stopping you from moving?

Q68. How safe or unsafe do you feel when **outside** in your local area?

	Very safe	Fairly safe	Neither safe nor unsafe	Fairly unsafe	Very unsafe	Don't know
During the day						
After dark						

Q69. Why do you feel this way?

Q70. Do you feel safe in your home at night? **Tick ✓ one only**

- Very safe
- Quite safe
- Not so safe
- Not safe at all
- Never alone at home at night
- Don't know

Q71. Why do you feel this way?

Q72. Since living in **North Yorkshire** have you, or members of your family, experienced any of the following? **Tick ✓ all that apply**

- Crime against the property (e.g. burglary) **Go to Q 73**
- Crime against the person (e.g. mugging) **Go to Q 73**
- Hate crime (e.g. racial harassment) **Go to Q 73**
- Anti social behaviour **Go to Q 73**
- Other (**please specify below**) **Go to Q 73**

I / family have not experienced any crime/hate crime **Go to Q 77**

Q73. Please can you give a bit more information about what happened to you?

Q74. Did you go to anyone for help with this problem?

- Yes **Go to Q 75**
- No **Go to Q 76**

Q75. If **YES**, who did you go to and what did they do?

Q76. If **NO**, why did you not seek any help?

Section E: Access to goods, services and facilities

Q77. Thinking about when you first arrived in [North Yorkshire] what information would have been helpful for you? How do you think information should be provided to people from different countries?

Q78. Do you currently access any of the following facilities/services?

Tick ✓ all that apply

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Community centre/social club | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Libraries | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Local church/place of worship | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Children's centres | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sports facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Public transport (i.e. buses, trains) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Job centres | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Shops | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| College (please specify what you are studying) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q79. Are you currently receiving any of the following benefits?

Tick ✓ all that apply

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Housing Benefit | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Child Benefit | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Job Seekers Allowance | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Income Support | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Council Tax Benefit | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sickness & Incapacity Benefit | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Child Tax Credit | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Working Tax Credit | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify below) | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| I am not receiving any benefits | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|

Q80. Do you think you understand your entitlement/rights to?

Benefits		Housing	
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q81. Since moving to [North Yorkshire], have you had contact with your local council (i.e. [Name of Council] or North Yorkshire County Council for any reason? (i.e. schools, housing, rubbish collection)

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 83
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 82
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 86

Q82. If **NO**, why is this? **Tick ✓ all that apply**

I have never needed to contact them	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 85
Language problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 85
Difficulty finding and contacting the right person	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 85
They are only open during 'office hours' (i.e. Monday – Friday 8.30 – 4.50pm)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 84
Didn't know where to go	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 85
Other (please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 85

Q83. If **YES**, what have you had have contact with them for?

Q84. Have you had any problem with your contact with your local council or North Yorkshire County Council?

Tick ✓ all that apply

Language problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 85
Difficulty finding and contacting the right person	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 85
They are only open during 'office hours' (i.e. Monday – Friday 8.30 – 4.50pm)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 85
Didn't know where to go	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 85
Other (please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 85

I have had no problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q 85
------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------

Q85. When would you need your local council or North Yorkshire County Council to be open for you to contact them?

Q86. Do you have children under 18 attending a local school/college or nursery?

Don't have school/college/nursery-age children living with me **Go to Q 91**

Yes – school/college **Go to Q 87**

Yes – nursery **Go to Q 87**

Yes – both school and nursery **Go to Q 87**

No – my children don't attend school or nursery **Go to Q 90**

Q87. If **YES**, what school/college/nursery do they attend?

Q88. Do they receive additional support to help them with their learning?

Yes **Go to Q 89**

No **Go to Q 91**

Don't know **Go to Q 91**

Q89. If **YES**, what support?

Q90. If **NO**, do you mind me asking why they don't attend school or nursery?

Q91. Are you currently registered with or do you currently access the following health care services/professionals? **Tick ✓ all that apply**

GP/Dr

Dentist

Accident & Emergency (A & E)

Health visitor

Midwife

Walk-in centre

NHS Direct

Other (**please specify below**)

Q92. If you are **not** registered with a Dr/Dentist, where do you go if you have any health care/dental problems?

Q93. Do you or any of your family living with you have any health problems or disabilities (including mental health/emotional issues)?

