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This study has reviewed the literature on migrant workers for substantive evidence that migrant workers are more susceptible to injury and illness in the workplace. The study has examined the sources of data available to facilitate this type of analysis and has evaluated their relative quality and availability. Survey sources typically fail to adequately capture migrant populations, whilst administrative sources lack the richness of data content. Statistics on accidents in the workplace (RIDDOR) are subject to considerable under-recording, particularly for the self-employed, for smaller businesses and, the evidence suggests, for migrant workers. No information is captured to differentiate migrant workers by their nationality, country of birth or first language. Health records are generally only accessible through health surveillance schemes; providing limited coverage on health and the workplace and with no statistics on nationality, country of birth or first language. These combined inadequacies result in a dearth of UK studies that make an explicit link between migrant workers, the workplace and health outcomes. The few studies which looked explicitly at the relationship between migrant status and occupational injury/illness have typically reported inconclusive evidence on the effect of migrant workers upon issues of health and safety, primarily due to inadequate data capture and coverage of the target population. However, a number of studies that have examined the impact of the recent influx of migrants from outside the UK have reinforced the general view that migrant workers, engaged in low-skilled jobs, are more at risk of accident and injury due to the nature of the work they are doing and the conditions in which they are doing it.

The research evidence suggests that there remain significant difficulties associated with the capture of new and reliable data on the geographical distribution and socio-economic profile of migrant workers. There is no substantive evidence that provides robust and representative data to improve existing estimates of migrant numbers and their relative health and safety risk. This study provides a number of options for enhanced data collection as a basis for improved local intelligence for HSE’s monitoring and targeted enforcement.

This report and the work it describes were funded by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). Its contents, including any opinions and/or conclusions expressed, are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily reflect HSE policy.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Context
There are few parts of the United Kingdom (UK) and its economy that remain unaffected by the surge in international migration from central and eastern Europe that has been evident since the expansion of the European Union (EU) in 2004. Employers, workers, local communities, schools, health, housing and social services, emergency services, banks and retailers, unions and advice agencies have all had to respond to a rapidly changing demographic landscape.

The government regards migrant workers as a key part of its strategy for continued economic growth but the statistical instruments available to measure the multi-dimensional impact of migration remain inadequate. The problem is particularly acute in a selected set of local areas, where migrant populations have had a significant demographic, economic and social impact.

There is a lack of consensus over the benefits that migrant workers bring to the UK, but there is general agreement that a large, transient, migrant population involved in low-skilled, low wage and demanding work is more vulnerable to exploitation in the workplace and exposure to inappropriate working conditions.

Requirements
This research project provides a review of the most recent literature and studies that have been completed on the impact of migrant workers. It assesses the data sources used and the evidence that has been produced. The research has sought to establish whether the anecdotal evidence, which has suggested that migrant workers are more at risk of workplace injury and illness, is borne out by available statistical evidence and how any new data might be generated to provide a more informed picture of migrant worker activity.

Research and data review
There is a general view that statistics on international migration provide an incomplete and often confusing picture of population movement to and from the UK. Survey sources typically fail to adequately capture migrant populations, whilst administrative sources lack the richness of data content.

Statistics on accidents in the workplace, captured through the RIDDOR process, are subject to considerable under-recording, particularly for the self-employed, for smaller businesses and, the evidence suggests, for migrant workers. In addition, no information is captured to differentiate migrant workers by their nationality, country of birth or first language.

Health records are generally only accessible through health surveillance schemes; providing limited coverage on health and the workplace and with no statistics on nationality, country of birth or first language.

The result of these combined inadequacies in the available data is a dearth of UK studies that make an explicit link between migrant workers, the workplace and health outcomes, confirming the evidence presented in the European literature (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, 2007).

This report provides a review of the more recent studies of migrant workers, identifying a wide range of national, regional and local analyses. The small number of studies which looked explicitly at the relationship between migrant status and occupational injury and illness have typically reported inconclusive evidence on the effect of migrant workers upon issues of health
and safety, primarily due to inadequate data capture and coverage of the target population. However, most studies that have examined the impact of the recent influx of migrants from outside the UK have reinforced the general view that migrant workers, engaged in low-skilled jobs, are more at risk of accident and injury due to the nature of the work they are doing and the conditions in which they are doing it.

A persistent problem facing research into international migration is the difficulty of generating new data due to poor rates of survey participation and the complexities involved in trying to achieve a representative research sample of the diverse migrant community. In the absence of a population register or similarly comprehensive administrative system there is no reliable record of the migrant population from which to base such a sampling process.

A number of the recent studies have used a combination of secondary datasets (LFS, NINo, WRS, Work Permit statistics, GP registrations) to produce a summary view of the level, profile and distribution of migrants. These studies have provided commentary, presentation and interpretation of the available statistics but have generated no new data and have not attempted to synthesise locally the different sources of statistics into a ‘one number’ count of new migrants.

A more substantial number of studies have supplemented the national statistics with data generated from surveys and/or interviews with a sample of migrant workers, employers, labour providers and other associated organisations. The focus of research has typically been on the impact of migrant workers upon the economy and the workplace, integration and cohesion in the community and the effect of the new workforce upon local service provision. In a number of cases attempts have been made to produce improved estimates of migrant worker numbers but have been constrained by an inadequate sampling process. These studies have a number of common characteristics:

- A small sample size with various methods used to select respondents.
- Different definitions of the migrant population.
- One-off studies, with data generated for a specific time-period with no system of ongoing measurement or analysis.
- Studies designed primarily to understand the phenomenon and processes associated with recent migration through qualitative analysis.
- New data not statistically representative of a target ‘population’ of new migrants, with any quantitative statistics derived from the samples subject to substantial bias.
- Because of the variety of purposes and methodologies used in the local surveys, only a qualitative synthesis, informed by local expertise and views, is possible.

The research evidence suggests that there remain significant difficulties associated with the capture of new and reliable data on the geographical distribution and socio-economic profile of migrant workers. There is no substantive evidence that provides robust and representative data to improve existing estimates of migrant numbers and their relative health and safety risk.

**Migrant worker risks**

Whilst identifying that migrants are more likely to be working in sectors or occupations where there are existing health and safety concerns, studies have not produced conclusive evidence of a higher incidence of injury or illness to migrants in the workplace. However, the failure of migrant workers to report accidents and the inadequate coverage of the migrant population within surveys has affected the outcome of these studies.
A number of studies have touched on issues of migrant worker vulnerability. Largely through qualitative evidence, a number of factors have been highlighted as an indication that migrant workers are more vulnerable to health and safety issues in the workplace:

- Migrant workers make up a large proportion of the workforce involved in **low-skilled occupations**. In parts of the horticulture and food processing industries the workforce is almost exclusively foreign-born.

- The type of work in which migrant workers are employed is typically that which the local workforce is reluctant to do. Jobs can be physically demanding, with evidence of migrant workers being given the **toughest jobs** and being set **higher productivity** targets.

- The evidence suggests that migrant workers are working **longer hours** and may take second jobs to boost income, increasing both their health and safety risks in the workplace and the quality of their service delivery.

- There is an increased **casualisation** of the workforce, with teams of workers often moved between jobs and often to jobs in other industries.

- There is also evidence of migrants working in **dangerous conditions**, without prior industry experience, particularly in construction, despite explicit guidelines to prevent this. But there is no conclusive evidence that this is more likely to be true for migrant workers than other workers.

- The **complexity of the supply chains** that exist, particularly in the construction industry, continue to blur the lines of responsibility for health and safety.

- The **language barrier** has been identified as the biggest factor affecting the risk to migrants, particularly when workers are new to a particular workplace. The risk is accentuated when combined with a lack of prior experience and the ambiguous lines of responsibility evident in long supply-chains.

- Migrant workers often suffer **ignorance** of the contractual arrangements under which they are employed and their pay is often subject to deductions to cover poor quality, tied accommodation and other services. This type of employment relationship is not conducive to a healthy and safe working environment.

- **Accommodation** in which workers are housed is often of a poor standard. The quality of HMO and other forms of temporary accommodation have been identified as having a potentially detrimental impact upon the health and well being of migrant workers.

Whilst recognising the potential risks to which migrant workers are being exposed, evidence suggests that they are generally willing participants, seeking to capitalise on the available economic opportunities. In addition, the youthful age profile of the migrant workforce, suggests that they are typically relatively healthy, unlikely to register with a GP and less likely to report accidents and injuries in the workplace.
Developing trends
The size of the migrant inflow that followed the extension of the EU in 2004 was considerably in excess of all expectations. Whilst the inflow continues to bring large numbers of new economic migrants to the UK, the research review presented here has identified a number of recent trends that may play a significant part in determining the future scale, profile and distribution of the migrant workforce.

- The **economic outlook** for the UK remains unclear. Whilst employers enjoy the flexibility of migrant workers, it is also evident that this characteristic is symptomatic of a workforce that will constantly be evaluating economic opportunities at home, in the UK and in other European countries. Economic development in central and eastern Europe and the relaxation of barriers to movement in Germany and France, could alter the dynamics of European labour migration.

- There is evidence that the **peak** in the inflow of migrants to the UK has been reached. The most recent NINo statistics suggest a reduction in new registrations, whilst studies of A8 migrants have suggested that up to 40-50% of those who arrived since 2004 have subsequently returned.

- In some **sectors** of the economy the workforce is almost exclusively foreign born. Any interruption to this ready supply of labour would create real problems for those businesses whose competitiveness now depends upon it.

- Evidence in the North of England suggests that migrant workers have begun to seek more appropriate housing accommodation, moving out of traditional HMOs into properties located within ‘Pathfinder’ sites, an affordable alternative and one which demonstrates that some migrants are seeking a **more permanent stay** in the UK.

- **Union representation** remains low in those sectors where labour providers have greatest control. However, unions and other agencies are increasingly active in seeking support and a stronger regulatory framework for vulnerable workers.

- A number of studies highlighted a hierarchy that is **developing within the migrant workforce**. In London, this was demonstrated with a definite ‘hiring queue’ evident for specific jobs. In other studies, some migrant groups have been establishing themselves in more senior positions with responsibility for overseeing the work of other nationalities.

- The **effectiveness of the migrant workforce** is likely to improve with experience and as language skills develop. This may help future waves of new migrants to integrate into the workplace, thereby reducing the risks associated with lack of industry expertise and poor English language skills.

- The **RSMPs** have been established as a secondary tier through which the government’s immigration policy can be managed and monitored. They are severely constrained by a lack of empirical evidence and by the diversity of issues associated with migrant workers and have yet to become effective as a focal point for research and analysis.

- There is a universal message being given concerning the quality and availability of statistics on international migration. There are no quick and easy solutions to this problem but there is a **need for creativity** in the use of existing data systems to provide improved intelligence on the migrant worker population.
**Recommendations**
The available statistics on migrant workers remain inadequate and incomplete, constraining effective research and analysis of workplace health and safety. In addition, new data capture is problematic due to the difficulty of capturing a representative sample of the target population and due to the continuing change in the dynamics and profile of the migrant worker labour force. A number of recommendations are made:

Labour Force Survey

- The **LFS** remains the primary source of information on the labour force and on the resident **stock** of migrants in the UK. Despite its sampling issues, the incidence of injury and illness to migrant workers should continue to be monitored through successive releases of the LFS.

Macro-level data

- HSE should consider the **New Worker and Health Databank** (NWHD) concept, to create a database of migrant worker statistics at national, regional and local authority level, combining ONS data on international migration with labour market statistics from NIRS2, WRS and the LFS and recorded incidents from RIDOR.
- This database would provide a consistent **geographical and time-series** view of available data, avoiding the need for snapshot studies through a regular process of update as new data becomes available.
- HSE should investigate **data sharing initiatives** with, for example, DWP, NHS, GLA, CAB and local PCTs to establish how additional intelligence on migrant workers might be extracted for mutual benefit.
- HSE might consider the development of **area clusters** with similar industry/migrant/accident profiles from which to develop a more strategic perspective on labour market trends and targeted enforcement.

National targeting and local intelligence

- Macro-level data will provide the **intelligence for monitoring and targeted enforcement**. More local intelligence can be taken from the **research studies** on migrant worker activity referenced in this report and from the people and organisations on the ground who completed these studies.

New Survey

- HSE could consider the development of a **small, intensive survey**, targeted specifically at measuring the ‘bias’ in national administrative datasets and their relationships. This would capture migration history, work history, health and safety history and history of registration with the UK’s major administrative registers. The purpose of this survey would be to discover the relationship between the administrative registers and the population at risk, yielding adjustment factors to use with the register counts to provide improved estimates of the target population at risk. There are risks associated with running such a survey, however, and it would need a feasibility study to establish best procedures, costs and potential pay-off. The issue of how to obtain a fully representative sample of migrant workers would still need to be resolved and the survey would ideally need to be repeated periodically given the current economic uncertainty that exists and the likely change in the pattern and trend in migrant worker flows. Expertise in ONS, the National Centre for Social
Research and the Institute for Social and Economic Research could be consulted for advice on the most appropriate methodology to employ.

Data linkage

• HSE should consider the addition of the National Insurance Number and/or NHS number to its existing RIDDOR data capture to facilitate linkage with other administrative datasets.

• Collaboration between HSE and DWP/HMRC is recommended to establish how additional intelligence on migrant populations might be generated in an aggregate/anonymised form and to identify how a risk analysis on RIDDOR records might be completed.

General

• Given the UK-wide requirement for better statistics on migrant workers and the renewed drive for improved occupational health and well-being, it is suggested that HSE adopts a collaborative approach to any new data capture initiatives, sharing both the costs and benefits of generating new intelligence.

• The HSE might consider a position within a wider group of UK stakeholders, brought together to establish a single source of intelligence on international migrants, from which a common and consistent set of statistics from a variety of sources might be drawn.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 CONTEXT

There are few parts of the UK and its economy that remain unaffected by the surge in international migration that has been evident since the unprecedented expansion of the European Union (EU) in 2004. Employers, workers, local communities, schools, health, housing and social services, emergency services, banks and retailers, unions and advice agencies have all had to respond to a rapidly changing demographic landscape.

The Economic Affairs Committee of the House of Lords, concluded its recent investigation on the economic impact of immigration with a view that this large scale migration to the UK would help to grow the UK economy but that it would be unlikely to have a significant impact upon the individual incomes of its resident population (House of Lords, 2008a).

Prominent in the Committee’s recommendations was the need to radically improve the measurement of migration to and from the UK and the general availability of these statistics. The lack of accurate and timely data on new migrants continues to be a barrier to informed public debate and has led to widespread confusion and uncertainty over the short and longer-term impact of migration upon local communities.

Improvements in the collection and delivery of migration statistics are underway as part of a cross-government approach to managing the impacts on migration recognising the fact that inadequate information is hampering attempts to understand local change and to plan for the future at all levels of government, from national to local (Communities and Local Government, 2008). However, there is increasing pressure for more fundamental changes to the way migration and population statistics are collected and disseminated with the inability to accurately measure migration being recognised as the major factor affecting the quality of population statistics in the UK (House of Commons Treasury Committee, 2008).

Simultaneously, the government has published its vision for the role of the workplace in promoting ‘health and well being’ (Black, 2008). The detachment of occupational health from mainstream healthcare is identified as a key constraint in redressing the economic and individual costs of workplace ill-health and Dame Carol Black’s report advocates a significantly raised profile for employee health and well-being that goes beyond the traditional remit of health and safety.

Once again the issue of the paucity of good quality data, to inform debate and policy formulation with regard to work-related ill-health, is seen to be an issue. Better statistical instruments are recommended to support national, regional and local occupational health initiatives.

Migrant workers, particularly those from countries joining the EU since 2004, have changed the profile of the UK workplace. Economic opportunism has encouraged migrant workers to take on jobs that are often more ‘dirty, dangerous and demanding’ (3D) providing employers with an attractive alternative to the more reluctant and generally more expensive indigenous population.

The proliferation of migrant workers, particularly in construction, agriculture, horticulture and food processing, has led to increasing concerns over issues of health and safety in the
workplace. Language and cultural differences combined with ambivalent employer attitudes to worker health and safety have been identified as key contributory factors, although there is insufficient empirical evidence to confirm the general view.

These concerns come at a time when the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) is under increased pressure to improve its inspection and enforcement process, particularly in those industries, such as construction, where there is a perception that the number of fatal injuries has increased whilst prosecutions for poor health and safety practice have declined (Observer 11th May 2008, ‘A high cost in builders’ lives’).

The HSE is seeking a more robust and reliable evidence base on which it can build its analytical understanding of the impact of the migrant workforce and on which it can better target its policy and enforcement initiatives.

1.2 REQUIREMENTS

The HSE has sought to establish whether migrant workers are at a greater health and safety risk than the comparable indigenous workforce. It has looked to build upon previous analyses to achieve the following:

- To identify all possible, published and unpublished, information on migrant worker numbers, distribution, and health and safety risks in Britain.

- To evaluate the methodological quality of and potential biases acting on, these information sources focusing on newly identified information.

- To use these analyses to inform where and by how much the data from national sources under- or over-estimate migrant worker numbers, their distribution, or their health and safety risks.

- To provide an evidence based assessment of the feasibility of developing new sources that would significantly improve the accuracy and reliability of estimates derived from currently available data.

This research project has sought to establish whether the anecdotal evidence, which has suggested that migrant workers are more at risk, is borne out by available statistical evidence and if not, then how any new data might be generated to produce a more informed picture of migrant worker activity.

1.3 METHODOLOGY

This study has primarily involved desk-based research and investigation. It has sought to identify any research, analysis and related publications which could provide a more informed, empirical view of the impact of migrants upon the UK workplace, specifically upon aspects of health and safety and their exposure to greater risks of injury.

The review has focused on research and analysis that has been completed since EU enlargement in 2004. The last twenty-four months, in particular, has seen a huge surge in national and local interest in the study of migrant workers, and a proliferation of comment, studies and
publications, all seeking to shed some light on the ‘impact’ that this new population is having and is likely to have on the socio-economic profile of the UK.

Keywords
Searches were typically conducted using a combination of the following keywords:

Migrant, migrant worker, foreign worker, migrant labour, immigration, immigrant, migration, health, safety, health and safety, workplace, accident, injury, illness, occupation, occupational health and safety.

These keywords were used to make direct searches within online databases, to search individual websites, to scan retrieved documents and publications and to make general searches on the internet.

Search strategies
The University of Leeds Library provided a key search facility across all journals, periodicals and other electronic resources, including the Medline database. This was supplemented with searches within the Intute database, providing information on research specifically in health and life sciences (www.intute.ac.uk), the EBSCO electronic journals service (http://ejournals.ekcbo.com/Login.asp) and the CISDOC occupational health and safety database (www.ilo.org/dyn/cisdoc/index_html).

The Google search engine was used to undertake specific searches using the combination of keywords providing links into potential sources of information and intelligence. This process was guided using key media sites including BBC (www.news.bbc.co.uk) and the Guardian (www.guardian.co.uk) search engines to review national and local media coverage.

This general search process was accompanied by a more focused and systematic approach which targeted national, regional and local organisations that potentially had an interest or would be influenced by the impact of migrant workers. It was felt that this systematic search process was necessary to identify the key research and analysis that has been conducted into migration data, migrant workers and health and safety issues and to capture any ‘grey’ literature which may exist on the subject.

The impact across different industry sectors is a key dimension of migrant worker activity. There are a multitude of Trade Associations across the UK, representing organisations in all industry sectors. The link below provided a convenient portal to all Trade Association sites.

Trade Associations  www.netregs.gov.uk/netregs/resources/277462/?lang= e

For this review all general trade associations were searched:

Association of Labour Providers  www.labourproviders.org.uk/
British Retail Consortium  www.brc.org.uk/
CBI  www.cbi.org.uk/
Federation of Small Businesses  www.fsb.co.uk/
National Federation of Enterprise Agencies  www.nfeai.org/  
Scottish Retail Consortium  www.scottishretail.org.uk/
Trade Association Forum  www.taforum.org/  

In addition, all sites in the Construction, Agriculture, Food and Drink Manufacture, Transport and Catering and Accommodation were searched as were organisations dealing directly with health and safety issues in the workplace. Trade Associations typically provided links to
additional information from trade journals and other industry publications which are largely unrecognised by the aforementioned search engines.