- Yes **Go to Q 94**
- No **Go to Q 95**
- Don't know **Go to Q 95**

Q94. If **YES**, please describe the health problem/disability/emotional problem and who has it

Section F: You and your family

I would like to ask you some questions about you and your immediate family.

Q95. What is your nationality? **Tick ✓ one only**

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Polish | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Latvian | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Lithuanian | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Czech | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Slovak | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Estonian | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Hungarian | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Slovenian | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Romanian | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bulgarian | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (please specify below) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
-

Q96. Are you from a Roma background?

- | | |
|-----|--------------------------|
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| No | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q97. What are your religious beliefs?

Section G: Future intentions

I would now like to ask you about what you would like to happen in the future.

Q98. How long do you think you will continue to live in [North Yorkshire]?
Tick ✓ one only

- | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Less than 6 months | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 99 |
| 6 months – 1 year | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 99 |
| 1 – 2 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 99 |
| 2 – 3 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 99 |
| 3 – 4 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 99 |
| 4 – 5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 99 |
| 5 years or more | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 99 |
| Indefinitely | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 101 |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 101 |

Q99. Where are you going to go after this? **Tick ✓ one only**

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Back to home country | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Another country (please specify which) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <hr/> | |
| Another part of the UK (please specify where) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <hr/> | |

Q100. Why?

Q101. Do you think that you will be joined by members of your family currently living in your home country?

- | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 102 |
| No | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 104 |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | Go to Q 104 |

Q102. If **YES**, when do you think this will happen? **Tick ✓ one only**

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Within next 12 months | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1 – 2 years | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 – 3 years | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 – 4 years | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4 – 5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| More than 5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q103. If **YES**, who is likely to join you from your home country?

Q104. Finally, is there anything else that you'd like to mention?

Further Contact

1. If Salford University needed to contact you again to ask for additional information would you be happy for them to do so?

Yes Name: _____

Tel no.: _____

No

2. If [North Yorkshire] Council or North Yorkshire County Council wanted to contact you for additional information, would you be happy for them to do so?

Yes No

3. Would you like a copy of the final report when the study is completed?

Yes **(please ensure their address is clearly written on the front of the questionnaire)**

No

Prize Draw

4. Do you wish to be entered into our prize draw with a chance to win £150?

Yes Name: _____

Tel no.: _____

No

Agreement and signature

This form is to be signed by the respondent to state that they saw your identification badge and were left with a letter explaining the survey.

I (respondent) confirm that **(please tick the boxes)**:

I saw the Identification Badge of the person who interviewed me.

I was given a copy of the letter from the University of Salford explaining the survey.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Thank you very much for your time

Appendix 2: What the data tells us about North Yorkshire

Using the Worker Registration Scheme (WRS) information for each of the local authorities involved in the study is provided below.

Craven

Table I: Craven registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008

Period	Czech Rep	Estonia	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovakia	Slovenia	Total
May 04 – Mar 06	10	†	5	5	5	160	10	-	195
Apr – Jun 06	†	†	5	†	†	15	5	-	25
Jul – Sep 06	5	-	†	†	5	30	5	-	45
Oct – Dec 06	†	†	†	-	†	20	†	-	20
2004 – 2006	15	†	10	5	10	225	20	-	285
Jan – Mar 07	†	-	-	†	†	25	†	-	25
Apr – Jun 07	-	-	5	-	†	25	†	-	35
Jul – Sep 07	†	†	5	-	†	25	†	-	40
Oct – Dec 07	-	-	†	†	-	25	-	†	30
2007	5	†	10	5	5	100	5	†	130
Jan – Mar 08	-	-	-	-	-	15	†	-	15
Apr – Jun 08	†	-	†	†	-	15	5	-	25
Jul – Sep 08	-	-	†	†	†	10	-	-	15
Oct – Dec 08	-	-	†	-	-	10	†	-	15
2008	†	-	5	5	†	50	10	-	70
Total	20	5	25	15	15	375	35	-	490
%	4	1	5	3	3	77	7	-	100

Source: Home Office (2009).

Note: These figures are rounded up to the nearest 5 (- denotes nil and † denotes 1 or 2. † is taken as 2 when rounding totals for nationality).