Both the Office of National Statistics and the Home Office have published extensively on the quality and completeness of statistics on international migration and on their respective strategies for improvement. All key documents were sourced from the respective sites:

National Statistics  www.statistics.gov.uk
Home Office  www.homeoffice.gov.uk

The recent report published by the Economic Affairs Select Committee of the House of Lords provided a key source of intelligence on the ‘Economic Impact of Immigration’. Volume II of the report was particularly useful, providing full details of all submissions to the enquiry on all of the key aspects of migrant worker statistics plus links to a wide range of additional sources of intelligence.

www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200708/ldselect/ldeconaf/82/82ii.pdf

A key objective of the project was to identify local research and datasets that might better inform the national picture. Regional Assemblies and the Regional Development Agencies provided a key focal point of this research, in conjunction with corresponding organisations in Scotland and Wales. All Regional Assembly and Regional Development Agency sites were investigated.

Regional Development Agencies  www.englandsrdas.com/

Regional Strategic Migration Partnerships have been created to provide a focal point for the implementation of migration policy at a local level. Each organisation was searched for evidence of migration research and publications and for evidence of the latest local initiatives that are underway.

East of England  www.southwest-ra.gov.uk/nqcontent.cfm?a_id=3141
North East  www.newcastle.gov.uk/css.nsf/AllCSSWeb/377426DD7B4323DD80256B660057217B
North West  www.migrantworkersnorthwest.org/
Scotland  www.asylumscotland.org.uk/index.php
South West  www.southwest-ra.gov.uk/nqcontent.cfm?a_id=3141
Wales  www.newport.gov.uk/_dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=refugeesasyllum.homepage
West Midlands  www.wmlga.gov.uk/page.asp?id=323
Yorkshire & The Humber  www.refugeeaccess.info/default.asp?step=2&id=43

Regional Observatories have been established to provide a focal point for the dissemination of regional and local statistics. Each of the Observatory sites was visited to explore the availability of relevant data and publications. A link to each was provided through the Association of Regional Observatories’ weblink below.

Association of Regional Observatories  www.regionalobservatories.org.uk/index.html

Regional Public Health Observatories have also provided a useful source of intelligence on the availability of statistics on occupational health and the difficulty of linking directly to
information on migrant workers:

Association of Public Health Observatories  www.apho.org.uk
Injury Observatory Britain and Ireland  www.injuryobservatory.net/stats_iobi_phoh.html
Collaboration for Accident Prevention and Injuries Control  www.capic.org.uk/index.html
Scotland Unintentional Injuries  www.isdscotland.org/isd/4475.html

This regional research provided the gateway into research and publications that have been produced for local organisations. Further investigation of local activity was facilitated through the Communities and Local Government iDEA portal, providing a ‘Communities of Practice’ forum for the sharing of best practice in dealing with local migrant worker issues. (www.communities.idea.gov.uk).

A number of key policy and research institutes were searched to identify and review relevant publications and research activity, including:

Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations  www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/crer
Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies  www.ncl.ac.uk/curds/
Centre on Migration Policy & Society  www.compas.ox.ac.uk/
Institute of Community Cohesion  www.coventry.ac.uk/researchnet/icoco
Institute of Employment Studies  www.employment-studies.co.uk
Institute of Public Policy & Research  www.ippr.org/
Sussex Centre for Migration Research  www.sussex.ac.uk/migration/
Joseph Rowntree Foundation  www.jrf.org.uk/
London Migration Research Group  www.lse.ac.uk/collections/MSU/l-m-r-g.html
Migration Research Unit, UCL  www2.geog.ucl.ac.uk/mru/
Migrationwatch  www.migrationwatch.org/
Queen Mary College, London  www.geog.qmul.ac.uk
Working Lives Research Institute  www.workinglives.org/

In addition, advice agencies, regulatory bodies and public sector organisations were investigated to review relevant material on migrant worker activity, including:

Audit Commission  www.audit-commission.gov.uk
Bank of England  www.bankofengland.co.uk
Commission for Rural Communities  www.ruralcommunities.gov.uk
COVE  www.vulnerableworkers.org.uk
DEFRA  www.defra.gov.uk
Gangmasters Licensing Authority  www.gla.gov.uk
GMB  www.gmb.org.uk/
Local Government Association  www.lga.gov.uk
The Association of British Insurers  www.abi.org.uk/
The British Safety Council  http://www.britishsafetycouncil.co.uk/about/index.aspx
The British Safety Industry Federation  www.bsif.co.uk/index.asp
The Construction Industry Training Board  www.citb.co.uk/
Although the focus of the literature review was on UK activity, an international perspective was provided through information sourced from a number of organisations including:

European Agency for Health & Safety at Work  
European foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions  
International Labour Organisation

A snowballing approach was adopted throughout the research process with each website, publication, comment or other printed material providing links for further research and investigation.

### 1.4 DOCUMENT STRUCTURE

Section 2 of the report provides a brief overview of the existing mechanism for managing migration to the UK and describes the conceptual and definitional issues that add complexity to the interpretation of statistics on migrant workers. The section includes an illustration of statistics drawn from a selection of sources.

Section 3 summarises the international and UK context for the research review, with an increasing concern for the vulnerability of migrant workers and their potential exploitation in the workplace.

Section 4 reviews the latest research and analysis on the impact of migrant workers, searching specifically for evidence of an increased incidence of accidents in the workplace as a result of the influx of foreign labour into low-paid, low-skilled employment.

Section 5 provides a summary of the research identified in Section 4, using a ‘data typology’ to classify studies based on the quality of data and evidence presented.

Section 6 summarises the quality and characteristics of the existing datasets that are available for research and analysis in this field and identifies areas where improvements might be possible in data coverage and data availability.

Section 7 concludes the report with a summary of findings and a series of recommendations for improved data capture on migrant workers and their impact upon the workplace.
2 MANAGING AND MEASURING MIGRATION

2.1 MANAGING MIGRATION

The international movement of people between countries is now a key driver of population change in the 21st century. The growth in the capacity for rapid air travel has left few areas of the world inaccessible, whilst political and economic change has continued to have a gravitational effect upon the international movement of migrants. Significant wage disparities, the availability of employment opportunities, development and disruption in home countries and regional conflict, all continue to contribute to the forces driving population redistribution.

In Europe, economic migrants and political refugees and asylum seekers have, and continue to have, a significant impact upon regional economies and local communities. The expansion of the EU in 2004 resulted in huge regional disparities in wages and opportunities between new and old member states, driving a major flow of inter-country migration.

Government policy in the UK continues to regard migrant workers as a key part of its strategy for continued economic growth, although, increasingly, the freedom of movement from within the European Economic Area (EEA) is being balanced with tighter controls on migration from elsewhere.

In early 2008 the Home Office introduced the first phase of the UK’s new immigration system designed to simplify the process by which non-EEA migrants come to the UK (Home Office, 2006). The new points-based system consists of five separate tiers; each subject to different conditions, entitlements and entry-clearance checks.

- Tier 1: Highly skilled individuals
- Tier 2: Skilled workers to fill specific gaps in the UK labour force
- Tier 3: Low skilled workers to fill temporary labour shortages
- Tier 4: Students
- Tier 5: Youth mobility and temporary workers

Points are awarded to migrants reflecting their skills, experience and age and the demand for these skills in the UK economy.

The new system does not apply to migrants from the EEA and Switzerland. Migrants from Accession countries have freedom of movement throughout the EU but, until April 2009, must register with the Workers Registration Scheme (WRS) if they are to be employed in the UK. Bulgarian and Romanian migrants have similar freedom of movement but employment in the UK requires an individual application for an ‘accession worker card’ and, in certain cases, an application for a work permit from an employer.

The new policy has been accompanied by a new administrative structure, established to manage and monitor the impact of migration, both nationally and at a local level (Figure 1).

The Migration Advisory Committee (MAC) is made up of a team of independent experts to advise Government on where in the economy there are labour shortages that could be filled by new migrants and, in conjunction with the Migration Impacts Forum (MIF) to set the points ‘hurdle’ that these migrants need to cross to work or study in the UK.
The MIF has been created to advise the Government on how migration affects issues such as housing, employment, education, health care, crime and community cohesion. The MIF consists of representatives from local government, health, education, the police and criminal justice system, the voluntary sector, the Confederation of British Industry (CBI) and the Trades Union Congress (TUC).

A regional structure has been reconstituted with devolved responsibility for managing migrant integration (Home Office, 2007). This regional framework was originally established in 2004 to deal with the dispersal, accommodation and support of asylum seekers and refugees. Since 2007, the remit of the new Regional Strategic Migration Partnerships (RSMP) has been extended to include all migration issues. Regional representatives provided initial feedback to the MIF, producing evidence on the local impact of migrant populations and highlighting some of the deficiencies that existed in the available empirical evidence (Home Office, 2007). The RSMPs typically consist of representatives from Regional Development Agencies (RDA), regional government offices and assemblies, local authorities and a variety of commercial and voluntary organisations. The evidence presented in this report suggests that the effectiveness of the coordinating role of the RSMPs remains unclear.

CLG has overall responsibility for issues of community cohesion and migrant integration. It has established a forum for sharing local best practice on migrant issues through its Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) and there are regular contributions from local organisations across the RSMPs.

2.2 MIGRATION MEASUREMENT

In the UK, the dynamics of international population movement and its impact upon local economies is placing far greater importance on its ‘measurement’. In an attempt to better understand and manage the impact of international migration, there is increasing political pressure for improved intelligence on the volume, profile and geographical distribution of migrants (Statistics Commission, 2007; House of Lords, 2008a&b; House of Commons, 2008).
In the absence of a population register, there is no single source of statistics that provides a comprehensive view of the migrant population and its many dimensions. Since EU enlargement, this has resulted in much confusion and media hysteria over the precise size and impact of migrant flows. With an unclear statistical picture at a national level, an understanding of migrant impacts at a local level has been even more problematic; but it is in these local communities, health services, education services and local businesses where the impact has been most dramatic and where better information to facilitate research, analysis and policy formulation is most crucial.

National statistics on international migration are produced periodically but provide an incomplete picture of the complex picture of migration to and from the UK. National surveys and alternative administrative sources provide additional intelligence but also deliver only a partial view of the migrant population.

The pattern of passenger journeys in the UK is complex, with visitors and migrants coming into and out of the country for a variety of reasons and for a variety of lengths of stay (Figure 2).

Figure 2: UK International Passenger Arrivals and Departures, 2006

Most visitors and migrants will enter the UK legally, some illegally. Some come to find work, some to study, others to join existing family members and some to seek protection from abuse or persecution in their home country. Some migrants will come to the UK as visitors and then decide to stay for a longer period, sometimes for more than 12 months (visitor switchers). Others will come as migrants with the intention of staying for a long period but then change their mind and return within 12 months (migrant switchers).

Some migrants will be highly skilled, others less so, seeking manual and semi-skilled employment. Some will emigrate permanently from the UK; others will leave for a short or extended length of time but then return. Some migrants will come to the UK, stay in one place for only a short period but then move on to a more permanent residence.
The new, points-based system is designed to streamline and simplify the process by which migrant workers enter the UK’s labour market. In 2005, it was estimated that over 400,000 migrant workers came to the UK to work legally, using a variety of routes available for entry to the labour force (Figure 3) (Salt and Millar, 2006).

**Figure 3: Foreign labour inflows by route of entry, UK, 2005**

*Source: Salt and Millar (2006)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worker Registration Scheme *</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Permits b</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU and EFTA c</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Holiday Makers d</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Skilled Migrant Programme b</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme b</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Servants a</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Ancestry *</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectors Based Schemes b</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Engineering Graduates Scheme a</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au Pairs *</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministers of Religion *</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>401</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data sources:
* Home Office; b Work Permits (UK); c IPS; d UK Visas; e IRSS admissions

In terms of occupation type, the work permit system has been the route for a large number of migrants in professional and managerial roles, particularly in health care services, computer services and other business and management services. The WRS covers migrants from the Accession countries across the full range of occupation types, but with a large number concentrated in lower-skilled jobs. Other schemes, such as the Working Holiday Makers Scheme (WHMS), the Highly Skilled Migrants Programme (HSMP), the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme (SAWS) and the Sector Based Scheme (SBS) have all allowed specific non-EEA migrants access to the UK labour market (Dench et al., 2006).

### 2.3 Migrant Definitions

The accuracy of the UK’s migration statistics has been the subject of much criticism but much of the confusion has been due to the complexity of the conceptual and definitional issues associated with international migration and the different data sources that are used to measure it. In an effort to better coordinate the dissemination of migration statistics (and to limit the constant stream of negative media coverage as each set of statistics is released) the Office of National Statistics (ONS) now has a quarterly programme of publication for its population and migration statistics. This has improved the process of publication but the latest release (May 2008) demonstrates the challenge faced by any individual or organisation trying to interpret the multitude of statistics to produce a definitive count of migrants in the UK and their impact upon local populations (Figure 4).

Certain sources provide only a national picture; others a sub-national view. Some provide a count of inflows during a year; others measure the resident stock of migrants. Some are based on surveys; some are derived from administrative systems. In the absence of a population register, there is no simple solution to capturing a more comprehensive and more accurate picture of the complex and multi-dimensional process illustrated in Figure 4. The existing proliferation of data sources requires that a user of the statistics first defines the type of migrant that is of interest and then generates an integrated view using the available datasets.
The length of time a migrant stays in the UK is a particular issue when interpreting migration statistics (Figure 5). Those staying for less than three months, for example, are generally classed as visitors. A ‘short-term migrant’ is defined as, ‘a person who moves to a country other than that of his or her usual residence for a period of at least 3 months but less than a year, except in cases where the movement to that country is for purposes of recreation, holiday, visits to friends and relatives, business, medical treatment or religious pilgrimage’ (United Nations Statistics Division, 2006).

At present, data on short-term migrants are not included in published statistics and it is the indeterminate length of stay of the majority of Accession country migrants that is the main source of confusion and uncertainty with UK migration statistics.

A ‘long-term migrant’ is a person whose country of usual residence changes for a period of 12 months or more. It is this migrant definition that is the basis for the UK’s National Statistics on total annual immigration and emigration via a question on intended duration of stay in the International Passenger Survey (IPS).
The distinction between stocks and flows is also an important one when using migrant statistics:

- Stocks provide a count of the total number of resident migrants. Resident migrants can be counted in a number of different ways; as persons with a different country of birth or as persons who have immigrated to the UK within a specified time period.

- Flows provide a count of the number of new migrants that come to or leave the UK in a specified period of time, usually a single year. Migrant flows will increase or decrease the size of the resident stock of migrants, depending upon the balance of emigration to immigration.

Migrant workers have typically been classified as those who have arrived in the UK within the last five years, so will encompass both stocks and flows when considering available statistics. These workers will be a combination of legal and illegal workers, including those from the EEA who have a right to live and work in the UK plus those from outside the EEA who require a work permit or who come to the UK as working holiday makers or seasonal agricultural workers.

2.4 MIGRANT STATISTICS – NATIONAL

There are a number of alternative sources of statistics on international migration. Individually, none of the sources provides a neat and definitive picture of migrant stocks and flows at a national and sub-national level. Collectively, they do provide a more complete picture but only with careful interpretation of the conceptual and definitional issues that exist between the different datasets.

Section 6 of this document includes a summary of the datasets that provide intelligence to any analysis of migrant workers in the UK, looking specifically at the alternative census, survey and administrative datasets of international migration. ‘National Statistics’ on international migration are typically only robust at a national level. Regional statistics are subject to more significant sampling error, requiring alternative administrative datasets to be used to provide an alternative view of migrant activity at a local level.

The Labour Force Survey (LFS) continues to provide the definitive source of information on the UK labour market and is the only source of information on the resident stock of migrant workers. However, its migrant data is subject to error for two main reasons: it does not capture people living in communal households; and it excludes individuals who have been resident in the UK for less than six months. These groups will include a disproportionate number of migrants, so the LFS is liable to undercount total migrant worker numbers (Statistics Commission, 2007).

The distinction between migrant workers and foreign workers is an important one as over one third of those born abroad and in employment in 2007 were UK nationals (Statistics Commission, 2007). In addition, most migrant workers are not recent arrivals. Less than half of those born abroad and in UK employment in 2007 arrived in the last ten years.

Despite its limitations, the LFS is now an integral part of ONS’ ongoing improvements to the release of migration statistics (ONS, 2008a). ONS defines a foreign worker based on ‘country of birth’, including all people born abroad who are aged 16 and over. In 2008, the LFS estimates the total number of foreign workers in the UK to be 3.68 million, 12.5% of the total workforce (Figure 6). This has increased by 62% since 2001.
Approximately 510,000 of the foreign worker total consists of migrants from the A8 countries, over 80% of whom have come to the UK since 2004. It is important to recognise that these are estimates of migrant ‘stock’ and not a count of all inflows since 2001. Using a combination of LFS stock data and WRS data, it has been estimated between 40-50% of all A8 migrants who have come to the UK since 2004 have since returned to their home country (Lemos and Portes, 2008; Pollard et al., 2008).

Figure 6: Employment of foreign workers in the United Kingdom, 2001-2008

The LFS suggests that A8 migrants are found in most significant numbers in manufacturing industries and in distribution, hotels and restaurants, with over 50% of workers employed in these sectors. For non-A8 foreign workers, it is public administration which employs most, followed by business services and distribution, hotels and restaurants (Figure 7).

Figure 7: Percentage distribution across industries, UK foreign workers, 2007

Source: ONS, 2008a. Labour Force Survey
In terms of occupation, approximately 55% of A8 migrants are employed in low-skilled jobs, with other foreign workers having a much higher representation in senior, professional and managerial roles (Figure 8).

**Figure 8: Percentage distribution across occupations, UK foreign workers, 2007**

The UK’s most robust measure of migrant ‘flows’ is provided by the composite ‘Total International Migration’ (TIM) statistics produced by the Office of National Statistics. TIM statistics only measure ‘long-term’ migrants; those who come to, or leave, the UK for up to twelve month’s duration. They do not provide a measure of ‘short-term’ migrants. Short-term migrants are an increasingly important component of the UK workforce whose length of stay is typically less than twelve months.

Total immigration of long-term migrants to the UK in the calendar year 2006 is estimated at 591,000. Approximately 231,000 (39%) of these arrived to take up a definite job or to seek employment. Some 27% were students (Figure 9).
In terms of nationality or citizenship, 14% of the long-term immigrants in 2006 were British, 28% were from the EU and 58% from elsewhere. The EU proportion has increased from 13% of the total in 2003 (Figure 10).

The net flow picture for 2006 reveals the balance of inflow and outflow by citizenship, with a significant net loss of British citizens matched by the net gains from New Commonwealth countries (Figure 11). The net increase in the A8 population will exclude any short-term migrants, not captured in the TIM statistics.
In response to the pressure for more information specifically on short-term migrants, ONS has produced its first set of statistics on migration flows with a duration of stay of less than twelve months (ONS, 2008b). Whilst these statistics remain only ‘experimental’, the Department of Works and Pension (DWP) database of national insurance number (NINo) registrations provides the most complete view of migrant worker statistics, albeit with no clear differentiation between the length of stay of each individual registrant. In 2006/07 there were a total of 685,000 NINo registrations to workers from outside the UK. Approximately 265,000 of these registrations (39%) were to migrants from Accession countries (Figure 12).

Statistics on the size of the illegally resident workforce in the UK are, by their very nature, difficult to define. Totals of between 450,000-500,000 have been estimated as likely stocks and these statistics have remained as a regularly quoted benchmark (Pinkerton et al., 2004; Woodbridge, 2005). However, these estimates are highly uncertain.

Figure 11: Net flow by Citizenship, UK, TIM 2006

![Net flow by Citizenship, UK, TIM 2006](image)

Source: ONS (2008a)

Figure 12: NINo registrations, UK 2002-2007

![NINo registrations, UK 2002-2007](image)

Source: 100% data extract from the National Insurance Recording System (NIRS2).
2.5 MIGRANT STATISTICS – GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

At a sub-national level, NINo statistics provide the most complete view of migrant worker flows, albeit with no identification of precise length of stay or of the occupation profile of migrants. The WRS provides an additional view for Accession migrants only but provides the profile of migrants by industry and occupation.

In 2006/07, non-Accession migrant worker registrations were heavily biased towards London, with 46% of the total (Figure 13a). Migrant workers from Accession countries have typically been far more distributed around the UK, in both urban and rural areas. Only 23% of Accession migrant registrants were resident in London in 2006/07 (Figure 13b).

Figure 13: NINo registrations, Great Britain, 2006/2007

(a) Non-Accession migrant workers

(b) Accession migrant workers
The WRS provides an alternative view of migrant workers from the Accession countries, as it records each migrant worker based upon the location of the employer rather than the residence of the migrant. The distribution of registrations is much flatter, reflecting the dispersal of Accession migrants across the UK’s labour market (Figure 14).

**Figure 14: WRS registrations, 2006/2007**

![Graph showing the distribution of WRS registrations across different regions of the UK.](image)

The different distributions that are illustrated by the NINo Accession migrant registrations and the WRS registrations, is evidence that there is considerable movement of migrants between place of work and place of residence.
3 VULNERABLE WORKERS

3.1 AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

The movement of labour between countries and continents, driven by economic opportunism and the increased ease of international travel, is a permanent feature of the global economy. In receiving countries, migrant workers may be relatively small in number but they typically have a high profile. The International Labour Organisation (ILO) has captured the generic advantages and disadvantages of immigration, from the perspective of the individual migrant, for business and for the destination country (Figure 15).

Figure 15: Potential advantages and disadvantages of immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>Services that free women to enter the labour</td>
<td>Competition for jobs; marginalisation of less skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheaper goods and services</td>
<td>Lower local wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richer cultural life</td>
<td>Crowded schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Cheaper, more flexible labour</td>
<td>Less stable workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce diversity</td>
<td>Dependence on foreign labour for certain jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large markets and economies of scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>Rejuvenating population</td>
<td>Social friction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>Larger workforce; lower inflation</td>
<td>Delay technology upgrading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher GDP; capital brought by immigrant</td>
<td>Increased income inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>investors</td>
<td>Costs of integration programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brain gain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More diverse and energetic population</td>
<td>More social stratification; immigrant ghettos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax income from younger workers</td>
<td>Cost of social services, welfare benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In host countries, less-skilled migrant workers can find themselves marginalised into the lowest-wage employment, confronted by the difficulty of dealing with the local language, customs and systems of the new country. Employers will be attracted to a cheap and flexible labour force but in the long-term there is a danger of an over-dependence on foreign workers in particular sectors. The larger workforce can have the benefit of lowering inflation whilst contributing to the public purse through tax income. However, new migrant communities may also lead to unwanted social friction and an increased burden upon public services to facilitate integration with the host population.
The ILO has provided the overarching policy view on the requirement for individual countries to ensure adequate systems are in place for preventing workplace injuries and fatalities; providing particular protection for workers in high-risk sectors, migrant workers and other vulnerable groups (ILO, 2006). Recognising the potential implications of the increasing international movement of workers upon occupational health and safety, and its inter-relationship with the general health of migrant workers, the ILO identified three key factors which are likely to make migrant workers more vulnerable to workplace injury and illness:

- Proliferation of migrant workers in high-risk industry sectors
- The existence of cultural and language barriers which prevent adequate assimilation of health and safety communication
- The tendency for migrant workers to work long hours and to suffer from poor general health making them more susceptible to occupational injuries and work-related illness.

The European picture of migrant workers has become increasingly complex since 2004 and this situation is likely to intensify as member states relax their restrictions on movement and as new members join the EU. In 2004 there were an estimated 25 million ‘non-nationals’ living in EU countries, approximately 5.5% of the total population (Eurostat, 2006).

The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (2007) has compiled an overview of the employment and working conditions of migrant workers in the EU. Using responses from representatives from each member country, a series of national reports have been produced, with a number of key themes evident:

- In most countries, migrant workers have higher unemployment rates
- Migrants tend to be segregated in unskilled occupations
- They are generally exposed to higher risks in the workplace
- They experience considerable job insecurity
- They are employed in sectors and jobs characterised by poor working conditions
- Women and young migrants are the most vulnerable

Source: (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2007)

The European Agency for Safety and Health at Work has extended this analysis with a review of research and analysis of migrant worker activity across Europe; investigating how their increasing proliferation is affecting occupational health and safety (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, 2007). The report identifies that the vulnerable position of migrant workers within the labour market is linked to a number of factors, including:

- Poor language skills and low education
- Poor knowledge of the labour market
- A higher propensity of ‘non-Western’ migrants in low skilled jobs
• A high incidence of undocumented workers in low skilled employment
• Likelihood of workplace bullying and racial abuse

Source: (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, 2007)

The report identifies a dearth of research that links working conditions and health. Migrant workers in Europe are employed both in high-skilled professional occupations but also in the 3D jobs, particularly in construction, agriculture and food processing, healthcare, households and transport. In these jobs, migrants are typically exposed to more unfavourable conditions than the indigenous workforce, with more physically demanding roles combined with longer working hours and lower pay. The review identified a number of specific European studies on accidents in the workplace, in Austria, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Germany and Slovenia which indicated that migrant workers have higher incidence rates than the local workforce. However, other studies, in Sweden and Finland, provided a contradictory view. In cases where migrant workers and local workers were similarly employed, studies showed no discernible difference in accident rates.

The importance of accessible occupational health facilities is emphasised as a critical component of migrant welfare, although the report identified little empirical research on the health outcomes of poor working conditions on migrant workers. The linkage between migrant status, health and working conditions appears to be a subject that has received little attention (Figure 16).

**Figure 16: The key dimensions of migrant worker research**
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The paucity of analysis on the subject is a symptom of the lack of availability of suitable empirical evidence to enable this type of research. The European review identified that the nationality of a worker is rarely registered in administrative systems operated by health and safety or health workers. Research has tended to focus on age, gender and socio-economic status rather than on nationality or ethnic status. In summary, the report identifies that the inadequacies of European sources of statistical information on migrant workers and activities in the workplace are characterised by:

• Poor sample size, geographical coverage and different time frames for data capture
• Inadequate use of personal identification numbers
• Multiple definitions of a migrant

• Inability to directly link migrant status, employment and health status

Source: (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, 2007)

3.2 THE UK PERSPECTIVE

The impact of migrant populations upon the UK has been the source of much debate and analysis, with an inevitable diversity of opinion concerning the short and longer-term benefit and implications of the continued influx. A comprehensive assessment of the economic and fiscal impact of immigration may be found in a recent cross-departmental submission to the Economic Affairs Committee of the House of Lords (Home Office and DWP, 2007).

The Bank of England’s view of the macro-economic impact of the influx of migrants from the Accession states has suggested a positive impact upon inflation in the short-term, brought about by the increased labour supply relative to demand for goods and services. In the longer-term the impact upon unemployment levels are less certain and are dependent upon migrant workers filling specific skill gaps in the labour market (Blanchflower et al., 2007; Bank of England, 2007).

In terms of wages and unemployment, a number of studies have identified no significant impact of the recent migrant influx upon the labour market outcomes of the local workforce (Portes and French 2005; Gilpin et al., 2006; Lemos and Portes, 2008). Others have argued that in the absence of migration, the UK would have experienced slower growth, higher inflation and higher interest rates (Coats, 2008).

The general impact of the new migrant population upon public finances has been demonstrated to be positive with a ‘net annual fiscal contribution’ per capita in excess of the indigenous population, suggesting that migrants are contributing more than they are receiving in benefits and public services (Sriskandarajah et al., 2005).

Summarising the evidence presented, the Economic Affairs Committee concluded its investigation of the ‘Economic Impact of Immigration’ with a more negative view:

Immigration has become highly significant to the UK economy: immigrants comprise 12% of the total workforce—and a much higher proportion in London. However, we have found no evidence for the argument, made by the Government, business and many others, that net immigration—immigration minus emigration—generates significant economic benefits for the existing UK population.

House of Lords (2008a)

The report recognises the importance of net immigration to continued economic growth but concludes that the impact of this trend upon the individual incomes of the UK population is likely to be negligible.

From an employers’ perspective, a study completed for the Home Office in advance of its implementation of the new points-based system, examined existing routes into the labour market for a sample of 124 businesses in London, East Anglia and the North East (Dench et al., 2006). The study illustrated the increasing dependence on migrant workers, particularly in low skill occupations in agriculture and hotels and catering. Employers were generally positive
about the flexibility and reliability of migrant workers and typically cited language as the only real barrier to effective assimilation into the workforce.

Aside from the economic debate, new and expanding migrant communities have raised a multiplicity of issues related to integration and community cohesion (Commission on Integration and Cohesion, 2007). Dealing with the impact of these communities requires a complex response across a broad range of areas that includes: housing, healthcare, education, crime and the workplace.

With such a large and diverse migrant workforce, the vulnerability and exploitation of migrant workers in the workplace is now a major issue in the UK. Trade union organisations, whilst acknowledging the economic benefits of a dynamic and flexible migrant workforce, are increasingly engaged in activities to ensure equal treatment for migrant workers, through agreements with employers and the provision of information and services specifically tailored to the needs of foreign workers (TUC, 2007a).

The TUC has examined aspects of exploitation and vulnerability of A8 migrants. In the North East and North West regions, gathering primary evidence from a range of individuals and organisations, it examined the relative importance of different routes into the labour market and how union activity could be more effective in supporting Polish migrants in the construction and food processing industries (Fitzgerald, 2007). In a further study, based on a mail survey of 508 Lithuanians and Poles, it examined the difficulties facing migrant workers, citing widespread exploitation based on low wages and poor standards of accommodation, particularly when provided by the employer. The report calls for greater advice and support to migrant workers but noted that only 3% of respondents had actually joined a union in the UK (Anderson et al., 2007).

The TUC estimates that organised workplaces have half the serious injury rate of those without trade unions or other forms of consultation (TUC, 2007b). It has issued specific health and safety guidelines for dealing with migrant workers on the basis that:

Many migrant workers are more vulnerable than UK workers to illness, injuries or even death at work due to a combination of a lack of safety training, non-existent or inadequate safety clothing and equipment, and poor English skills.

TUC (2007b)

The Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers (RMT) in its response to the Department for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform’s (BERR) consultation on measures to protect ‘agency’ workers is clear on its view that accidents in the workplace are more prevalent due to the use of agency and migrant labour.

The overwhelming majority of serious accidents and fatalities that have occurred since Network Rail brought infrastructure back in-house have involved contractors or agency workers. The transient and poorly regulated nature of agency work makes it difficult for unions to ensure that health and safety briefings are properly disseminated to all workers. Furthermore, as agencies rely on migrant workers as a cheap and flexible source of labour, the union is concerned that some workers may lack a sufficient level of competency in the English language to fully understand Health and Safety advice or warnings, let alone about their rights at work.

RMT (2007)

The Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians (UCATT) has responded similarly given the reported increase in the number of deaths in the construction industry during 2007/08.

UCATT believe that many of the deaths and injuries in the industry are as a result of the casualised nature of the industry. They are calling on the Government to extend gangmasters legislation to the construction industry and to ensure the industry no longer has endemic levels of bogus self-employment.
By introducing such reforms jobs would become secure and stable, increasing safety. It is now widely accepted that migrant workers who are most likely to be in casualised forms of employment, are at greater risk of being killed or injured on construction sites.

UCATT (2008)

The TUC has now embraced the whole issue of vulnerability in the workplace with the creation of its Commission on Vulnerable Employment (COVE) and the publication of its vision for dealing with the issue (TUC, 2008b). It defines vulnerable employment as:

Precarious work that places people at risk of continuing poverty and injustice resulting from an imbalance of power in the employer-worker relationship.

(TUC, 2008b)

COVE has used the LFS to identify approximately 1.5 million low skilled workers in low paid and temporary employment. To this it adds a further 500,000 undocumented and informal workers to give an estimate of up to 2 million people in the UK in vulnerable employment. Migrant workers are seen to be particularly vulnerable because of their immigration status and because of the dependence upon recruiting agencies for entry to the labour market. The Commission has called for the abolition of the WRS, which it argues does not provide an accurate measure of the number of migrant workers and applies unnecessary restrictions on migrants’ right to reside in the UK. The general recommendations of the Commission towards vulnerable workers are for:

- Improved awareness and advice on employment rights
- Better enforcement of employment rights
- Better regulatory and legal protection
- Improved union organisation
- A guarantee of rights down the supply chain

The TUC has highlighted how a lack of accurate statistics on migrant populations at a local level are a real hindrance to the development of timely policy responses to the new influx of foreign workers.

Unions would encourage the Government to work towards more accurate local-level predictions of the numbers of migrant workers and dependents and the capacity to respond rapidly to changes.

TUC (2007a)

The impact of migrant populations is recognised as being ‘hard to measure and highly regional’ and ‘poorly understood’. The inadequacy of the empirical base for analysis and research is highlighted:

There are significant unknowns and uncertainties in the existing data on immigration and immigrants in the UK. There are insufficient data about people leaving the UK and about short-term immigration to the UK. Existing data do not allow for accurate measurement of the stock of immigrants at national, regional and local levels. Inevitably, even less is known about the scale of illegal immigration and illegal employment of immigrants. The gaps in migration data create significant difficulties for the analysis and public debate of immigration, the conduct of monetary policy, the provision of public services and a wide range of other public policies.

House of Lords (2008a)

The inability to accurately measure migration was identified as the major factor affecting the quality of population statistics in the UK in the highly critical review published by the House of
Commons Treasury Committee (2008). The review calls for fundamental changes to the way migration and population statistics are collected and disseminated at a time of significant population change. Recommendations of the review include:

- To replace the International Passenger Survey with a new survey that is more comprehensive and more suited to the accurate measurement of international movements affecting the size of the resident population of the United Kingdom.

- To utilise and better link data held by the Government and by local government in order to provide a more accurate picture of the population; and to develop administrative databases to provide a more accurate and cost effective method of monitoring the population.

- To establish a pilot project enabling a population register to be operated alongside the 2011 Census in order to compare the effectiveness of such a system with that of the Census.

Source: House of Commons (2008)

The integration of asylum seekers and refugees was the dominant issue in the early years of the decade but has since been superseded by the issue of the integration and outcome of other migrant sub-groups. The significant gaps in the evidence base to support research and policy of both refugee and migrant populations is due to the limitations on available data (Spencer, 2005). In relation to health outcomes, there is poor statistical evidence on patient ‘ethnicity’ and an inability to identify new migrants within administrative datasets:

There is, in Britain, no immediately accessible source of data that gives any direct measurement of or authoritative perspective on the health of new migrants or refugees, whether from an epidemiological, personal, public health or occupational health perspective.

…it is almost impossible to establish reliable estimates of the relative risks among different groups, whether defined in terms of their ethnic origin, citizenship status, or length of residence in the UK.

(Spencer, 2005)

Where ethnicity is recorded, it is typically not accompanied by other information on citizenship, length of residence or country or birth which would provide a more appropriate indication of ‘migrant’ status. The study identifies that migrant workers, due to their age profile, generally demonstrate above-average levels of health but that occupational health deteriorates over the life course. In its review of the literature on the health of refugees and new migrants, the study identifies a number of key factors associated with poorer health outcomes including: the barrier that language creates to the effective delivery of health care; the inability of migrants to interact with UK administrative systems and procedures; the ability of health care systems and staff to cope with culturally diverse populations; the psychological impact of being in a foreign country, with a reluctance to make proper use of public services and administrative systems, and the impact of relative poverty of refugee and migrant communities.

The lack of adequate intelligence on the scale, profile and distribution of migrant workers has severely constrained research and analysis of the impact of these increasingly diverse and mobile populations. Skilled migrants are an important source of labour to the UK economy but it is the vulnerability of low-skilled labour that is the cause for most concern. The following section provides an illustration of the more recent evidence and intelligence that has been produced on the impact of migrant populations upon the UK workplace.
4 MIGRANT POPULATIONS - IMPACT ON THE WORKPLACE

4.1 HSE ANALYSIS

The HSE has commissioned a number of studies to examine health and safety outcomes of minority group populations. A study of work, inequality and musculoskeletal health identified ‘layers of influence’ upon an individual’s occupational health; those that are fixed such as age, gender and ethnicity and those that can be modified such as lifestyle, social network, and living and working conditions (Woods and Buckle, 2002). The research identified inadequate social support structures and lack of access to health information and education as factors which could affect musculoskeletal health and the propensity to report ill-health. Low status, low income jobs were likely to have higher incidents of musculoskeletal injury but the analysis of ethnicity proved inconclusive in terms of differential health and safety risk versus the majority population.

Using data directly from the LFS and the 2001 Census, combined with a review of UK and international literature, a further study examined the extent to which ethnic minority groups were disproportionately at risk of injury and illness in the workplace (Szczepura et al., 2004). Occupation was found to be the dominant influence upon risk of injury in the workplace but the study proved inconclusive when attempting to identify a greater propensity for workplace injury and illness for ethnic groups. The analysis raised concerns about the quality of the LFS and the possible under-reporting of injuries by ethnic minority respondents. The study found little literature to confirm its analyses, demonstrating that the subject area was/is significantly under-researched in the UK and is constrained by lack of available data:

...there remains a need to examine other data sources and consider ways of improving future data collection with respect to both resident black and ethnic minority populations and migrant workers…

(Szczepura et al., 2004)

It made a number of recommendations for improved data collection and analysis, including a further study to collect evidence on work-related health and safety issues for migrant workers. This subsequent study was completed using data collected through interviews with 200 migrant workers, 60 employers and a further 30 representatives of other agencies involved with migrants in some capacity (McKay et al., 2007). The study did not find evidence of a higher incidence of accident and injury to migrants in the workplace but identified that migrants are more likely to be working in sectors or occupations where there are existing health and safety concerns.

A third of the migrant workers interviewed had not received any formal training in health and safety and language difficulties were identified as a particular barrier to effective communication. There was a general lack of knowledge of basic health and safety procedures and evidence of non-reporting of incidents. A general perception of those interviewed was that responsibility for health and safety lay with the employee rather than the employer. The report identified that the relative inexperience of new migrant workers was placing them at a greater risk of accident or injury in the workplace.

The transient, short-term nature of most migrant employment was identified as a potential risk to health and safety in the workplace. Working hours were long, but migrants, the majority of whom were aged 20-40, were willingly accepting the opportunity to earn more during the limited time they would be in the UK. Some employers interviewed suggested that the
employment of migrant workers had actually reduced accident levels by bringing greater stability to the workplace employing workers that were generally better skilled and educated than the previous indigenous workforce.

The report examined the related issue of the impact of migrant workers upon community cohesion, particularly in those areas in which there was little evidence of past migration. Public perceptions and reactions to an increased burden upon public services, specifically housing, health and education was identified as having potentially detrimental impacts upon the health and safety outcomes of migrant workers.

The HSE has attempted to develop its intelligence on the migrant worker issue, with an analysis of the LFS, linking the incidence of injury and illness to migrant status (HSE, 2007). Its analysis draws evidence on migrants who were born outside the UK, have worked within the last twelve months and who have been in Britain for up to 5 years. The sample equates to an estimated 1 million workers, broadly distributed across industry sectors. The analysis confirms that there are a higher proportion of migrant workers in low-skilled occupations, but there is no evidence to suggest that migrant workers are at a higher risk of injury and illness than the indigenous workforce. The analysis raises specific concerns over the use of the LFS sample for a number of reasons:

- The LFS excludes people in communal households and those who have been in the UK for less than six months
- The LFS is grossed to population estimates that excludes short-term migrants
- Migrants, because of their relatively youthful age profile, are likely to be healthier than the non-migrant workforce

The first two concerns are likely to have resulted in a significant under-count of migrants within the LFS.

Using data on migrant workers from the Construction Omnibus Survey (COS), HSE was able to conduct a similar analysis on accident and ill health within the workplace (HSE, 2007). Results from the COS again suggested that migrant workers were not more susceptible to injury and illness in the workplace, although migrant sampling issues were again likely to have influenced outcomes. Neither the LFS or COS provide a sufficient sample size to enable more disaggregate analysis by geographical area.

The number of fatal accidents to foreign workers in the construction industry between 2002-2006 was shown to be in proportion to those to the indigenous workforce (Crick, 2007). The small sample size provided by the COS made it difficult to assess the comparability of non-fatal accidents. Anecdotal evidence from specific contractors suggested that the reverse may be true, with migrant workers demonstrating a lower propensity for injury in the workplace relative to UK workers. The lack of prior experience in the construction industry and a lack of formal training in occupational health and safety issues were highlighted as specific factors putting migrant workers at a greater risk in the workplace.
In the agriculture industry, where the impact of a large number of low-skilled migrants is most evident, there is a general lack of intelligence on size of the migrant workforce and the differences that exist in the risk and incidence of injury and illness in the workplace:

Lack of information about the size of the migrant working population in the industry, the limitations of existing statutory and other reporting systems and associated, gross under-reporting of work-related injury and ill health in the industry means it is impossible to estimate the potential contribution of these workers to the reported injury and ill health statistics.