Hambleton

Table II: Hambleton registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008

Period	Czech Rep	Estonia	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovakia	Slovenia	Total
May 04 – Mar 06	15	5	†	40	50	145	80	†	335
Apr – Jun 06	-	-	-	†	10	15	10	-	35
Jul – Sep 06	5	-	-	10	15	50	20	-	100
Oct – Dec 06	†	-	-	5	10	45	10	-	70
2004 – 2006	20	5	†	55	85	255	120	†	540
Jan – Mar 07	†	†	†	10	5	40	10	-	65
Apr – Jun 07	†	-	-	5	10	30	20	-	70
Jul – Sep 07	-	-	-	5	10	30	20	-	60
Oct – Dec 07	†	-	-	†	5	35	15	-	55
2007	5	†	†	20	30	135	65	-	250
Jan – Mar 08	10	-	†	†	5	30	15	-	60
Apr – Jun 08	10	-	-	5	5	40	20	-	75
Jul – Sep 08	†	-	-	†	10	20	15	-	50
Oct – Dec 08	5	-	-	5	†	15	5	-	30
2008	25	-	†	10	20	105	55	-	215
Total	50	5	5	85	135	495	240	†	1,015
%	5	<1	<1	8	13	49	24	-	100

Source: Home Office (2009).

Note: These figures are rounded up to the nearest 5 (- denotes nil and † denotes 1 or 2).

Harrogate

Table III: Harrogate registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008

Period	Czech Rep	Estonia	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovakia	Slovenia	Total
May 04 – Mar 06	75	5	55	90	140	455	70	†	890
Apr – Jun 06	15	-	10	5	10	60	15	-	115
Jul – Sep 06	10	-	5	5	5	95	10	-	130
Oct – Dec 06	5	-	15	5	15	125	15	-	180
2004 – 2006	105	5	85	105	170	735	110	†	1,315
Jan – Mar 07	10	-	5	5	15	95	15	-	145
Apr – Jun 07	5	-	15	5	15	75	10	-	125
Jul – Sep 07	5	-	10	5	5	65	10	-	100
Oct – Dec 07	†	-	15	†	5	70	10	-	105
2007	20	-	45	15	40	305	45	-	475
Jan – Mar 08	5	-	10	15	5	90	5	-	135
Apr – Jun 08	5	-	15	15	5	55	5	-	100
Jul – Sep 08	†	-	15	10	5	30	10	-	65
Oct – Dec 08	5	-	15	5	5	45	5	-	85
2008	15	-	55	45	20	220	25	†	385
Total	140	5	185	165	230	1,260	180	5	2,170
%	6	<1	9	8	11	58	8	<1	100

Source: Home Office (2009).

Note: These figures are rounded up to the nearest 5 (- denotes nil and † denotes 1 or 2).

Richmondshire

Table IV: Richmondshire registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008

Period	Czech Rep	Estonia	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovakia	Slovenia	Total
May 04 – Mar 06	†	5	†	25	40	140	15	-	225
Apr – Jun 06	†	-	-	†	†	25	5	-	30
Jul – Sep 06	†	†	-	†	10	35	†	-	45
Oct – Dec 06	-	-	-	†	†	35	-	-	35
2004 – 2006	5	5	†	25	50	235	20	-	335
Jan – Mar 07	-	5	-	†	†	20	5	-	30
Apr – Jun 07	-	-	†	-	†	20	†	-	25
Jul – Sep 07	†	-	-	†	5	15	5	-	25
Oct – Dec 07	-	-	5	-	†	15	5	-	25
2007	†	5	5	5	5	70	15	-	105
Jan – Mar 08	-	-	-	5	5	25	†	-	30
Apr – Jun 08	-	-	-	†	†	10	-	-	15
Jul – Sep 08	-	-	-	†	-	5	†	-	5
Oct – Dec 08	-	-	-	5	5	15	-	-	25
2008	-	-	-	10	10	55	5	-	75
Total	5	10	5	40	65	360	40	-	525
%	1	2	1	8	12	69	8	-	100

Source: Home Office (2009).

Note: These figures are rounded up to the nearest 5 (- denotes nil and † denotes 1 or 2).