HSE (2006)

The June Agricultural Survey (DEFRA, 2008) is an annual survey collecting information from a sample of farm holdings in England on land use, crops, livestock and the workforce. Its workforce statistics, which disaggregate by full-time, part-time and casual labour but not by any nationality or migrant identifier, are deemed to be unrepresentative of the industry due to the self-reporting nature of the survey. A previous study (DEFRA, 2005) used an alternative sample survey to estimate a total of between 235,000-345,000 migrant workers in the industry, 40% of which were from the EU and 60% from elsewhere. It is unclear whether these estimates include undocumented workers.

Coupled with the paucity of accurate statistics on migrant workers, is the under-reporting of accidents and illness which appears to be endemic within the agriculture industry. Although fatal accidents are well recorded, it is estimated that RIDDOR records only 26% of non-fatal injuries in respect of employees and only 5% for the self-employed and an even smaller percentage of statistics for work-related illness.
4.2 NATIONAL STUDIES AND SECTOR ANALYSIS

There is a generally held view that migrants and refugees are more at risk in the workplace:

The uncertain status of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, their economic vulnerability and lack of awareness of workplace regulations, reduces the likelihood that employers will abide by national employment standards. Recently arrived migrants are likely to be most at risk and trafficked migrants are likely to be exposed to unregulated, unsafe and dangerous working conditions.  

(O’Brien, 2007)

But, as the European review study has demonstrated, there is a general lack of definitive evidence on the issue:

To date, little attention has been paid to the relationship between migration and injuries. Research has more often focused on ethnicity rather than migrant status and there remains a lack of clarity about the relationship between migration and health.  

(O’Brien, 2007)

The ‘changing status, changing lives’ project, funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) examined the experiences of low-wage migrant workers coming to the UK, both within and outside the workplace (Anderson et al., 2006a: 2006b). It used a combination of quantitative surveys and qualitative interview methods to generate an evidence base from approximately 600 migrants and 500 employers, pre and post-accession. The studies identified the general pattern of high quality migrants, well educated and/or experienced, in low-paid employment doing demanding and arduous jobs. Migrants were observed to be accepting of their situation as new and temporary entrants to the UK workforce but the long, unsociable hours, often in rural locations and the willingness of migrants to move with seasonal employment was a barrier to effective social participation and integration.

The Commission for Rural Communities (CRC) produced its own briefing paper on the impact of migrant workers, recognising that some of the more geographically isolated areas of the UK were being significantly impacted by the inflow of new migrants (CRC, 2007). The study used recognised sources of statistics (LFS, NINo and WRS) and mapped the distribution of workers by local area to illustrate the rural concentrations of A8 workers that exist in Lincolnshire, the Wash, Yorkshire and Herefordshire, in particular. In relation to housing for migrant workers, the study identified prevalent health and safety breaches associated with the presence of poorly managed and unlicensed accommodation in caravan sites and converted farm buildings. In addition, the practice of transporting workers from urban locations to the rural workplace was identified as a potential risk due to issues concerning the drivers and the vehicles used. Importantly, the study recognised the fact that many rural economies have now become dependant upon the migrant workforce and that any change in the availability of foreign workers could have a significant impact upon the viability of local businesses.

Anderson and Rogaly (2006) examined the extent to which coercive practices of recruitment and employment have been used in the UK to control and exploit migrant workers. The study identified how migrants often find themselves at the end of long sub-contracting chains, between labour provider and labour user; with each link in the chain seeking some economic gain from the arrangement. These long-chains lead to ambiguities in the employment relationship with consequent risks to the adequate handling of health and safety issues.

The required flexibility of migrant workers is highlighted as a contributory factor, increasing the risks to health and safety in the workplace. In agriculture, gangmaster businesses require
workers to operate in exhausting and frequently dangerous conditions, and to be willing to work extremely long hours. Frequent movement of workers is identified as a particular issue with agricultural workers often moved to other sectors such as construction, contract cleaning and hospitality.

Specific issues within the contract cleaning sector and with care assistants were identified, where workers are typically operating in relative isolation and where individual relationships with supervisors can be a source of abuse and exploitation.

The research identified the need for improved data collection and availability and makes a recommendation that the HSE should routinely collect ‘ethnicity’ data in its administrative systems.

The economic pressure exerted by retailers upon the supply chain is identified as a key factor affecting the nature of working conditions in UK horticulture (Rogaly, 2007). Reporting on work completed for DEFRA, the research identified a direct connection between the pressure for suppliers to minimise costs and the poor conditions in which employees were being asked to operate. Other commentators have put it more bluntly:

The truth is that as a society we depend on huge numbers of people working and living in appalling conditions to provide us with cheap food on demand.

(Lewis, 2007)

The now almost exclusive use of migrant labour in the UK’s horticulture and food processing industries has created a business environment that has allowed some businesses (particularly larger organisations) to thrive, enjoying the flexibility and reliability of migrant workers in a competitive economic marketplace. Despite the working conditions that are prevalent, it is recognised that some migrant workers are willing to accept the situation in order to maximise their earnings; working hard in temporary, low-wage employment (Rogaly, 2007).

The codes of labour practice operated by the large UK retailers have been examined by the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI) to establish the extent to which the supply chain has been influenced to the benefit of migrant workers (Barrientos and Smith, 2006). This study examined the supply chain relationships that existed with a single UK retailer of food and general merchandise. It surveyed a number of ‘first tier’ and ‘second tier’ suppliers, interviewed a small sample of workers on-site and consulted with unions and two labour providers.

The most positive changes from company codes appeared to be in relation to health and safety, although the perceptions differed between employers and workers:

Management at three sites reported a number of improvements in health and safety (H&S) procedures as a result of ETI and other industry codes, such as having a full time H&S officer, giving more thorough training/inductions, keeping accident logs, putting up fire exit signs and ensuring fire extinguishers were not out of date. While they acknowledged these provisions, workers were not particularly aware of changes in this area.

(Barrientos and Smith, 2006)

The attitude and commitment of individual suppliers within the supply chain was key to the successful implementation of the code of labour and this was seen to vary considerably in the small sample observed (Barrientos, 2007). In addition, the survey had little exposure to agency workers - those employed directly by labour providers – and was primarily focused on workers employed directly or on the SAWS programme.
The construction industry has experienced a period of major growth and the latest industry forecasts suggest that an additional 88,000 workers will be needed between 2009-2012 to sustain this growth, increasing the size of the construction industry workforce from 2.6-2.8 million (Construction Skills, 2008), though these forecasts seem ‘optimistic’ in view of the current crisis in housing construction. The forecasts give no indication of the extent of migrant labour within these statistics but reliance upon cheap and flexible labour has always been a key component of the industry and traditional Irish labour has now been replaced by a ready supply of migrant workers from the expanded EU.

Migrant workers in the construction industry are generally perceived to be subject to specific risk because of the temporary nature of their employment and their inability to communicate effectively due to the language barriers that exist (Bust et al., 2008). The language barrier has been identified as a key driver of vulnerability in the workplace and is recognised as one of the biggest obstacles to effective integration of migrants into local communities (Commission on Integration and Cohesion, 2007). The TUC has argued that the workplace and the community are inextricably linked and improved integration and social cohesion will only work if vulnerable workers are given suitable access to vital English language skills (TUC, 2008a).

A recent study of the construction industry in London and the South East has highlighted some of the issues that migrant workers face (Dainty et al., 2007). The inadequacy of the WRS as a measure of migrant employment in the industry was clear with the prevalence of migrant workers in the study much higher than statistics would suggest. Self-employment is evident throughout the industry, which not only impacts upon the estimation of the number of migrant workers but also affects the reporting of accidents on construction sites. The study emphasises the HSE picture of considerable under-reporting of accidents amongst self-employed workers and highlights the fact that the propensity for casual workers to record incidents will be even lower.

Of the sample of migrant workers interviewed (54 in total) only 30% confessed to having prior construction industry experience, which conflicted with the general view of employers that all workers were required to have prior experience as defined by the Construction Skills Certification Scheme (CSCS). This confusion reflects the complex supply chains that exist within the construction industry with often blurred lines of responsibility between contractors and sub-contractors (Craw et al., 2007). Many of the workers interviewed in the London and South East study were unsure of their general terms and conditions of employment and their specific employment status. Many were believed to be self-employed.

Approximately half of the migrant workers interviewed were employed in unskilled activities, one third in skilled construction trades and the remainder in specialist engineering jobs. Employers cited communication as the most significant challenge in dealing with an increasingly multi-cultural workforce but none of those consulted were providing language training, reflecting the transient nature of the workforce. Migrant workers generally claimed a good understanding of health and safety risks but there were numerous examples of a lack of awareness of hazards in the workplace. There was a lack of awareness of some of the longer-term impacts of construction work upon health and a lack of understanding of the lines of responsibility that existed for health and safety in the workplace (Dainty et al., 2007).

The London and South East study concludes with recommendations for a pan-industry body to coordinate research into migrant worker activity and to disseminate good practice. It emphasised the need for more detailed and accurate information on the distribution and profile of migrant workers in the construction industry.
In a separate study by members of the same research team, evidence from the UK and abroad was gathered through consultation with the European Construction Institute’s Safety, Health and Environment Working Group and through survey responses from health and safety managers in the construction industry. In the UK, the research identified some ambiguity in the perceived impact of migrant workers:

In the UK, health and safety managers often began by saying that migrant workers pose no additional risk and then explained a series of additional measures they take to ensure that they are properly aware of health and safety and inducted into site rules, practices and procedures.

While the telephone survey results indicated that the use of translators and the translation of health and safety information are the methods most likely to be used to manage migrant workers, lack of communication was seen as the main consequence of employing migrant workers. (Bust et al., 2008)

The study advocates further research to examine the extent to which construction workers of different cultures actually understand health and safety issues and how they use this knowledge to interpret health and safety instructions.

Research in the UK food and drink industry has identified little evidence that migrant workers are more vulnerable to occupational injury and illness (Anslow, 2007). To compensate for the lack of available data, the study collaborated with a number of organisations in the East Midlands, using anonymised employment records to create a sample of 658 workers, 131 of whom were identified as migrants (non-UK or Irish citizens working in the UK). The accident data compiled for the study is summarised in Figure 17.

Figure 17: Data collection – accidents in the workplace
Source: Anslow (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Date of accident</td>
<td>dd-mm-yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status</td>
<td>Local or migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Occupation</td>
<td>Standard Occupation Classifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Start date</td>
<td>Length of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Date of birth</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Type of injury</td>
<td>Sprain, fracture etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cause of accident</td>
<td>Fall, machinery etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study discovered that migrant workers were no more vulnerable to occupational injury than indigenous workers and demonstrated evidence that less experienced local workers were actually more likely to suffer injury than migrants.

However, as a parallel research exercise, the study examined the attitudes of migrant workers to the reporting of accidents and illness in the workplace and found that migrant workers were significantly less likely to report accidents in the workplace compared to indigenous workers. This reluctance to report incidents was related to a number of factors including: a perception that an incident was too minor to record, difficulties arising from effective communication, fear of reprisal, and uncertainty over the process or procedure for reporting.

The report concludes that:

As migrant workers may significantly underreport accidents at work, the reported accidents in part one of this research may significantly underestimate the actual risk of injury facing migrant workers. Therefore, it is likely that migrant workers are in fact more vulnerable to occupational injury than local workers.

Anslow (2007)
The Food Standards Agency has commissioned its own review of the industry. This has included secondary data analysis and a review of relevant literature to profile the migrant worker population; a telephone survey of up to 600 employers across the UK to capture intelligence on the use of migrant workers and their impact upon the workplace; interviews with other stakeholder bodies to establish a wider view of the use of migrant workers in the industry and a small number of employer case studies to highlight specific issues. The study will report its findings during summer 2008.

A more recent study, using the WRS in combination with occupation data derived from Jobseekers Allowance (JSA), has examined the impact of migrant labour upon wage levels in the UK (Lemos and Portes, 2008). The report makes no reference to health and safety issues specifically, but the analytical approach that has been used demonstrates an innovative use of administrative statistics to derive outcomes at a local level. This is in contrast to similar studies that have used survey data, which do not support this level of geographical disaggregation. In addition, the study makes an explicit comparison between migrant workers and the local workforce.

The analysis derives regression equations to model the relationship between the inflow of A8 migrants and changes in the level of JSA unemployment and wages for native workers. It finds no statistically significant relationship between A8 inflows and the level of unemployment and wages of the local workforce. The only criticism of the study is that it uses WRS data, which might lead to bias in the results produced.

Two recent publications in the health care sector have raised different issues with regard to migrant workers. The first highlights how the international recruitment of health workers has become a solution to the skills shortage in some countries (Buchan, 2007). Certainly in the UK, this strategy has been used to fill nursing and other vacancies in the NHS, whilst there are an increasing number of migrant workers employed in care homes across the UK. The study identifies the lack of information on both the inflow of workers into the health sector and the stock of these workers resident at any point in time. This lack of information constrains further analysis of the scale, distribution and effectiveness of migrant workers in this industry.

A second review highlights how European countries have struggled to incorporate the needs of migrants into local health systems (Mladovsky, 2007). From a summary review of the European literature, the report states that migrant populations are more susceptible to accidents, injuries and musculo-skeletal disorders but also identifies the ‘healthy-migrant’ effect, driven by a generally more youthful age profile. Migrant populations are seen to be at a disadvantage when using healthcare services due to language difficulties, legal barriers, mistrust of service providers and the cultural differences that may exist between doctor and patient. In the UK, the health of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups is an integral part of health policy but the lack of accurate and consistent data on ethnicity makes evaluation of specific initiatives difficult. The availability of statistics on more recent migrant populations is even less accessible.

The review identifies the lack of information that is recorded on ethnicity or migrant status of individuals as a major constraint on research into the more effective delivery of health care to migrant workers. It identifies a number of initiatives for generating data; including linking different datasets together and using algorithms to identify individuals of a specific ethnic origin. The use of surveys which specifically identify migrant workers are questioned due to the complexity of precisely which groups are encapsulated within the migrant definition and due to the fact that some migrant sub-groups (undocumented migrants) do not have legal access to health care facilities. For these reasons the review confirms that there are few, if any, national
or European surveys which measure the relative health outcomes of migrant populations and the indigenous population. It concludes with a recommendation to include data on migrants in future national surveys of health.

In a review of the social integration of migrants in Europe, much improved data recording was recommended, to improve the evidence base on migrant health outcomes. This included information on dates of migration and citizenship to enable more effective ethnic monitoring and patient profiling. In addition, the development of a longitudinal ‘tracker’ survey of new migrants has been suggested. This would track individuals from point of entry through integration to the workplace and local community (Spencer, 2006).

One final piece of analysis which may be a source of useful intelligence in the near future is the inquiry by the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents’ (RoSPA) National Occupational Safety and Health Committee (NOHSC) into the provision of assistance to small and medium sized enterprises (SME) (Fidderman, 2007). The inquiry is designed to evaluate best practice in the delivery of effective occupational safety and health practices in business which have fewer than 50 employees. SME’s are notoriously bad at recording injury and illness in the workplace and are also likely to have featured little in surveys that have examined the impact of migrant workers upon business. The RoSPA inquiry makes no specific reference to ‘migrant workers’ but its proposed literature search and qualitative surveys with SMEs and service providers may provide additional intelligence on a business sector that received little analytical attention.
### 4.3 REGIONAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

#### 4.3.1 Measuring the Local Impact

Since 2004, increased migrant flows have affected the geographical regions of the UK in different ways and the local capacity for responding to these demographic changes have typically not kept pace with the speed of change (Audit Commission, 2007). Some local areas are experiencing issues associated with a diverse ethnic community for the very first time; whereas other communities, with established immigration streams have experienced further increases in diversity due to the influx of migrants from Accession countries (Bauere et al., 2007). The Commission identified patterns of employment, transport and housing as the key drivers of the regional distribution of migrant workers.

In its final report, the Commission on Integration and Cohesion (CIC) identified ‘family groups’ of local areas in which the impact of migrant populations was a particular issue (CIC, 2007). The first four areas exhibited specific similarities; the fifth included a variety of areas which had a single factor that was driving specific migrant cohesion and integration issues. These areas were defined as follows:

1. Changing, less affluent rural areas which experienced complex patterns of immigration for the first time, with Eastern European migrants coming to work in agriculture or food processing.

2. Stable, less affluent urban areas (particularly in the North and Midlands) with a declining manufacturing industry and specific issues of deprivation.

3. Stable, less affluent urban areas without manufacturing decline but with issues of deprivation.

4. Changing, less affluent urban areas. These are spread across the country and including coastal towns and other places reliant on manufacturing with high demand for low skilled labour resulting in increased numbers of migrant workers.

5. Towns or suburban areas which are not deprived, but in which there is a single issue such as terrorism arrests or a proposed centre for asylum seekers which is causing tensions.

Source: CIC (2007)

Recent evidence suggests that the peak in migration to the UK from the A8 countries has been reached and that the number of new arrivals will fall over the next few years (Pollard et al., 2008). Using data from the WRS, NINo and LFS in combination with interviews with Polish migrants who have returned home, the study estimates that approximately 1 million A8 migrant workers have come to the UK since 2004 but that up to 50% have subsequently returned. The report cites a number of developments that are encouraging the return home, including: economic development in the home country, alternative opportunities in other parts of Europe, smaller cohorts of potential migrants in sending countries and the decreasing value of the pound relative to the Polish Złoty.

Even with this apparent shift in the pattern of migrant inflow, the number of migrant workers coming to the UK on an annual basis remains high and the presence of a relatively large foreign-born population is a feature of a much broader group of geographical communities than was the case pre-2004. In the absence of accurate information on migrant numbers, the Audit
Commission has identified the need for an effective regional and local response that involves cooperation between a range of local public bodies (Audit Commission, 2007). It encouraged regional and local bodies to engage in the collection of local intelligence, supplementing the NINo and WRS statistics with local surveys, information from employers and recruitment agencies and the sharing of data with service providers such as the police and health service.

The Institute of Community Cohesion (iCoCo) conducted a survey of local authorities to establish the extent to which research had been completed to assess the local impact of migration (iCoCo, 2007). Data was collected from over 100 councils, with over half providing evidence of studies that had been completed, typically using a combination of secondary data (WRS and NINo) combined with small surveys targeted at migrants and service providers. The report demonstrates little evidence of studies focused specifically on migrants in the workplace, although the issue of the potential impact of language barriers upon health and safety is raised in a number of cases, as are the risks caused by persistent over-crowding in houses of multiple occupation (HMO). The iCoCo report summarises the key sources of data available for migration analysis and calls for better statistical instruments from which a more accurate picture of local authority impacts could be derived.

A review of regional studies that have had a specific focus on aspects of health and safety in the workplace are summarised in the following sections.

4.3.2 North East

The research team at the Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies (CURDS) has used successive censuses to examine country of birth dynamics, combining this with the latest evidence from the WRS (Stenning et al., 2006). Using case studies in Newcastle and from outside the region, in Peterborough, the study identifies that the impact of new migrant flows has left local agencies and service providers ill-prepared to respond, resulting in poorly formed institutional structures for more effective handling of migrant issues, and which limit the regulatory development required to better control the process.

Another study of the distribution and profile of migrant workers in the North East, used data from the WRS and LFS as the empirical basis for assessing how best to maximise the skills and expertise provided by the migrant population in a region where economic participation rates are low compared to the rest of the UK (Pillai, 2006).

The North East Public Health Observatory (NEPHO) has examined the potential implications of the increasingly diverse migrant workforce upon health provision in the region (NEPHO, 2008). The report does not make specific reference to aspects of occupational health but it does provide a proactive view on how health services need to respond to the presence of diverse migrant populations. Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) in the region were seen to have limited knowledge of migrant groups, other than as part of their arrangements for local BME populations. Given the suspected low levels of General Practitioner (GP) registration amongst migrant workers it was identified that Accident and Emergency (A&E) services could be impacted by use of these facilities following accident or acute illness.

The NEPHO report concludes with recommendations that include the creation of a specific ‘Migrant Health Group’ within the framework of the North East Strategic Migration partnership and also makes suggestions for improved access to ethnic group information collected by National Health Service (NHS) systems.
4.3.3 North West

In the North West, the Merseyside Social Inclusion Observatory (MSIO) completed a study of migrant workers in the region, to better inform the Regional Development Agency (RDA) and to provide guidance for the new RSMP: Migrant Workers North West (Pemberton and Stevens, 2006). The research used statistics from the WRS in combination with survey responses from a sample of migrant workers in the region.

In relation to specific health and safety issues, language was identified as a particular problem. In addition, examples were given of migrants, employed by agencies, being given higher productivity targets than their co-workers, of the speed of production lines being increased to achieve these targets and of shift patterns changing to ensure migrants worked additional hours for no extra pay. There were several instances given of migrant workers being required to pay for health and safety training and equipment and examples were provided of employment agencies establishing separate companies for each migrant worker they recruited – thus avoiding any ‘duty of care’ as an employer. However, industry sectors such as transport, which were subject to more visible union activity tended to be addressing employment discrimination issues more systematically.

The same research team has extended its survey analysis of migrant workers in the region with a study of the experiences of Accession migrants living in the Housing Market Renewal (HMR) Pathfinder areas of Merseyside and Lancashire (Pemberton and Stevens, 2007). Up to 2,500 migrants were believed to be resident in the New Heartlands development in Liverpool and approximately 1,500 in the Oldham and Rochdale HMR Pathfinder area. These areas of residential redevelopment, particularly in Merseyside, have attracted large numbers of migrants into more affordable accommodation that fits with the relatively low wages being received in generally low-skilled employment.

The study does not provide evidence of health and safety issues but is an interesting perspective on the integration of migrant workers who have opted for an extended stay in the UK. HMR areas appear to offer opportunities to migrants wishing to improve their standard of accommodation; moving out of the relatively poor conditions of HMOs, to less-crowded and better quality flat-shares, as well as potentially into owner-occupation. These areas provide realistic housing solutions to low-wage migrants seeking to establish a more permanent base in the UK and an environment that is likely to deliver better health outcomes than the over-crowded HMOs.

A research report produced for the Low Pay Commission by the Centre for Industrial Relations at Keele University examined the impact of migrant workers into North Staffordshire (French and Möhrke, 2006) an area characterised by industrial contraction and restructuring, low paid jobs in industry and the service sector, persistent unemployment and an active British National Party (BNP). The area is home to a varied profile of new migrants, including those from Accession states, those recruited directly into the health sector, a large number of overseas students and a diverse population of asylum seekers and refugees.

The fieldwork for the study consisted of small-scale surveys and interviews with employer representatives and migrant workers. The majority of migrant labour was demonstrated to be employed in low-skilled jobs in the food processing, manufacturing and distribution sectors, at or slightly above the National Minimum Wage (NMW). Employers recognised the positive benefits of a reliable migrant labour force, their willingness to take-on low status, physical jobs and to work long and flexible hours. By addressing recruitment and retention problems, improving productivity and reducing absenteeism and sickness, employers were seen to be making substantial savings in unit labour costs, without the need to reduce rates of pay.
Exploitation of migrant workers was evident; the most prominent was agencies’ use of accommodation and other services as a method of making deductions from workers’ wages at source. This typically included extortionate payments for poor quality accommodation and payments for services not provided. It was often accompanied by the constant movement of workers between jobs and locations to keep them relatively isolated.

There was also evidence of discrimination through the allocation of additional or harder work to migrant workers. Few workers had an understanding of the precise terms and conditions of their employment and language was again identified as a barrier and a risk to worker safety.

A study for Sefton Borough Council on Merseyside examined the impact of migrant workers in an area with particular skills gaps for low skilled jobs in administration, production and sales as well as a lack of skilled workers in the construction industry (CLES Consulting, 2006). The Borough is also identified as an area with a potentially high level of replacement demand due to the combined demographic process of population decline and ageing. Information was derived from the WRS, postcode level data and from small sample surveys with migrant workers, employers and labour providers in the area.

The overall impact was considered to be positive for Sefton’s local economy as migrant workers were meeting the demand for low-skilled labour. The availability, volume and flexibility of the labour force were deemed to be of great benefit with intermediary labour providers increasingly evident in the horticulture and care sector. Relatively poor standards of accommodation in HMOs were identified. Employers raised concerns over the need for better language skills combined with a greater appreciation of key areas of food safety, manual handling, hygiene and first aid but few were prepared to invest time in training temporary or seasonal workers.

4.3.4 Yorkshire and the Humber

In Yorkshire and the Humber, established ethnic communities have historically provided the focus for immigration to the region and continue to do so. In addition, large numbers of asylum seekers and refugees have been accommodated within the region’s main urban areas. Since 2004, rural communities and areas of relative industrial decline have received a significant influx of migrant workers, introducing new issues of integration and community cohesion to these areas.

A number of studies have used published datasets to illustrate the impact of migrant workers across the region of Yorkshire and The Humber (Boden and Stillwell 2006; Boden 2007, East Riding of Yorkshire Council, 2007). The extended urban areas around Leeds, Bradford and Sheffield have accommodated an increasing number of new migrants but rural communities and smaller urban areas subject to industrial decline have also attracted disproportionately large numbers.

Two recent studies, in Barnsley and Leeds, have used small-scale surveys of migrant workers to examine the issues associated with this influx. In Barnsley, evidence of worker exploitation was significant with long hours, relatively low pay and abuse of workers’ terms and conditions of employment; with a proliferation of workers in areas of the economy with little union representation (McKenzie and Ford, 2008). In Leeds, employers viewed the new migrant labour in a positive light, with the productivity of Polish workers being particularly highlighted (Cook et al., 2008). A hierarchy within migrant groups was identified, with Slovak and Roma workers typically taking the low-skilled manual jobs, with some Polish workers moving into more
highly skilled jobs. No specific evidence on health and safety issues in the workplace were reported.

In a more extensive survey of migrant workers across West Yorkshire, North Yorkshire and The Humber, the importance of adequate language skills was identified as a critical component of community integration and workplace effectiveness, citing particular worker vulnerability to inadequate comprehension of health and safety issues (Experian, 2007).

4.3.5 East Midlands and East of England

In a study similar to one completed in the West Midlands a combination of surveys, with employers, migrant workers and with other third party organisations was conducted to examine the impact of migrant workers upon the East Midlands labour market (Green et al., 2007a). Geographically, migrants were concentrated in the major urban areas, reflecting the presence of existing communities but with high rates of growth in the region’s rural agricultural areas. Migrants tended to be concentrated in industries where wages were significantly lower than average, although there was evidence of a bi-polar distribution with a concentration of migrant workers in higher paid jobs in the IT and health industries. A large proportion of the lower paid jobs tended to be in the manufacturing sector that was subject to overall and long-term decline, with shrinking numbers of UK-born workers. The study estimated that workers born outside the UK contributed up to 10% of Gross Value Added (GVA) in the region.

A study for South Lincolnshire used a sample survey to examine the experiences of migrant workers in this rural community (Zaronaitė and Tīrziţe 2006). It was estimated that up to 26 different nationalities made up the casual and temporary workforce in South Lincolnshire and Boston. In relation to health and safety in the workplace, approximately 13% of labour providers stated that they did not run induction programmes on health and safety, either because labour users were doing it for them or they did not have the facilities for doing it themselves. Approximately 25% of workers employed by gangmasters did not understand basic health and safety rules when working in potentially dangerous environments, with migrant workers who had limited or no English languages skills deemed to be more at risk as a result.

Boston Borough Council has identified the language barrier as the biggest obstacle to successful integration of migrants into the workplace (Boston Borough Council, 2008). Boston College was identified as having students from 51 different countries enrolled on its courses. The Council also identified the operations of illegal gangmasters as a continuing issue, tying workers jobs to accommodation and constantly moving migrants to different work/home locations. The difficulty of adequately monitoring the size of the local population was highlighted with GP registrations in the Borough totalling 79,000 against an official population of 58,300.

The number of migrant workers in the East of England has been estimated at between 50-80,000 during peak season (McKay and Winkelmann-Gleed, 2005). This study used interviews with migrant workers to identify long hours and low pay as key issues in the region. It identified little or no recording of accidents in the workplace, no signs in languages they could understand and no information on the risks associated with particular types of work. There was a general lack of health and safety adherence with limited provision of health and safety guidelines and procedures in workers’ native language.

The East of England Development Agency (EEDA) is very active in providing support to its migrant population that is generally regarded as vital to the region’s economic development. The unique ‘Migrant Gateway’ project (www.migrant-gateway.eu) has established a web portal
providing guidance to migrant workers on a wide range of issues, including explicit information on health and safety responsibilities in the workplace, from an employee and employers perspective. The service includes a helpline, the Mobile Europeans Taking Action (META), providing information support and guidance.

A new research study was initiated by EEDA in early 2008 (EEDA, 2008-10). The study, run by researchers at Anglia Ruskin University, is designed to track the activities of migrant workers in the region over a three year period using a number of analytical methods, including a longitudinal survey to monitor factors such as the motivation for coming to and staying in the UK and issues surrounding participation in the workforce and integration within the local community. The study has similar objectives to another three year study, begun in 2007 at the Working Lives Research Institute which is focused on black BME communities and how they access support related to issues arising in the workplace. Both projects could be a useful future source of intelligence on the changing health and safety regime that exists for businesses employing a culturally-diverse workforce.

### 4.3.6 West Midlands

In the West Midlands the impact of migrant workers was examined using a combination of surveys, with employers, migrant workers and with other third party organisations involved with supporting migrant workers (Green et al., 2007b). The analysis was supplemented with statistics from the LFS, WRS and NINo statistics. A significant increase in migrant workers in rural areas, particularly Herefordshire, was noted, coupled with additional flows into established communities of labour migrants in urban areas. The surveys demonstrated that migrant workers were disproportionately employed in low-wage jobs but that there was general satisfaction from employers with the quality of work being done by employees who were prepared to work longer hours whilst maintaining quality of output.

The West Midlands Strategic Migration Partnership (WMSMP) has produced a scoping document, designed to establish an operational framework from which it could be most effective in supporting local authorities and other partners in dealing with migrant issues (WMSMP, 2008). Using summary statistics from the NINo database it has identified significant migrant worker inflows to the main urban local authorities but has highlighted those areas where the pace of change in migrant numbers has been greatest; including South Shropshire, Herefordshire, North Warwickshire, Tamworth, Wychavon, Redditch, Stratford-upon-Avon and Wyre Forest.

Wychavon District Council examined the impact of the migrant workforce in the Vale of Evesham; specifically in the local agriculture and food processing sectors (Fox and Gullen, 2006). There was evidence that expected pressure on the housing stock was being minimised through the provision of mobile homes and other HMO alternatives but with no indication of the standard of this accommodation. Significantly, the report identified an impact upon local healthcare providers with the Minor Injuries Unit at Evesham’s community hospital dealing with an increasing number of migrant workers. Local healthcare workers identified an issue with migrant workers returning to work too soon after injury or illness, placing further strain on local resources. There was little evidence of employers providing information or support for occupational health issues and the casual nature of the employment in the area suggests that many of the incidents of injury and illness relating to the workplace have gone unreported.

In Stratford-upon-Avon, a similar analysis examined the experiences of a small sample of migrant workers employed in cleaning jobs and in agriculture (Bayliss and Gullen, 2007). Those employed as cleaners expressed satisfaction with working conditions whereas those
working in agriculture, the majority of whom were contracted through employment agencies, were less satisfied with the information they had been provided on pay and conditions. HMOs were again prevalent, with issues related to over-crowding reported and minor concerns over deterioration in the quality of private rented accommodation.

In Birmingham, the presence of a large number of migrants working in potentially hazardous conditions, was believed to have sparked an increase in the number of injury compensation lawyers targeted specifically at Polish workers (Birmingham Post, January 14 2008). With the majority of migrants employed in low-paid jobs with potentially inadequate health and safety standards, a potential increase in the presence of no-win-no-fee legal representation is an interesting development that could indirectly help to improve health and safety standards through increased pressure on employers.

From a slightly different perspective, the WMSMP in conjunction with a local PCT has examined the impact of increased migration upon the provision of adequate maternity health care (Taylor and Newall, 2008). A key strategic recommendation of the report is for much improved intelligence to better inform policy development toward the provision of services to asylum seekers and economic migrants as the demand on health care resources increases.

The WMSMP in its scoping document makes specific reference to the potential impact of health and safety upon health outcomes, although does not base its statements on any specific empirical evidence:

The circumstances in which migrant workers in particular find themselves either due to the nature of industries in which they work, their lack of understanding of health and safety issues, communication problems or lack of training, mean that they are at greater risk of suffering from mental and physical ill-health than their British co-workers.

Employers and employment agencies recruiting migrant workers could do much more to alleviate occupational health and safety issues amongst this group.

WMSMP (2008)

The WMSMP advocates the development of new research to examine the health needs of migrants from different backgrounds and suggests that greater access to health records could help to improve research and policy formulation in relation to migrant workers and other foreign nationals:

(Through the WMSMP) consider the exchange of good practice, for example on challenging issues such as the use of migrants health records to develop a clearer picture of the number of new arrivals within a locality alongside other available data, and consider how such good practice models could be adapted elsewhere in the region to reduce health inequalities amongst migrants and the indigenous population.

WMSMP (2008)

4.3.7 London and South East

London continues to be a magnet for immigration to the UK, with up to a third of all new migrants coming to the capital each year. Since 2004, migrant flows have been more dispersed around the UK; NINo statistics suggesting that, in 2006/07, 50% of England’s non-Accession registrations were in Greater London, compared to only 26% of Accession registrations.

Migrant workers are seen to have increased the labour supply, stimulated employment growth and reduced wage inflation, whilst providing a very flexible workforce with a diverse skill-set (Gordon et al., 2007). At the same time, migrants are typically seen to be using relatively fewer public services and, with a concentration in private rented accommodation, having limited
impact on house prices or the availability of social housing. This report highlights the real difficulties involved in accurately understanding the size and composition of local area populations with such large, diverse and mobile communities.

The difficulty of accurately measuring the impact of migrant workers is particularly acute in London with such a diversity of population and high levels of churn throughout the city. The Greater London Authority (GtLA) is responsible for the production of estimates and forecast of population numbers for London Boroughs (LB) and has long recognised the inadequacies of statistics on international migration. These inadequacies have resulted in much debate concerning the accuracy of estimates of LB populations and also around what constitutes a ‘usually resident’ population. Short-term migrants, which proliferate throughout London, are typically excluded from mid-year estimates (MYE) of population but are a permanent fixture to service providers within individual LB.

The GtLA commissioned a specific study to evaluate the availability of alternative statistics on new migrants in an effort to improve its ability to accurately forecast LB populations (Rees and Boden, 2006). The study concluded with a recommendation to develop a ‘New Migrant Databank’ (NMD) bringing together all sources of data on international migration to provide an analytical framework from which individual local authority districts, unitary authorities and London Boroughs (LB) could derive a complete and up-to-date view of the impact of migration upon their particular geographical area.

The NMD concept has now been developed further by a research team at the School of Geography at the University of Leeds and is currently subject to review by the stakeholders to the project, including the GtLA and ONS (Rees, Norman and Boden, 2007-09). The GtLA has produced a further descriptive analysis of new migrant data, using a number of the sources reviewed in the original study to examine the latest evidence on new migrant flows into London Boroughs (Hollis, 2008).

The Data Management and Analysis Group (DMAG) at the GtLA publishes extensively on a wide range of demographic topics, including labour force participation of ethnic groups and migrant populations, using data on country of birth drawn from the LFS and the Census (Spence, 2005). It has also used the LFS to examine the profile of London’s working population based upon the ‘first language’ of respondents, a useful alternative indicator of ethnic diversity and/or migrant status (Spence, 2006). In 2003, 18% of adults were estimated to have English as a second language (ESL), although this figure was likely to be higher due to LFS sampling issues. The ESL population comprised 20% of the working age population although represented 14% of the employed population and 28% of the unemployed.

A research team at Queen Mary, University of London has been engaged in a project to study the evolving dynamics of low-paid work in London (Wills et al., 2008). They have used the LFS to examine the increasing dominance of migrant workers in certain occupations and supplemented this with their own quantitative and qualitative methods, conducting a total of 424 questionnaires and 103 in-depth interviews in five sectors of the London economy: construction, cleaning, food processing, hotels and hospitality, and care. In 2004/05, 75% of chefs and cooks, 62% of catering assistants, 69% of cleaners and 56% of care assistants in the capital were foreign born. Migrant workers were generally employed in the least desirable jobs, with black Africans being the lowest paid ethnic group. Using the cleaning sector as an illustration, given its attraction as a gateway to employment for new migrants, the research identified the existence of a Migrant Division of Labour (MDL) with a definite ‘hiring queue’ for specific jobs. Employers in the cleaning sector had a strong preference for workers from Europe, specifically eastern Europeans and Portuguese and were less amenable to black African migrants, particularly where immigration status was unclear.
This division of labour is confirmed in an analysis of domestic workers in the UK, where ‘foreignness’ is identified as a discriminating factor, with employers preferring to recruit workers of a particular nationality in order to ensure flexibility and reliability and to establish a particular type of employer-employee relationship (Anderson, 2007).

The London research also confirmed the willingness of migrants to take low wage employment, citing a ‘dual frame of reference’ in which workers are constantly comparing economic opportunities in their chosen destination with those of their home country. The research team identified a number of strategies adopted by low-paid workers to survive economically (Datta et al., 2007). From its sample of workers, 43% were working overtime and 18% were doing more than one job, whilst labour mobility remained high in an attempt to find optimum working conditions. The impact of these strategies upon issues of health and safety were examined, with longer working hours in the care sector contributing to negligence in the workplace; whilst having two jobs was potentially exposing workers to stressful work environments.

The South East of England Regional Development Agency (SEEDA), in collaboration with other regional stakeholders, commissioned a study of Migrant workers in the South East Regional Economy (Green et al., 2008). The research is focused on an assessment of the socio-economic impact of migrant workers and has used a combination of secondary data sources plus qualitative evidence from a 700-respondent migrant workers survey and surveys with employers and service providers. Research evidence suggests that the concentration of migrant workers in certain sectors (manufacturing, hotels and restaurants and health and social work) has increased over time with most migrant workers concentrated in low-skilled, elementary occupations. The migrant worker survey suggested a very strong bias towards elementary occupations (44%) compared to the LFS evidence (10%). Migrant workers expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their employment experience and employers cited enthusiasm and willingness to work hard as key attributes of the migrant workforce. A small number of respondents raised concerns that long hours and poor working conditions of some migrant workers may have a detrimental impact on their health and safety in the workplace.

At a more local level, Winkworth et al (2007) used the WRS in combination with a small qualitative survey to examine the impact of migrant workers upon the delivery of public services in Southampton. In Chichester, the WRS was used in conjunction with worker, employer and service provider surveys to estimate the size and profile of the new migrant workforce (Gaine, 2006). Migrant workers were seen to be largely employed in the agricultural sector but their presence in other low-paid occupations was seen to be crucial to the local economy. Neither study makes explicit reference to concerns over of health and safety of the migrant workforce.

In Slough, concerns over the inadequacies of the mid-year estimates of population and their impact upon local authority funding, prompted a detailed analysis of the migrant worker community (Slough Council, 2006). The study uses a sample of approximately 100 migrant workers and 139 employers to generate qualitative evidence on the profile of the new migrant workforce and its impact upon the local economy and community.

**4.3.8 South West**

Since 2004, the rural communities of the South West have been impacted significantly by an influx of migrant workers but the true scale and nature of this impact remains relatively unclear. A review of the research activity that has been conducted by county councils and district councils reveals a paucity of statistics on the distribution, economic characteristics and impact of migrant workers in the region (Skills and Learning Intelligence Module, 2007).
At local government level, many district and unitary authorities have begun to turn their attention as to how effectively they are meeting the needs of migrant workers and have become acutely aware that they have no data to show where migrant workers are; who they are; where they work and what support services they need.

(Skills and Learning Intelligence Module, 2007)

The Cornwall Strategic Partnership commissioned research to investigate the scale and impact of migrant worker activity in the county and used this evidence plus evidence from around the UK to produce a summary of the difficulties of measuring migrant worker numbers (Local Intelligence Network Cornwall, 2006; 2007). It used an employer survey to capture evidence on the number of migrant workers employed by local businesses but recognised the difficulty of achieving robust statistics on a highly mobile and transient workforce.

In Devon, a multi-agency task group has drawn evidence from WRS and NINo statistics to produce summary statistics for the county (Community Council Devon, 2007) and in Somerset, the same statistics have been used to provide an overview of the county picture (Hiscock, 2006).

A further employer survey of food and drink businesses in the South West of England identified that, on average, migrant workers accounted for 21% of the workforce, with a very positive attitude from employers towards migrant labour. (Bryant et al., 2006). They were typically employed in the ‘less attractive’, hard-to-fill vacancies of the food production and processing industry with 44% employed directly, the remainder sourced through labour providers. The flexibility and mobility of the workers provided through labour suppliers was seen to be critical in responding to the demands of supermarket retailers. Conditions under which migrants had been living and working were often poor with evidence of exploitation and intimidation. Most of the firms in the study were covering health and safety and job specific issues in their informal training, however much of this was at a fairly basic level and few claimed to be giving any English language training.