Ryedale

Table V: Ryedale registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008

Period	Czech Rep	Estonia	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovakia	Slovenia	Total
May 04 – Mar 06	40	20	10	50	25	175	65	†	385
Apr – Jun 06	†	-	5	10	5	30	20	-	70
Jul – Sep 06	-	†	5	5	5	35	30	-	80
Oct – Dec 06	†	-	-	-	†	25	5	-	30
2004 – 2006	40	20	20	65	35	265	120	†	565
Jan – Mar 07	5	-	5	5	†	25	5	-	45
Apr – Jun 07	†	-	5	†	5	40	20	-	70
Jul – Sep 07	5	†	5	5	5	35	20	-	75
Oct – Dec 07	†	-	†	5	†	55	20	-	85
2007	10	†	15	15	10	155	65	-	275
Jan – Mar 08	†	-	†	5	-	30	5	-	45
Apr – Jun 08	15	-	5	5	†	30	15	-	65
Jul – Sep 08	10	-	5	5	5	45	30	-	95
Oct – Dec 08	-	-	†	5	5	45	5	-	60
2008	25	-	10	20	10	150	55	-	265
Total	75	20	55	100	55	570	240	-	1,115
%	7	2	5	9	5	51	22	-	100

Source: Home Office (2008).

Note: These figures are rounded up to the nearest 5 (- denotes nil and † denotes 1 or 2).

Scarborough

Table VI: Scarborough registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008

Period	Czech Rep	Estonia	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovakia	Slovenia	Total
May 04 – Mar 06	10	5	5	30	15	180	10	-	255
Apr – Jun 06	†	†	-	†	†	35	10	-	45
Jul – Sep 06	-	†	-	5	†	45	†	-	50
Oct – Dec 06	†	†	-	5	-	40	5	-	50
2004 – 2006	10	5	5	40	15	300	25	-	400
Jan – Mar 07	-	-	†	-	†	25	5	-	30
Apr – Jun 07	-	-	5	†	5	30	†	-	40
Jul – Sep 07	†	-	-	†	†	40	5	-	50
Oct – Dec 07	†	-	-	-	-	20	†	-	25
2007	5	-	5	5	5	115	10	-	145
Jan – Mar 08	-	-	†	-	-	20	†	-	25
Apr – Jun 08	†	-	15	†	5	25	†	-	45
Jul – Sep 08	†	-	†	†	†	20	5	-	30
Oct – Dec 08	-	-	†	†	-	15	†	-	15
2008	5	-	15	5	5	80	5	-	115
Total	20	5	25	50	25	495	40	-	660
%	3	1	4	8	4	75	6	-	100

Source: Home Office (2008).

Note: These figures are rounded up to the nearest 5 (- denotes nil and † denotes 1 or 2).

Selby

Table VII: Selby registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008

Period	Czech Rep	Estonia	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovakia	Slovenia	Total
May 04 – Mar 06	5	†	†	30	5	290	25	-	355
Apr – Jun 06	†	-	-	20	-	35	-	-	55
Jul – Sep 06	†	†	-	60	20	50	-	-	130
Oct – Dec 06	-	†	-	55	20	165	5	-	245
2004 – 2006	5	5	†	165	45	540	30	-	785
Jan – Mar 07	†	†	†	40	10	105	†	-	155
Apr – Jun 07	-	†	-	60	40	55	5	-	160
Jul – Sep 07	-	-	-	40	25	100	5	†	170
Oct – Dec 07	†	-	-	40	10	110	10	-	170
2007	5	5	†	180	85	370	20	†	655
Jan – Mar 08	†	-	-	15	10	75	5	-	105
Apr – Jun 08	5	-	-	20	10	115	5	-	155
Jul – Sep 08	5	-	-	20	†	70	5	-	105
Oct – Dec 08	†	-	†	25	5	25	-	-	55
2008	10	-	†	80	25	285	15	-	420
Total	20	10	5	425	155	1,195	65	†	1,875
%	1	<1	<1	23	8	64	3	-	100

Source: Home Office (2008).

Note: These figures are rounded up to the nearest 5 (- denotes nil and † denotes 1 or 2).