In the absence of hard data, collaboration between organisations has been used as a strategy to fill the knowledge gap. Cornwall has a long tradition of employing temporary workers for harvesting but the profile of its casual labour has changed since 2004. It is estimated that at peak times, there can be 25,000 migrant workers in the county, primarily involved in agriculture and food processing but also with significant numbers involved in cleaning and the care sector. In Kerrier, with a particular concentration of migrant workers, a partnership arrangement between the Council, Police, Fire Brigade, the probation Service and the adjoining district of Penwith has been established (Kerrier District Council, 2006). The Migrant Worker Action Group (MIGWAG) has been established to try and ascertain the precise size and distribution of the migrant population.

Most workers in the agricultural industry in Kerrier are housed on farms, many acting as illegal residential sites. Health and safety issues predominate, with overcrowding, lack of heating, inadequate sanitation and a general risk to workers’ health. In the workplace, there is evidence of frequent disregard for health and safety precautions and long-hours are prevalent. Evidence has shown that gangmasters regularly employ agents on site to control dissent and complaints.

An ‘Information Sharing Protocol’ has been established to enable the creation of a database of information on employers, labour providers, accommodation providers, number of workers and their nationality. The objective is to provide a data repository for recording the results of any site inspection and investigation, although, as yet, it has no information on the incidence of accidents in the workplace. The MIGWAG initiative is its infancy and the data capture process
remains relatively informal and ad hoc. However, the partnership is seeking to extend the scope of the database to include care and residential homes, where significant numbers of migrant workers are also employed and the local police force has begun to record specific incidents involving migrant workers, with a particular issue with regard to road traffic accidents.

The SLIM report emphasises the need to establish more formal data sharing protocols of this type, to enable a more coordinated regional response to the emerging needs of migrant workers, an increasing number of whom are identified in the report as seeking more permanent residence in the region.

In Gloucestershire, a study was commissioned to examine the scale and profile of migrant workers in the county (Gloucestershire County Council, 2007). The objective to determine a more precise estimate of the number of migrant workers present was again constrained by available data, with the research identifying, ‘no viable solution to the problem of verifying official statistics to determine the actual size of the migrant worker population in the county’. Its estimate of approximately 15,700 migrant workers resident at the end of 2006 was based on evidence from published statistics, with additional survey evidence providing a richer source of information on migration profiles and experiences.

4.3.9 Wales

Studies in Wales have used available data sources coupled with small scale surveys to identify some broad issues relating to the impact of migrant workers. A feature of migrant workers in rural areas was their willingness to work long hours, in poor conditions, and to work for relatively low rates of pay in order to maximise their earnings potential (Wales Rural Observatory, 2006; Winkler, 2007). Migrant workers had replaced UK students as the primary source of casual agricultural labour. Those who had little knowledge of English, who were working through employment agents or gangmasters and were unaware of their employment rights were seen to be particularly vulnerable to exploitation. Recommendations are made for an agreed code of conduct for the employment of migrant workers in Wales, union targeting of hard to organise sectors and greater support for English language training (Winkler, 2007).

4.3.10 Scotland

The local response to migrant workers is coordinated through the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) Strategic Migration Partnership. In addition, a portal to a wide range of issues relating to migrant workers has been established by the Community Infosource organisation, providing links to key research and data in Scotland and other areas of the UK (http://www.migrantinfosource.org.uk/).

A local migrant presence is evident across all local authorities in Scotland (Daily Record, November 2007) and there have been a large number of studies completed which have examined the impact of migrant workers upon local communities. A selection of these studies is presented here.

A relatively early study of the impact of A8 migrants was conducted in Tayside (Communities Scotland, 2006). The study used a range of survey evidence to examine the size and profile of the migrant workforce. It combined NINo statistics with survey data to estimate the resident ‘stock’ of migrants to be approximately 4,000, compared to an annual inflow of 10,000. An extensive survey of employers was conducted but there was no systematic data capture on issues of health and safety.
A study of migrants in the Borders provided evidence of the impact and health outcomes of new Accession workers (Aitken, 2006). Employment conditions were cited as having a negative impact upon the health of migrant workers with long hours, low pay, restrictive terms and conditions and fear of dismissal contributing to a potential higher propensity for ill health. Agricultural work involving chemicals or machinery was of particular concern. The study was used to inform Scotland’s National Resource Centre for Ethnic Minority Health (NRCEMH), a unit of NHS Health Scotland established to develop services specifically for black and minority ethnic groups, to reduce inequalities and to improve the health of these communities. The NRCEMH has undertaken steps to routinely collect information on ethnicity to better inform policy makers but the standard ethnic classification does not enable differentiation of the, predominantly white, ethnic migrants who have arrived from central and eastern Europe.

A more recent study in Grampian used a wide variety of secondary data sources combined with a survey of migrant workers, employers and service providers (de Lima et al., 2007). It examined migrant experiences of employment and access to services and reported on aspects of migrant health. The majority of participants stated that they had received basic training in health and safety and food hygiene, although the extent of this varied considerably. Most migrant workers had received training in English.

It appeared common practice for employers to rely on migrant workers with better English to assist them with the dissemination of health and safety information. Focus group participants expressed serious health and safety concerns and minimal training in a number of specific businesses. Examples of serious accidents were provided in the food processing industry, including a serious work accident involving chemicals for which neither the employer nor the employment agency were reported to accept responsibility for the incident. Other participants identified businesses whose health and safety record was very poor, and highlighted a number of incidents affecting migrant workers as well as local employees, for which little action had been taken.

A comprehensive study of Accession migrants living and working in Glasgow was completed using surveys with workers, employers and service providers, combined with secondary information from the WRS, NINo and also from school census data (Stevenson, 2007). Evidence of worker exploitation included a lower wage level compared to indigenous workers (although generally higher than in the home country), not being given statutory holidays, working overtime without extra pay, discrimination in finding employment, and verbal harassment. There were issues raised in relation to short term contracts and job insecurity, illegal and unexpected deductions from wages and problems getting statutory sick pay and holidays. Concern over health and safety was raised in relation to the difficulty that some Accession migrants had working with the much stricter health and safety regulations that exist in the UK and because of inadequate language skills, some demonstrated a lack of understanding of warning signs and other guidance.

The report recognised the shortage of information available on the distribution and activities of migrant workers and recommended that service providers, in particular, sought to collect more information on the migrant population.

Door Step is a not-for-profit organisation based in Glasgow that is seeking to develop new migrants as specialist advisers in employment, housing and welfare rights. It has conducted research into the experiences of Polish migrant workers and identified a generally positive view on employment from its respondents but suggested that a ‘significant and growing number are experiencing employment, inequality, abuse of rights and exploitation’. The research identified
that excessive deductions from wages were not uncommon and that working hours were generally in excess of those experienced by the indigenous workforce (Collins, 2007).

A large survey of migrant workers in Fife was commissioned by a multi-agency group in Fife, to provide more insight into their experiences in the workplace and in the community (Fife Research Coordination Group, 2008). The survey was qualitative in its approach but did identify that 25% of workers were not registered with the WRS and 13% did not have a NINo at the time of survey. The survey did not capture information on health and safety experiences in the workplace. Most of those surveyed were factory workers in the food processing industry with over 70% making no use of their existing qualifications and skills in their current jobs.

In Edinburgh a survey of migrant workers was conducted to capture intelligence on their experiences of accessing health, housing and social care services (Orchard et al, 2007). In Dumfries and Galloway a study was conducted with a specific focus on the workplace, with the objective of producing estimates of the size of the migrant workforce and to examine issues of economic integration. The employer survey identified that 4.8% of workers were migrants, although the sample from which the data was drawn was biased towards migrant employers. Migrant workers were most prevalent in food and drink businesses (10% of the total workforce). Employer responses to questions on migrant workers were overwhelmingly positive and no indication was given of any adverse impact of migrant workers upon health and safety in the workplace.

Jentsch et al (2007) examined the experiences of recently arrived migrants in rural areas of Scotland. Its survey of employers revealed only positive responses to the impact of migrant workers. The researchers emphasised the reluctance of migrant worker interviewees to appear openly critical of existing employers but few respondents had permanent contracts of employment and most participants from the food processing and construction sector were working long hours in demanding jobs.
4.4 GLA AND CAB CASE STUDIES

4.4.1 Gangmaster Licensing Authority

The Gangmaster Licensing Authority (GLA) was established in April 2005 following the Gangmasters (Licensing) Act 2004. Its role has been to regulate gangmaster recruitment practices in order to deal with the incidence of business fraud and the increasing exploitation of migrant and other vulnerable workers in a specific sector of the UK economy. The GLA’s remit covers only agriculture, forestry, horticulture, shellfish collection and the associated food packaging and processing industry, although there is an increasingly strong case to extend this to other sectors, particularly the construction industry.

Following its first year of operation the GLA was subject to an extensive review and evaluation process, to assess its performance and establish priorities for its future operation (Geddes et al., 2007 and Scott et al., 2007). This review process has collated empirical evidence from a variety of primary and secondary sources to provide an effective baseline for future policy formulation. An accurate estimate of the size of the labour market in these sectors has proved difficult particularly in relation to casual and migrant workers.

Data has been drawn from the DWP’s NINo database and the Home Office’s WRS statistics to give a general overview of migrant numbers; this data being particularly important in providing a detailed geographical analysis of migrant concentrations. Data on casual labour has been taken from the June Agricultural Census but numbers appear very low in comparison to the alternative statistics generated by Precision Prospecting Ltd (DEFRA, 2005) which used the number of farm holdings as the basis for its estimation of a total of 420,000-610,000 temporary workers in the GLA sectors, of which approximately 70% are supplied through gangmasters and 60% are foreign workers.

The GLA maintains its own database (‘LAWS’) which records information on approximately 1000 licensed businesses, providing statistics on gangmaster company locations, financial turnover, employee numbers and indicators of compliance. Approximately 42% of the registered businesses are subject to additional licence conditions (ALC), which must be met if a full licence is to be obtained (Geddes et al., 2007). The dominant reasons for an ALC are:

1. A failure to provide adequate health and safety procedures
2. Wage, tax and national insurance issues
3. Issues regarding employee contracts
4. Hours of work

The analysis demonstrated that health and safety non-compliance issues were more significant for those businesses licensed with the GLA’s predecessor, the Temporary Labour Working Group (TLWG). Wage issues are the dominant area of non-compliance for more recent licencees with the GLA. Nevertheless, the GLA is clearly forcing greater recognition of issues of health and safety upon labour providers but it is unclear whether this is having a knock-on impact upon labour users. This is a particular issue given the lack of clarity over health and safety responsibility that results from lengthy supply chains.
The GLA is an independent body with non-departmental public body (NDPB) status. Its stakeholders are drawn from a wide range of organisations from the business sector, the voluntary sector and other public sector agencies and there are key partner organisations where data sharing is seen to be a key component of the GLA’s licensing and compliance process:

- Department of Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR)
- Department of Works and pensions (DWP)
- Home Office (HO)
- Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs (HMRC)
- Health and Safety Executive (HSE)

Although the extent of data sharing between partner organisations appears to have been relatively limited in its first year of operation (Geddes et al., 2007) the progress that the GLA has been able to make in this area is seen to be extremely positive:

...there might be merit in re-examining how enforcement is measured across government and whether or not a common set of deliverables could be developed. The government stakeholders we spoke praised the GLA for taking the lead in building partnerships at a local and national level.

(Scott et al., 2007)

The GLA has also gathered data through direct contact with members of the public and through the Crimestoppers initiative. The assignment of these additional items of information to the data records held on individual businesses, adds intelligence to the management and monitoring of the compliance process.

As part of its annual review process the GLA has made use of its LAWS database, using a postal survey and face-to-face interviews with a sample of licensees to collect responses on all aspects of the GLA’s first year of operation and its future form. This survey process has been combined with interviews with labour users and with representatives from key stakeholders. The GLA has demonstrated how creative use of primary and secondary sources, a flexible and accurate administrative database and participation with other organisations can build a very significant source of empirical evidence from which to base its operations and from which to assess future policy requirements.

In addition, its ongoing enforcement process is providing new evidence on exploitation of migrant workers (GLA, 2007), from which collected data could help to better inform the wider stakeholder group on issues of health and safety risk within the agriculture and food processing industry.

4.4.2 Citizens Advice Bureau

The Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) has found itself at the forefront of issues relating to migrant workers and their impact upon the workplace and local communities. There are approximately 3,000 local CAB’s around the UK and few will have been unaffected by the influx of migrant workers. As migrant workers have spread into all areas of the UK, the caseloads of advice workers in both urban and rural areas have become increasingly diverse (CAB, 2004, 2005a, 2005b).

The CAB deals with over 5 million cases each year; approximately 9-10% of which relate to issues of worker exploitation. Other issues feature high on the advice requirements of migrant workers, specifically housing, benefits, and assistance with immigration procedures. In rural areas, where the visibility of migrant workers is often greatest, the CAB has identified areas of specific concern:
• Problems with employment agencies and gangmasters in relation to the mismatch between perceived and actual terms and conditions and the lack of information on workers rights

• Problems with employers, particularly in relation to wages and conditions of employment

• Issues associated with quality and cost of tied housing

• Issues associated with the quality and cost of alternative housing arrangements

• Lack of knowledge of public services and associated procedures

• Community cohesion issues

Source: CAB, 2005b

The CAB notes that advice consultations are frequently multi-dimensional, reflecting the fact that the impact of migrant workers touches a wide range of issues both in the workplace and in the community.

In managing its caseload the CAB has compiled a large evidence base against which it is able to review its activities and from which it can lobby for specific changes in policies and local services. The CAB national sample database provides a valuable resource on aspects of worker exploitation and its consequences. Its data have been shared with the GLA for its own review process. Further sharing of anonymised and/or aggregate data could provide additional intelligence to the identification of local health and safety issues.
5 REVIEW OF NEW EVIDENCE

5.1 A SUMMARY VIEW

The previous section has illustrated that there has been no shortage of studies on the subject of migrant workers and their impact upon the UK’s economy, business and local communities. In addition, there is a healthy research environment focused on a range of aspects of integration, cohesion and exploitation of new migrant communities.

However, there is only limited evidence of analysis which links migrant workers to their position in the workplace and their resulting health outcomes and very limited evidence on new data to improve existing estimates of migrant worker numbers. Many of the studies reviewed in section 4 are prefaced by a commentary on the difficulty of accurately measuring migration due to the absence of a single instrument of data collection, the complexity of the migration process and the conceptual and definitional issues that are associated with the data sources that are available.

Figures 18, 19 and 20 provide a summary of the research presented in section 4. The summary is structured geographically, first listing those studies which have had a national focus and secondly listing those which had a regional or local focus. The information presented for each study is as follows:

Summary: A short description of the focus of the study.

Coverage: An indication of the geographical scope and industry coverage plus an indication of whether the study focused on all migrants or just the A8.

Main Secondary Sources used: An indication of the main sources of secondary data on migrant workers that have been used in the study (LFS, WRS, NINo).

Primary Data Collection: A summary of any new data capture that has been completed, either on migrant workers, employers or other service providers. The sample size is indicated in each case, together with a note on the approach used to capture information from interviewees.

Health and Safety: An indication of those studies which have attempted to generate explicit information on workplace injury/illness or health and safety risk.

Migrant Sampling: Where appropriate, the method used to capture the sample of migrant workers is identified using the following coding system:

1  Representative unbiased sample
2  Advertised respondent sample
3  Quota interview sample
4  Snowball interviewing
5  Pre-registered or specifically identified individuals
6  Sampling from company records

Data Typology: A classification to identify the type of evidence provided by each study on
migrant worker numbers and health and safety risk.

0  Research based on existing published sources
1  New information but largely qualitative and subject to sampling bias
2  New information that is likely to be representative
### Figure 18: Review of evidence – Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Main Secondary Sources Used</th>
<th>Primary Data Collection</th>
<th>Health and Safety</th>
<th>Migrant Sampling</th>
<th>Data Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson and Regaly (2016)</td>
<td>Migrant workers and forced labour</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson et al. (2006a, 2006b)</td>
<td>Migrant experiences and employer activity</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Agriculture, hospitality, health</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>370 survey, 93 interviews, 370 face-to-face</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Polish and Lithuanian case study</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>Postal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Distribution of all migrants</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burt et al. (2018)</td>
<td>Migrant workers, health and safety risks</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC (2017)</td>
<td>Summary of migrant workers in rural areas</td>
<td>Rural Areas</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemos and Bates (2000)</td>
<td>Migrant labour and wage levels</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKay et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Health and safety risks</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair et al. (2007)</td>
<td>GLA review of operation</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>GLA areas</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollard et al. (2008)</td>
<td>All migrants and length of stay</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>370 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East &amp; North West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLES Consulting (2006)</td>
<td>Impact of new migrant workers</td>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenchchord Morley (2006)</td>
<td>Impact of new migrants</td>
<td>South Tyneside</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemberton and Stevens (2006)</td>
<td>Estimating migrant numbers</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menzies et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Impact of new migrants</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemberton and Stevens (2007)</td>
<td>Housing outcomes of migrants</td>
<td>Newcastle and North Tyneside</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; The Humber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beden (2007)</td>
<td>Migration and household estimates</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Riding/Yorkshire Council (2007)</td>
<td>Migrant analysis</td>
<td>East Riding</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Economic needs of migrants</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Euros Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie and Ford (2008)</td>
<td>Economic and social outcomes of migrants</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Euros Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 19: Review of evidence – Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Main Secondary Sources Used</th>
<th>Primary Data Collection</th>
<th>Health and Safety</th>
<th>Migrant Sampling</th>
<th>Data Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Migrant LFS NINo WRS</td>
<td>Migrant Non-migrant Method</td>
<td>No Service Provider</td>
<td>Injury Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands &amp; East of England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKay and Winkelmann-Gled (2005)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zannetti and Trzete (2001a)</td>
<td>Dynamics of migrant labour</td>
<td>Boston and S</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hickford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anfow (2007)</td>
<td>Migrant vulnerability to occupational injury</td>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>Food and drink</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>Employment records</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green et al (2007b)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>Quantitative focus</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>face-to-face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox and Gullen (2006)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>Wychavon</td>
<td>Agric / food processing</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayfis and Gullen (2007)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>Starred sporo</td>
<td>Chasing out agriculture</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green et al (2007b)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London &amp; South East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaine (2006)</td>
<td>Scale and impact of migrant workers</td>
<td>Chiswick</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green et al (2003b)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>South East</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holts (2008)</td>
<td>London through migration</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slough Council (2006)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wills et al (2006f)</td>
<td>Migrant divisions Labour</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winkworth et al (2007)</td>
<td>Impact on local services</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Figure 20: Review of evidence – Part 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Main Secondary Sources Used</th>
<th>Primary Data Collection</th>
<th>Health and Safety</th>
<th>Migrant Sampling</th>
<th>Data Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>LFS</td>
<td>NINa</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>Migrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West &amp; Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant et al (2006)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Food and drink</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Council Devon (2007)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester County Council (2007)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Postal / online / interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiscock (2006)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINC (2006)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales Rural Observatory (2006)</td>
<td>Distribution of All migrants</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldie (2007)</td>
<td>Distribution of All migrants</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen City Council (2007)</td>
<td>Migrant worker statistics</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collina (2007)</td>
<td>Housing, work and welfare experiences</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Face-to-face / focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities Scotland (2006)</td>
<td>Migrant worker experiences and needs</td>
<td>Tayside</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife Research Coordinating Group (2009)</td>
<td>Migrant worker experiences and needs</td>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, Aitken (2007)</td>
<td>Migrant profile and experiences</td>
<td>Dundee &amp; Fife</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Survey / interview</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins et al (2007)</td>
<td>Migrant workers in rural areas</td>
<td>Rural Scotland</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Lima et al (2007)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>Gothenburg</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Face-to-face / focus groups</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard et al (2007)</td>
<td>Migrant profile and access to services</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns &amp; others (2007)</td>
<td>Scale and profile of migrant workers</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling Council (2007)</td>
<td>New migrant statistics</td>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 SAMPLING ISSUES AND DATA BIAS

A persistent problem facing research into international migration is the difficulty of generating new data due to poor rates of survey participation and the complexities involved in trying to achieve a representative research sample of the diverse migrant community. The research studies summarised in Figures 18 and 19 have used a variety of methods to select survey respondents. These are identified with a 1-6 coding system which encompasses the following sampling methods, all of which, apart from the first, have been used by one or more of the research studies.

1. Representative unbiased sample

To generate a truly representative, unbiased sample requires a full list of potential respondents belonging to the target population. A sample is selected for interview or asked to complete a questionnaire using a method that ensures that each respondent has an equal or known chance of being included. The migrant population is diverse, mobile and sometimes hidden. In the absence of a population register or similarly comprehensive administrative system there is no reliable record of the migrant population from which to base such a sampling process.

2. Advertised respondent sample

A number of the surveys use various media to invite respondents from the target population to participate either through a postal survey or through interview. This approach has often been linked to an incentive to respond. Respondents are self-selected and the targeting method will not capture a representative cross-section of the target population.

CLES (2007) achieved a 10% response rate on its employer survey and obtained the majority of its migrant sample from focus group interviews at a local college. The statistics provide a useful illustration of migrant profiles in Sefton but are not sufficiently representative of the wider migrant community to allow more general application of the results.

French, S. and Möhrke, J. (2006) attempted to generate a representative sample from within the North Staffordshire study area but were constrained by poor response and reluctant participation. The authors acknowledge the limitations of their research for quantitative analysis of the migrant labour, but focus on the qualitative responses of employers and on the experiences of migrant workers.

Pemberton, S. and Stevens, C. (2006) were similarly constrained by poor response rates from employers and the difficulty of capturing a representative sample of migrant workers, particularly those working illegally. The study objective was to estimate migrant numbers in Merseyside but the additional migrant sample data provided only qualitative input with the main estimation process using WRS and NINo statistics.

Cook et al (2008) and McKenzie and Ford (2008) used community contacts to generate migrant samples for their respective studies, providing useful qualitative evidence to better understand local impacts and experiences but no basis for any quantitative analysis or generalisations for the wider population.

The survey produced a diverse sample by age, nationality, and industry sector but self selection prevented a truly representative sample from being generated.

Zaronaite and Tirzite (2006) generated survey responses through advertisement in the local community. The sample size is large in comparison to other surveys although respondents, in this instance, were self-selected and data was not collected through face-to-face interview, presenting potential issues of bias in the survey. However, the data is used to examine migrant profiles in the local area of Boston and South Holland and collected specific responses on health and safety risk to migrant workers.

Fox and Gullen (2006) used national sources and a small employer survey to estimate migrant worker numbers within Wychavon. The estimates are not definitive due to the subjectivity applied to the estimation process but the analysis demonstrated the difficulty of achieving accuracy and robustness from a variety of sources and has provided a useful local benchmark.

Bryant et al (2006) used a small migrant and employer survey to provide qualitative input to the analysis of the food and drink industry in the South West of England. In the absence of additional quantitative survey data, the study uses existing national sources plus alternative migrant worker statistics for the industry (Defra, 2005) to establish migrant worker estimates.

In Cornwall a study to produce better estimates of migrant worker numbers was constrained by the difficulty of accurate data capture from employers (LINC, 2006). The authors identify that in a region with a highly mobile and transient workforce, a snapshot survey, completed through postal returns is unlikely to provide a representative view of migrant worker numbers.

Two relatively small studies in Chichester and Southampton (Gaines, 2006; Winkworth et al, 2007) have used the WRS as their main secondary source, supplemented with qualitative data generated from small migrant worker surveys. In Slough, a variety of methods were used to obtain a sample of migrant workers with over 60% captured through on-street interviews and a further 20% provided through community groups (Slough Council, 2006).

In Dumfries and Galloway migrant workers were captured through an advertised survey and an employer survey was targeted at business known to be employing migrant workers (Hall Aitken, 2007). The study recognised potential biases in it sampling process but used survey data in combination with NINo to derive estimates of the size of the migrant workforce.

Stevenson (2007) used a number of methods to capture migrant worker respondents in its relatively large sample for the Glasgow area. The study makes a direct comparison of the survey results with the WRS and NINo data, although potential sampling bias makes the robustness of the comparison questionable. Few studies have attempted to do this direct comparison due to sampling inadequacies. There is some confusion over the migrant counts produced from the WRS and the NINo but the study uniquely estimates future migration streams based upon estimated length of stay and also recognises a 32% undercount in the WRS statistics.

The Doorstep survey of migrant workers used organised ‘events’ to interview Polish Workers on their experiences of housing and employment outcomes in Scotland (Collins, 2007). Conclusions are drawn from qualitative evidence and presented only as general perspectives with little quantitative assessment of the responses given.

Jentsch et al (2007) used a small sample of migrant workers plus telephone interviews and focus group discussions with employers to examine the impact of migrant workers upon rural
Scotland. The qualitative evidence is combined with data drawn from published NINo statistics.

3. Quota interview sample

A quota methodology has been used in a number of cases. This has involved the identification of strata in the target population and an ‘ideal’ mix of respondents with specific age, gender, occupation and nationality characteristics. Poor participation and response rates have typically made the achievement of a representative quota sample impossible.

Pollard et al (2008) used snowballing to capture a sample of Polish migrants based on age, gender, level of qualification and when they last lived in the UK. The study used the sample data in conjunction with statistics from the LFS and the WRS to examine length of stay in the UK, providing a unique perspective on the likely number of A8 migrants who remain in the UK. The direct comparison of the WRS with the LFS demonstrates innovative use of the data but results are subject to considerable uncertainty due to the unrepresentative coverage of short-term migrants in the LFS and the analysis provides only ‘ballpark’ estimates and not definitive statistics.

Green et al (2007) completed the ‘West Midlands Migrant Worker Survey’ to assess the regional impact of migrant workers. The same research team has applied a similar approach in the South East of England, completing the ‘South East Migrant Worker Survey’ to examine the impact of migrant workers upon the regional economy (Green et al, 2008). Both surveys used a quota sampling method to generate a sample of migrant respondents. The authors emphasised the difficulty of obtaining a representative view due to the lack of sampling frame from which to draw a sample of migrant workers. They also highlighted the ‘snapshot’ nature of the surveys, with the value of data ageing rapidly at a time of significant demographic change. The authors report on statistics from national sources but stop short of producing alternative regional estimates of migrant numbers based on the respective Migrant Worker Surveys.

4. Snowball interviewing

Snowballing methods have used an initial sample of known members of the target population for survey or interview. Interviewees have subsequently been asked for further contacts and the sample has developed accordingly. In the absence of more information on the target population, this method has been successful in generating sample respondents although unrepresentative of the full migrant population.

Anderson and Rogaly (2007) used personal contacts of researchers to identify its initial sample and snowballing methods to increase the sample size.

McKay et al (2007) targeted a cross-section of workers within each region based upon gender, country of origin and major migrant worker employer. The authors acknowledged the difficulty of producing a representative sample in the absence of a data source on the total population of migrant workers, with employer contacts and snowballing methods used to build the migrant sample. The sampling bias and the sample size prevent any use of the research findings to generalise migrant worker numbers and profiles by nationality, region or industry sector.

De Lima et al (2007) recognised the difficulty of generating a representative sample of migrant workers in the Grampian region. They used snowballing methods to obtain a small sample of workers and targeted an employer survey at selected organisations. The employer survey was used to produce local estimates of migrant worker numbers by sector and by nationality,
although the sample size was too small to be more generally representative. The migrant sample was used to provide additional qualitative input to the analysis.

In Edinburgh a survey of migrant workers was captured to examine the profile of A8 migrants and their experiences of accessing health, housing and social care services. A sample of migrants was obtained through snowballing with targeted quotas. Although triangulation of survey data with NINo and WRS was contemplated the study did not attempt to produce revised estimates from its survey responses.

Fife Research Coordination Group (2008) produced its relatively large sample using snowballing methods based on place of work. The authors again recognised the difficulty of obtaining a representative sample of migrants. Although the results produced an in depth perspective on migrant worker activity in the Fife area, the data are biased towards particular employers in the food processing industry. The survey process did, however, seek to capture information on whether or not migrant workers had registered with the WRS and had obtained a NINo, identifying that 25% of workers were not registered with the WRS and 13% did not have a NINo at the time of survey.

5. Pre-registered or specifically identified individuals

In some instances respondents have been selected from existing lists, either from administrative systems or following a request for additional information. These are unrepresentative of the full target population.

Anderson et al (2006b) used both quantitative surveys and more in-depth interviews in its sample of migrant workers, with data captured both pre- and post-Accession. The majority of the sample were specifically selected rather than randomly chosen. The sample is unrepresentative of the wider population of migrants and employers precluding wider generalisations.

Anderson et al (2007) used a multiple choice survey for the capture of basic data. The sample was pre-selected based on migrants who had registered with the WRS and who had requested further information on workers rights and agreed to complete an additional TUC questionnaire. The survey process was voluntary. The sample is therefore likely to be biased towards migrants in formal employment.

Dainty et al (2007) focused their analysis on the construction industry using a qualitative approach, similar to that used by McKay et al (2006), to examine accident and illness in the workplace. The migrant worker sample was obtained from direct contacts working on large construction projects in London and the South East with the majority being recent, A8 migrants. The size and bias in the sample makes more general use of the statistics difficult and the study highlighted the inadequacy of the WRS as an indicator of migrant worker activity in this industry sector due to the proliferation of self-employment.

In Gloucestershire a large-scale survey of businesses produced over 700 responses, although there were noticeable non-responses from a number of major migrant worker employers in the county. A sample of migrant workers was identified from “willing” employers and survey responses were gathered using a combination of postal, online and interview methods. Data biases restrict the use of the survey data to an examination of migrant profiles and experiences. The estimates of migrant worker numbers for the county are derived from published NINo statistics.
Communities Scotland (2006) initially targeted businesses in Tayside who were believed to employ migrant workers. From a response of 700 business, a total of 47 businesses were interviewed in depth and a sample of 112 migrant workers were identified from these businesses following permission from the employer. The study makes a direct comparison between the survey results and published NINO statistics to estimate the stock of migrant workers at the end of 2005, recognising the potential biases in the sample data.

6. Direct use of company records

In a number of studies, employment records have been used as the basis for the identification of migrant workers. Where this method has been applied, although limited to a very small number of companies, it has included the derivation of a sample of both migrant and non-migrant workers for direct comparison.

The Anslow (2007) study was the only new analysis that explicitly evaluated the risk of accident and injury to migrant workers. It achieved this through data captured on both migrant and non-migrant workers from company records in a sample of food and drink organisations in the East Midlands.

Wills et al (2007) used company records from a single, London-based cleaning company to guide their analysis of increased diversity in the sector and to emphasise the predominance of migrant workers (over 80% of the workforce in this case).

The variety of methods used to capture new data on migrant workers illustrates the great difficulty involved in generating a truly representative sample. Surveys have typically provided a rich source of qualitative evidence on migrant workers but are generally unsuitable as the basis for more informed quantitative analysis.

5.3 DATA QUALITY

The research has identified a large number of studies which have examined the ‘impact’ of migrant workers. Regional and local analyses have been commissioned to better understand patterns, trends and profiles, encouraged by the Audit Commission’s recommendation to generate new data in the absence of reliable national datasets.

However, based on the evidence presented, none of the studies has produced new evidence that is sufficiently representative to produce definitive evidence regarding either migrant worker numbers and/or relative health and safety risk.

In addition, very few studies have an explicit focus on health and safety issues, although many comment on a variety of issues associated with migrant worker ‘vulnerability’.

In Figures 18 and 19 a simple ‘0, 1, 2’ coding system has been used to provide a ‘Data Typology’ of the evidence produced. This typology is an assessment of the extent to which the studies provide more definitive evidence on migrant worker numbers and health and safety risk.

Those studies that have been coded ‘0’ are those that have used existing national sources of information on migrant workers. These sources are primarily the LFS, WRS and NINO but have also included Work Permit statistics, SAWS data, GP registration data and pupil census statistics. The studies provide commentary and interpretation of the statistics but have
generated no new data and have not synthesised locally the different sources of statistics into a ‘one number’ count of new migrants.

Those studies that have been coded ‘1’ encompass research and analysis that has generated new data either nationally or locally but which is largely qualitative and subject to sampling bias. These studies have the following characteristics:

- A small sample size with various methods used to select respondents.
- Different definitions of the migrant population.
- Studies are one-off, with data generated for a specific time-period with no system of ongoing measurement or analysis.
- The main purpose is to understand the phenomenon and processes associated with recent migration through qualitative analysis.
- They are not designed to be statistically representative of a target ‘population’ of new migrants. Any quantitative statistics derived from the samples will be subject to substantial bias.
- Because of the variety of purposes and methodologies used in the local surveys, only a qualitative synthesis, informed by local expertise and views, is possible.

There is an absence of studies with a data quality code of ‘2’ reflecting the fact that all studies have been constrained to some degree by the difficulty of achieving a representative sample from the migrant worker population. A small number of studies have made particularly innovative use of the data that has been available but evidence is still subject to sampling bias and quickly out-of-date at a time of rapid demographic change.

The McKay and Winkelmann-Gleed (2005) study in East of England, for example, is not a particularly recent study but it is one of very few that has attempted to make judgments about the size of a local migrant workforce. Combining intelligence from both employer and employee responses, it estimated a total migrant workforce of between 50-80,000 depending upon time of year and identified sector and geographical concentrations of these workers.

The recent Pollard et al (2008) study of A8 migrants represents an innovative matching of national sources and survey data to provide additional intelligence on migrants who have subsequently left the UK, suggesting that approximately 50% of those who have arrived since 2004 have subsequently returned. The rate of return migration is a key statistic for better estimation of migrant worker numbers but further research is required to enable more authoritative and disaggregate statistics of this type to be derived.

The Anslow (2007) study is unique amongst the identified studies of migrant workers in that it provides an alternative view on accident and injury in the workplace, albeit from a relatively small sample of workers in the food and drink industry. In this instance, the difficulty of obtaining a representative sample of migrant workers is compounded by the fact that they are significantly less likely to report accidents in the workplace compared to indigenous workers.

Despite a wealth of research and analysis into migrant workers and their impact upon local communities and business, there remain significant difficulties associated with the capture of new and reliable data on their geographical distribution and socio-economic profile. There is no
substantive new evidence that provides robust and representative data to improve existing estimates of migrant numbers and their relative health and safety risk.

The evidence presented here suggests that commissioning a new national or other large-scale survey of the at-risk population of migrant workers is not an attractive option. Such a survey would face all the difficulties that the studies we have reviewed and evaluated suffer from:

1. The samples are likely to be unrepresentative, as there is not a reliable, comprehensive sampling frame – a list of the population at risk or the household units in which the population at risk may be found.

2. A one-off survey will become rapidly out of date. Launching a repeated survey (e.g. each year) would be a major financial commitment. As the mix of new migrants is changing rapidly year by year, what might be relevant as a sampling frame now (e.g. interviews at work sites of employers registering workers under the WRS) may change rapidly.

An alternative approach could be the development of a smaller-scale survey, targeted specifically at measuring the ‘bias’ in national administrative datasets. A number of studies have set out with the objective of generating new data from which to establish ‘better’ estimates of migrant worker numbers but none has succeeded in correcting or reweighting data from national sources. A small, intensive interview survey with the best sample that could be devised which asks for full details of a respondent’s migration history, work history, health and safety history and history of registration with the UK’s major administrative registers (National Insurance, National Health, Work Permits and Worker Registration Scheme) could provide new intelligence on which to base improved estimation.

This survey would be designed to measure how many new worker migrants were registered with the main administrative databases and how these databases related to their international and internal migration histories. So, for example, the Home Office’s Points Based System for Immigration Visas, the NINo database and the NHS registration system may be identified as the basis for estimating the number of new worker migrants, both short term and long term into the country. Survey respondents would be asked about their full migration and work histories and their histories of registration for entry work permits, NI numbers and NHS numbers. From the survey responses it would be possible to derive the degree of under count of each of the administrative data sets, obtaining a series of correction factors that would enable modification of the administrative register counts to estimate the true population of migrants of interest.

However, there are risks associated with running such a survey and it would need a feasibility study to establish best procedures, costs and potential pay-off. The issue of how to obtain a fully representative sample of migrant workers would still need to be resolved and the methodology for achieving this remains unclear. In addition, the survey would ideally need to be repeated periodically given the current economic uncertainty that exists and the likely change in the pattern and trend in migrant worker flows.

The survey could be carried out through the ONS Omnibus Survey after careful preparation with ONS. The Omnibus Survey has become part of the IHS and so could potentially be used over the whole country. What would probably be more appropriate would be to select areas of high current immigration using a typology of areas based on administrative sources. There is considerable expertise in ONS, the National Centre for Social Research and the Institute for Social and Economic Research (Essex University) that could be tapped for advice on how to select the best sample possible and the most appropriate methodology to employ.
In the absence of new and more definitive evidence on migrant workers numbers and their health and safety risk, and the difficulties associated with capturing data to generate this new evidence, existing datasets remain an important source of intelligence. Section 6 provides a summary of these datasets and identifies a number of ways in which their content might be better exploited to meet HSE’s requirements for improved data on migrant workers.
6 A REVIEW OF EXISTING DATASETS

6.1 A SUMMARY VIEW

There are a number of existing datasets that contribute to the evidence base on migrant workers, their number, profile and their impact upon the workplace. This section provides a summary of the relative merits and deficiencies of each source and identifies, in certain cases, how improvements in data capture may increase the usefulness of the available statistics for migrant worker analysis and research. In addition, the section identifies a number of key administrative datasets where there remains potential to generate new statistical evidence on migrant workers and on workplace health outcomes.

Figure 21 provides a tabulated summary of the datasets reviewed in subsequent sections. The data presented in the table is as follows:

Source: Name of dataset and organisation responsible

UPRN: An indication of whether a Unique Person Reference Number is captured by the data

Coverage: An indication of the geographical coverage of the dataset

Migrant data: An indication of whether the data source provides explicit information on migrant populations. Specifically: whether this information is on the resident ‘stock’ of migrants or on the ‘flow’ coming into or out of the UK; the type of migrant population covered; and whether immigration and/or emigration data is provided.

Health and Safety: An indication of whether the data source provides explicit information on injury and illness in the workplace.
### Figure 21: Review of existing datasets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Migrant Data</th>
<th>Health and Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>UPRN</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total International Migration</td>
<td>ONS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Census</td>
<td>ONS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Pupil Dataset/PLASC</td>
<td>DES</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Passenger Survey</td>
<td>ONS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Force Survey</td>
<td>ONS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Population Survey</td>
<td>ONS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Omnibus Survey</td>
<td>BMRB</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Census</td>
<td>DEFRA</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAS Surveys</td>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Datasets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDDOR</td>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Control</td>
<td>HO</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Permits</td>
<td>HO</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme</td>
<td>HO</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Registration Scheme</td>
<td>HO</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRS - NINo Registrations</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Pensions Longitudinal Study</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime Labour Market Database</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIDB</td>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Episode Statistics</td>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP Registrations</td>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOR / THOR-GP</td>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.2 RIDDOR

RIDDOR requires all employers and the self-employed, to record any incidence of workplace injury or illness which results in absence from the workplace for three days or more.

This formal reporting process provides the empirical basis from which the HSE and Local Authorities are able to improve standards of health and safety in the workplace through risk assessment and through targeted enforcement.

Accurate and timely reporting through the RIDDOR system is the responsibility of employers and not employees. The reporting process can be completed over the telephone to the HSE’s ‘Incident Contact Centre’ or using alternative online, email and postal methods. Whichever method is used, the reporting process captures a number of key fields of information which describes each incident:

- Employer details and industry type
- Time and details of incident
- Type of accident
- Type of injury or illness
- Severity (fatal, major or ‘greater than three days absence’)
- Employee details (including name, address, age, gender, employment status and job-title)

Although the use of the RIDDOR process for reporting workplace injury and illness is mandatory for employers and the self-employed, there remains widespread under-reporting. The extent of under-reporting is evident in the latest National Statistics on Health and Safety (HSE, 2007b) which makes a direct comparison with data from the LFS. During 2006/07, 141,350 workplace injuries were recorded on the RIDDOR system, compared to 274,000 reportable injuries estimated using the LFS, an approximate 50% shortfall.

Daniels and Marlow (2005) researched the general issues associated with the under-reporting of workplace injury. They cite the prevalence of safety incentive programmes, the absence of a recognised safety ‘culture’ within organisations and an uncertain attitude towards internal reporting systems as factors which continue to have an adverse impact upon the accuracy and completeness of workplace injury statistics.