York

Table VIII: York registered workers by nationality, May 2004 – December 2008

Period	Czech Rep	Estonia	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovakia	Slovenia	Total
May 04 – Mar 06	30	5	30	30	25	410	70	†	600
Apr – Jun 06	†	-	†	5	†	55	5	†	65
Jul – Sep 06	†	†	5	†	5	80	5	†	95
Oct – Dec 06	5	-	5	†	†	105	10	-	125
2004 – 2006	35	5	40	35	30	650	90	5	885
Jan – Mar 07	5	-	†	†	-	50	5	-	60
Apr – Jun 07	†	†	5	-	-	50	†	-	55
Jul – Sep 07	5	-	5	†	5	65	5	-	85
Oct – Dec 07	5	-	†	†	†	50	5	-	65
2007	15	†	10	5	5	215	15	-	265
Jan – Mar 08	†	-	5	†	5	60	5	-	75
Apr – Jun 08	†	-	5	-	†	45	5	-	60
Jul – Sep 08	-	-	10	†	†	30	5	†	45
Oct – Dec 08	†	-	5	†	5	30	5	†	50
2008	5	-	75	5	10	165	20	5	230
Total	55	5	65	45	45	1,030	125	10	1,380
%	4	<1	5	3	3	75	9	1	

Source: Home Office (2008).

Note: These figures are rounded up to the nearest 5 (- denotes nil and † denotes 1 or 2).

Further information is provided by the National Insurance Number registrations (NINo) on the number of migrant workers within each local authority

Craven

Period	Estonia	Czech Rep	Slovak Rep	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Total
2004	-	-	-	10	-	-	20	-	-	-	30
2005	-	-	-	10	-	-	20	-	-	-	30
2006	-	-	-	10	-	-	20	-	-	-	30
2007	-	-	10	30	-	-	80	-	-	10	130
2008	-	-	10	20	10	-	60	-	20	-	120
Total	-	-	20	80	10	-	200	-	20	10	340
%	-	-	6	24	3	-	59	-	6	3	100

Source: DWP (2009) Note: Figures are rounded to the nearest ten

Hambleton

Period	Estonia	Czech Rep	Slovak Rep	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Total
2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	10	-	30
2005	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	10	-	30
2006	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	10	-	30
2007	-	10	50	-	20	10	190	-	-	10	290
2008	-	10	30	-	20	10	130	-	-	10	210
Total	-	20	80	-	40	20	380	-	30	20	590
%	-	3	14	-	7	3	64	-	5	3	100

Source: DWP (2009) Note: Figures are rounded to the nearest ten

Harrogate

Period	Estonia	Czech Rep	Slovak Rep	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Total
2004	-	20	20	10	-	20	40	-	20	-	130
2005	-	20	20	10	-	20	40	-	20	-	130
2006	-	20	20	10	-	20	40	-	20	-	130
2007	-	20	70	50	20	50	410	-	10	10	640
2008	-	20	40	70	50	30	280	-	10	10	510
Total	-	100	170	150	70	140	810	-	80	20	1,540
%	-	6	11	10	5	9	53	-	5	1	100

Source: DWP (2009) Note: Figures are rounded to the nearest ten

Richmondshire

Period	Estonia	Czech Rep	Slovak Rep	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Total
2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	10
2005	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	10
2006	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	10
2007	-	-	20	10	10	-	80	-	-	-	120
2008	-	-	-	10	10	10	30	-	-	-	60
Total	-	-	20	20	20	10	140	-	-	-	210
%	-	-	10	10	10	5	67	-	-	-	100

Source: DWP (2009) Note: Figures are rounded to the nearest ten

Ryedale

Period	Estonia	Czech Rep	Slovak Rep	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Total
2004	-	-	20	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	30
2005	-	-	20	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	30
2006	-	-	20	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	30
2007	-	10	30	10	10	-	170	-	-	-	230
2008	-	10	40	10	10	10	110	-	-	20	210
Total	-	20	130	20	20	10	310	-	-	20	530
%	-	4	25	4	4	2	58	-	-	4	100

Source: DWP (2009) Note: Figures are rounded to the nearest ten

Scarborough

Period	Estonia	Czech Rep	Slovak Rep	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Total
2004	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	-	-	20
2005	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	-	-	20
2006	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	-	-	20
2007	-	20	30	10	10	10	280	-	-	10	370
2008	-	10	30	10	10	10	180	-	10	20	280
Total	-	30	60	20	20	20	520	-	10	30	710
%	-	4	8	3	3	3	73	-	1	4	100

Source: DWP (2009) Note: Figures are rounded to the nearest ten

Selby

Period	Estonia	Czech Rep	Slovak Rep	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Total
2004	-	-	-	-	10	-	30	-	-	-	40
2005	-	-	-	-	10	-	30	-	-	-	40
2006	-	-	-	-	10	-	30	-	-	-	40
2007	-	-	10	-	10	-	240	-	-	10	270
2008	-	-	20	-	10	-	230	-	20	-	280
Total	-	-	30	-	50	-	560	-	20	10	670
%	-	-	4	-	7	-	84	-	3	1	100

Source: DWP (2009) Note: Figures are rounded to the nearest ten

York

Period	Estonia	Czech Rep	Slovak Rep	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Slovenia	Bulgaria	Romania	Total
2004	-	10	20	10	-	10	70	-	20	-	140
2005	-	10	20	10	-	10	70	-	20	-	140
2006	-	10	20	10	-	10	70	-	20	-	140
2007	-	10	40	50	10	10	560	-	-	10	690
2008	-	10	30	50	10	20	340	-	10	20	490
Total	-	50	130	130	20	60	1,110	-	70	30	1,600
%	-	3	8	8	1	4	69	-	4	2	100

Source: DWP (2009) Note: Figures are rounded to the nearest ten

Appendix 3: Previous Towns/Cities

The following provides a list of where respondents had lived prior to moving to their local authority area. These have been grouped according to region, where applicable.

Yorkshire and Humberside

Bainbridge (North Yorkshire)
Boroughbridge (North Yorkshire)
Bradford (West Yorkshire)
Bridlington (East Riding of Yorkshire)
Cross Hills (North Yorkshire)
Doncaster (South Yorkshire)
Huddersfield (West Yorkshire)
Hull (East Riding of Yorkshire)
Keighley (West Yorkshire)
Leeds (West Yorkshire)
Malton (North Yorkshire)
Pontefract (West Yorkshire)
Robin Hood's Bay (North Yorkshire)
Scarborough (North Yorkshire)
Sheffield (South Yorkshire)
Tadcaster (North Yorkshire)
Thirsk (North Yorkshire)
Whixley (North Yorkshire)
York (North Yorkshire)

South East

Eastbourne (East Sussex)
East Grinstead (West Sussex)
Horsham (West Sussex)
Isle of Wight
Kent
Midhurst (West Sussex)
Oxford (Oxfordshire)
Slough (Berkshire)

North West

Blackburn (Lancashire)
Bolton (Greater Manchester)
Burnley (Lancashire)
Cumbria
Manchester (Greater Manchester)
Preston (Lancashire)
Runcorn (Cheshire)

East Midlands

Ashbourne (Derbyshire)
Derby (Derbyshire)
Leicestershire
Lincoln (Lincolnshire)
Ripley (Derbyshire)
Scunthorpe (Lincolnshire)
Worksop (Nottinghamshire)

North East	Consett (County Durham) Darlington (County Durham) Loftus (North Yorkshire) Newcastle (Tyne & Wear) Tynemouth (Tyne & Wear)
West Midlands	Alcester (Warwickshire) Birmingham Herefordshire
South West	Gloucestershire Shaftsbury (North Dorset) Truro (Cornwall)
Scotland	Glasgow Inverness Nairn
East of England	Cambridge (Cambridgeshire) Essex
London	London

Appendix 4: Current Employment

The following provides a list of respondents' current jobs. This list is based on the specific responses given in the interviews.

- Administrator
- Au pair
- Bar manager
- Bartender
- Brand ambassador
- Builder
- Bus driver
- Butcher
- Cabin crew
- Car mechanic
- Care assistant/carer
- Catering assistant
- Chef
- Childminder
- Cleaner
- Conference assistant
- Conference Porter
- Crab worker
- Customer service assistant
- Data processor
- Dental nurse/technician
- Dentist
- Dispensing assistant
- Doctor
- Domestic assistant
- Driving instructor
- EFL Teacher
- Factory operative
- Farm worker
- Financial control consultant
- Fitness instructor
- Gardener
- Healthcare assistant
- HGV driver
- Housekeeper
- Kitchen assistant
- Laboratory assistant
- Linen porter
- Machine operator
- Maths teacher
- Nanny
- Night porter
- Night receptionist
- Packer
- Pharmacist
- Physiotherapist
- Production worker
- Quality control technician
- Receptionist
- Research assistant
- Restaurant supervisor
- Roofer
- Sales assistant
- Sales associate
- Security officer
- Software developer
- Special needs teacher
- Staff nurse
- Teaching assistant
- Vending machine operator
- Waiter/Waitress
- Warehouse assistant
- Window cleaner
-