The authors confirm that under-reporting is most prevalent in smaller businesses, for younger age-groups and for musculoskeletal and eye injuries in particular. In addition, the ‘service’ industry is seen to be the sector in which incidents are most under-reported but with issues also evident in agriculture, construction, health care and the voluntary sector.

Anslow (2007) conducted research specifically in the UK food and drink industry and found that migrant workers were significantly less likely to report accidents to their employer compared to indigenous workers. This reluctance to report incidents was related to a number of factors including, a perception that an incident was too minor to record, difficulties arising from effective communication, fear of reprisal, and uncertainty over the process or procedure for reporting.
As a source of statistics that accurately represent the incidence of injury and illness in the workplace, the RIDDOR database is severely constrained. As a source of information on the impact of migrant workers upon health and safety issues, it is even more so.

Resolving the endemic under-reporting is a challenge but the routine capture of a number of additional data items could extend the value of RIDDOR as a source of information on migrant worker activity. At present, no data are captured on ethnicity, nationality or first language of the employee. Ethnicity is the preferred differentiator of cultural diversity in most population and health statistics. However, its broad classification inadequately distinguishes between the increased diversity of the ‘other white’ ethnic group, which includes the majority of EU migrants.

For this reason, it would be more useful to capture nationality and/or first language as an indicator of ‘migrant status’. Ideally this would be accompanied by information on year-of-entry to the UK, to differentiate between short-term economic migrants and longer-term residents of the UK workforce.

One of the key recommendations of the recent review of the UK’s population and migration statistics was for the more effective use and linkage of the government’s administrative datasets (House of Commons Treasury Committee, 2008). Whilst this is likely to require extensive public debate to resolve concerns over data protection and confidentiality, the mechanics of data linkage are relatively straightforward once a ‘unique person reference number’ (UPRN) has been identified to link individual records from different datasets. A worker’s NINo provides the most obvious UPRN.

RIDDOR captures detail on employee name, address, age, gender, employment status and job title; these details could be extended to include NINo information. This would allow direct linkage to the DWP’s NINo database from which detailed information on country of origin could be obtained. Such data may only be required in summary format – aggregated by occupation or geographical area – thus avoiding confidentiality issues. But it would immediately provide additional intelligence on differences that exist between migrant workers and the local workforce; albeit from a source that is generally unrepresentative of the real level of incidence of accident and illness in the workplace.

6.3 LABOUR FORCE SURVEY

The LFS is a quarterly sample survey of households living at private addresses in the UK and is the most important source of detailed statistics on the UK labour market. To maintain consistency with equivalent LFS in other EU countries, the UK survey collects information using international definitions of employment, unemployment and economic inactivity.

The LFS is based on an estimated 60,000 sample of households in Great Britain and collects a wide range of information, including country of birth and nationality. Like the Census, the LFS asks the question, ‘where were you living one year ago’ so it can provide a count of the ‘flow’ of migrants coming to the UK within a single year. At present, the migration question is asked only in the Spring quarter of survey data collection. The LFS also records information on year of entry to the UK, which, unlike the Census, provides a picture of the length of time migrants have been resident – thus producing the most reliable statistics on the ‘stock’ of migrants in the UK.
Statistics from the LFS are now part of ONS’s periodic release of migration statistics, using country of birth to identify foreign workers within the UK labour force. However, as an accurate measure of migrant workers, the LFS has a number of drawbacks:

- It excludes students in halls of residence who do not have a UK resident parent.
- It excludes people in most types of communal establishments which will be a particular issue in the construction and agriculture industries.
- It will exclude migrants who have been in the UK for less than six months.
- It is grossed to population estimates that only include long-term migrants.

The LFS is therefore likely to significantly undercount the true level of foreign workers given the proliferation of short-term economic migrants resident in the UK.

To complement the employer-reported statistics of RIDDOR’s administrative system, HSE has commissioned its own questions in the LFS. The survey provides workplace injury and work-related illness statistics from an individual’s perspective (HSE 2007a).

The HSE has used the LFS to conduct preliminary research on the incidence of injury and illness to migrants (HSE, 2007c). Results suggest that migrant workers are at no higher risk of injury and illness than the indigenous workforce, although the analysis raised concerns over the use of the LFS sample:

- The capture of migrant workers in the sample is likely to be inadequate due to the issues raised above
- Migrants, because of their relatively youthful age profile, are likely to be healthier than the non-migrant workforce.

The LFS contains a sample of about 700 international migrants per year (i.e. persons who state they were resident overseas one year ago). This small sample size precludes more detailed analysis of injury statistics by geography, industry or risk category.

The Annual Population Survey (APS) comprises data from the annual LFS together with annual local LFS boost surveys for England, Scotland and Wales. The APS aims to provide enhanced annual data for England, covering a target sample of at least 510 economically active persons for each LADUA and at least 450 economically active persons in each London Borough. The APS does provide an indication of the size of the working age population disaggregated by broad nationality and ethnic category but at a local level the sample size is too small to allow more disaggregate analysis and the sampling issues that affect the LFS are resident in the APS.

During 2008/9, it is planned to combine the LFS with the Annual Population Survey (APS), the General Household Survey (GHS); the Expenditure and Food Survey (EFS); and, the National Statistics Omnibus Survey (NSOS) to create the Integrated Household Survey (IHS). This single survey approach will create a much larger sample size, with migrant worker questions from the LFS being retained in a core module. The capture of communal households and migrants who have been resident for less than six months will need to be addressed if the new IHS is to significantly improve the migrant counts available from the LFS.
6.4 INDUSTRY SURVEYS

6.4.1 Construction Industry
The COS was commissioned by HSE as part of the British Market Research Bureau’s (BMRB) rolling Omnibus survey. The survey was conducted during January-April 2005 and included a sample of 5813 construction workers.

The survey asked a range of questions relating to employment status and captured details on accident and ill health in the workplace. A total of 345 respondents were identified as foreign workers, with 327 stating that English was not their first language.

The COS has provided a snapshot view of the construction industry, for direct comparison with the rolling time-series derived from the LFS. It has allowed a detailed analysis of accident and illness rates to be completed, although only at a national level. In addition, the survey has enabled an analysis of the incidence of accidents to migrant workers relative to the native workforce but with no clear differences identified (HSE, 2007d).

Its migrant sample was of a sufficient size to provide an indication that migrant workers comprised almost 6% of the total for the industry in 2005. This compares to an LFS estimate of approximately 7.5% in 2007. There has been continued growth in the construction industry since the COS was completed in 2005 and migrant workers, particularly from the A8 countries, form an increasing percentage of the workforce.

CITB-ConstructionSkills operates an annual panel survey that is conducted with approximately 1000 employers in the construction industry. Limited statistical information is accessible from the survey but its 2006 returns confirmed a migrant workforce of 6% of the total employed in construction (Crick, 2007). CITB-ConstructionSkills also engage Experian in the production of construction industry forecasts and although the statistics provide a detailed regional profile of workers in the industry, there is no information provided on the future size or profile of the migrant workforce (ConstructionSkills, 2008).

6.4.2 Agriculture Industry
The June Agricultural Survey is an annual survey of the agriculture and horticulture industry, collecting information from a sample of farm holdings in England on land use, crops, livestock and the workforce (DEFRA, 2008). Its latest statistical release is based on approximately 40,000 responses. Its workforce data are disaggregated by full-time, part-time and casual labour but not by any nationality or migrant worker identifier.

It estimates a total workforce in the industry of 353,000, approximately 42,000, or 12% of which were classified as ‘seasonal, casual or gang labour’. The value and accuracy of these estimates is questionable due to the self-reporting nature of the survey. A previous study commissioned by DEFRA used an alternative sample of farm holdings to estimate a total of between 235,000-345,000 migrant workers in the industry (DEFRA, 2005).

There is no evidence of alternative surveys in the agriculture industry which specifically identify migrant workers and/or levels of accident and injury that are prevalent in the workplace.
6.4.3 Employer and worker surveys

The literature review has demonstrated evidence of a large number of relatively small scale surveys that have been conducted to examine the impact of migrant workers upon the workplace. Surveys with members of the workforce have typically only involved migrant workers with no representation from local workers. These migrant worker surveys have generally been combined with employer surveys and occasionally with responses from labour-providing organisations and other service providers. These surveys have typically not asked specific questions on injury or illness in the workplace but have sought a more general view of attitudes towards migrant workers and the issues associated with their impact upon the workforce and the community.

The HSE has commissioned IPSOS-MORI to conduct workplace survey to support the HSE’s FiT3 programme. These surveys are designed to provide information on current health and safety practices in a representative sample of approximately 6,000 workplaces across the full range of UK industry.

The current survey format excludes any questions on migrant workers but HSE has recently considered the introduction of additional questions to specifically identify the presence of migrant workers in organisations (HSE, 2008a).

In the East of England a new longitudinal survey is being developed to specifically monitor the activity of migrant workers in the UK (EEDA, 2008). The survey will track individuals, rather than businesses, and although there is no evidence of a specific health and safety focus, it is designed to provide intelligence on changing patterns of behaviour and outcomes of the migrant workforce. Section 6.6 provides a short review of some of the more extensive longitudinal data that is available from the DWP.
6.5 MIGRANT MEASUREMENT

6.5.1 Alternative sources
There is no single data collection instrument for the measurement of international migration to and from the UK, although ONS provides National Statistics on long-term migrants, derived primarily from the IPS and ‘experimental’ statistics on short-term migrants from the same source. There are a number of alternative sources which provide specific intelligence about the movement of population into and out of the UK. These sources, based upon the method and purpose of data collection may be generally classified as either census, survey or administrative datasets. Each has its own limitations depending upon the question asked, the purpose of the data collection and the population covered. The LFS has been reviewed in a previous section; other sources are described briefly in the sub-sections that follow.

6.5.2 IPS and National Statistics international migration
The IPS is the only instrument for measuring UK immigration and emigration, for nearly all types of migrant, capturing a population sample from across the complex picture of inter-country migration illustrated in Figure 2. Its long-term future as an instrument for measuring migration is uncertain, with increasing demands for a survey that is more ‘fit-for-purpose’ (House of Commons Treasury Committee, 2008).

The IPS is a multi-dimensional survey, of which the migrant questions are just one part. It surveys approximately 250 thousand passengers each year: about 1 in 400 of the total number entering or leaving at the UK ports. Of this sample, about 1% are migrants whose stated intention is to stay or leave the UK for more than 12 months. This is equivalent to approximately 3,000 respondents, 70% of which are immigrants and 30% are emigrants. From 2007, the number of interviews with departing migrants is being boosted to a comparable level to those on entry.

IPS respondents are asked their ‘intended length of stay’, to identify the main reason for their visit: work related, formal study, accompanying or joining a partner or immediate family, ‘other’ reasons, such as ‘looking for work’ or working holidaymakers and ‘no reason stated’. Country of residence’, ‘country of birth’ and ‘nationality are all captured together with information on age, gender, dependents and occupation. The IPS does not capture most asylum seekers and it excludes direct routes between the UK and the Irish Republic.

IPS estimates of long-term migration feed directly into National Statistics of Total International Migration (TIM). TIM combines data from the IPS with additional statistics from the Home Office on asylum seekers and their dependants and from the Irish Central Statistical Office on estimates of migration between the UK and the Irish Republic based on the Labour Force Survey in Ireland. Visitor switchers, those people whose original intention was to stay for less than twelve months but who subsequently stay for longer, are estimated from IPS visitor data. Migrant switchers, those people who intended to stay for more than 12 months but decide to leave within a year, are derived from Home Office data on non-EEA citizens.

TIM statistics are used directly in the estimation of the mid-year populations for each local authority district and unitary authority (LADUA) in England and Wales (ONS, 2007b). They are also used as the basis for estimating the future impact of international migration in the sub-national population projections for each LADUA (ONS, 2007c).
The latest TIM statistics, provide estimates of long-term immigration and emigration for 2006 at a national level, with detail on citizenship, country of last or next residence, country of birth, reason for migration, occupation, age, sex and marital status, length of stay and UK area of origin or destination (ONS, 2008c). Figures 9-11 have provided a previous illustration. The IPS data provides more disaggregate information but is subject to sampling issues at sub-national levels.

ONS has an ongoing programme of improvement for its international migration statistics that has included changes to the way sub-national estimates of long-term migration are produced to remove the tendency of the IPS to over-estimate immigration into London (ONS 2007d; 2007e). Since 2006, information from the LFS has been used to calibrate IPS migration flows for government office region (GOR) statistics and the methodology has been applied retrospectively to produce a consistent time-series from 1999-2006.

The Interdepartmental Task Force on Migration Statistics, responsible for ongoing improvements to international migration statistics has made a number of key recommendations:

- Improved capture of migrant data through enhanced port surveys and new administrative systems being developed to improve border control
- Better use of administrative datasets to provide more information on migrants resident in the UK.
- Better migrant statistics at a local level
- Improved estimation of short-term migrants
- Greater coherence in the production and publication of migration statistics.

The short-term migration issue is one which has been subject to much scrutiny as these migrants are typically not captured in mid-year population estimates and not routinely identified in any National Statistics output. The presence of large numbers of ‘short-term’ A8 migrants in local communities has led to much confusion and concern over precisely how many new migrants are resident.

Since 2004, the IPS has captured additional information on short-term migrants: those individuals whose intended length of stay is between three and six months. In response to the pressure for better intelligence on all aspects of the migrant population, not just the long-term variety, ONS has produced its first experimental statistics on migrant workers who have stayed in the UK for less than twelve months (ONS, 2008b). The short-term estimates plus the long-term statistics – collectively termed ‘long-and-short-term-combined’ (LSC) estimates – have been shown to demonstrate reasonable consistency with data derived from administrative sources (ONS, 2008d).

6.5.3 UK Census

Every ten years the Census collects a comprehensive statistical snapshot of all people and households in the UK. The Census is the most reliable geographical and socio-demographic data available, but the timeliness with which data is released and the ten-year time-period between successive enumerations render it less useful as a source of statistics on international migration.
The Census can provide both a view of migrant \textit{flows} for the year prior to enumeration and a measurement of migrant \textit{stocks} present in the usually resident population.

Migration ‘flow’ data is derived from a question, which asks for an individual’s address twelve months prior to enumeration day. Only in-migration is measured; there is no attempt to capture information on individuals who have emigrated during the Census year.

The stock picture is derived from detailed country of birth statistics, although in the absence of a question on year of entry to the UK, it is not possible to measure the length of time a migrant has been resident in the UK.

The Census does not capture data on nationality and the use of its ethnicity classification is increasingly blurred by the fact that many of the minority group populations captured are British Citizens, born in the UK and by the fact that alternative ‘white’ ethnic groups, from the new EU states, now form an important, unidentified sub-group of the population.

The 2011 Census will contain a more extensive set of questions on migration, including a record of ‘date of entry’ to the UK. This will allow measurement of short-term migration in the year prior to the census.

\subsection*{6.5.4 Home Office}

The Home Office regularly publishes National Statistics on immigration and asylum. British Citizens, those Commonwealth Citizens who have freedom of entry to the UK and nationals from the extended EEA are not subject to immigration control and are not included in Home Office statistics and no information is recorded on people emigrating from the UK.

National Statistics produced by the Home Office fall into three broad categories: asylum, control of immigration and persons granted British Citizenship (Home Office 2008a, 2008b). Most statistics are only available at a national level, with no sub-national provision. Asylum statistics, Work Permit statistics and SAWS data are available for each LADUA although Work Permit data are no longer routinely produced by the Home Office. Work Permit data are disaggregated by broad industry category and identify the top ten occupations of applications, with additional detail on age, gender and nationality. SAWS data is typically provided by postal geography indicating number of workers on the scheme by nationality.

The Home Office e-Borders programme should ultimately provide the best option for recording individual movements into and out of the UK although it is unlikely to provide information on where people are resident whilst they are in the country. It should be possible to measure and monitor length of stay of migrants although it will be necessary to establish rules for handling an increasing number of individuals who move into and out of the UK on a regular basis.

\subsection*{6.5.5 National Insurance Number registrations}

For a new migrant to the UK, acquiring a NI\textit{No} is a necessary first step for employment/self-employment purposes or to claim benefits or tax credits. A NI\textit{No} is allocated by Jobcentre Plus and the data is managed by the DWP within the National Insurance Recording System (NIRS2) which captures all subsequent benefit claims.

The information captured during the registration process includes a full postcode of the applicant (not of the employer), together with an indication of declared ‘date of arrival’ in the UK and the actual date of registration (which provides an indication of when migrants become
active in the labour market). In addition, an individual’s ‘country-of-origin’ plus demographic information on age and gender are recorded.

NINo statistics exclude dependents of applicants, unless they claim benefits or work themselves. They will also exclude most students and those migrants who are not of working age and not claiming benefits. The NINo statistics provide no indication of the length-of-stay of a migrant worker.

NINo statistics provide data on all migrants and not just those from Accession countries. However, they do not provide any information on the occupation or industry in which a migrant worker is employed. There is no formal de-registration process and migrants can actually leave the UK and return at a later date without the necessity to re-register for a new national insurance number.

The Information Directorate (IFD) within DWP is responsible for the publication of statistics from the NIRS2 system and a summary of NINo registrations to A8 migrants now forms part of the regular release of migrant statistics (Home Office, 2008c). A picture of NINo registrations by GOR for 2006 is provided in Figure 13.

NINo statistics on migration are drawn from a much larger labour market data resource that is managed by the DWP. This resource remains largely untapped for migration research. Its content and potential are discussed in section 6.6.

6.5.6 Worker Registration Scheme

On 1 May 2004, ten new countries joined the European Union. Nationals from two of these countries, Malta and Cyprus, have had full free movement rights and rights to work, throughout the EU since that date. Nationals from the other eight countries – the Accession 8 of Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia – who come to work in the UK are required to register with the WRS, a government scheme that is designed to regulate access to the labour market and to restrict access to benefits. A new registration is required when a person changes employment or an applicant is employed by more than one employer.

The scheme is administered by the Home Office and is a joint initiative with the DWP and HMRC.

WRS statistics have been an important source of data for research and analysis at all geographical levels although they are based upon data that records location of the employer and not the domicile of the applicant. Year of registration is held, as is nationality of the individual. Date of birth, gender and occupational status are also routinely captured. There is no method for tracking how long each applicant stays in the UK as, like the NINo system, there is no de-registration process necessary.

A detailed statistical picture produced from the WRS is regularly published illustrating the profile of applicants and of registered workers; detailing type of employment, hours of work and wages and a regional disaggregation (Home Office, 2008c).

The WRS provides richer data detail than NINo statistics but has a number of limitations. It only records information on A8 migrants but it also excludes those who are self-employed. This will be a particular issue in the construction industry. In addition, the WRS will not record
A8 migrants who come to the UK for reasons other than work, including students. The WRS is also only a temporary administrative system and is likely to be terminated during 2009.

6.5.7 GP Registrations

When new migrants first register with a GP, they are explicitly identified as an individual whose previous address was outside the UK and who has spent more than three months abroad. The Patient Registration Database System (PRDS) which captures the data, records age and gender but does not provide any detailed information on nationality, country of birth or any additional occupation or industry statistics. No information is captured on patients who have emigrated from the UK.

GP registrations will capture all migrants, regardless of age and employment status, so in theory they provide the most comprehensive view of migration inflows. Analysis of the GP registration data and TIM statistics has demonstrated a strong correlation between the datasets at a national and regional level, with more variation evident by local authority (Rees et al., 2007-9).

Migrants captured by the registration process will include short-term migrants, in addition to those who have been resident for at least twelve months. It is not possible to identify actual or intended length of stay from the data. For the majority of migrants, there will be a time-lag between entering the UK and registering with a GP and some migrants may never complete the registration process during their stay in the UK. Young men, in particular, will delay registration after migration more than older men or women. Also, a PRDS record loses its migrant status once a patient moves within the UK and registers with a new GP.

The data is not made routinely available as a source of migration statistics although it has been used by a number of local authorities for analysis. It provides a very useful comparison to alternative statistics derived from administrative systems, such as NI No and the WRS, on the level of migrant activity at a local level.

6.5.8 Pupil Census

The Pupil Census contains individual pupil records for all children in grant maintained schools in the UK. The dataset is managed by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and collected on a twice-yearly basis from individual schools within each Local Education Authority (LEA).

A total of 8 million pupils are included on the dataset each year. For each pupil, a full postcode and LEA identifier is provided, together with the date that each pupil first entered the education system. ‘First language’ of each pupil is now being recorded, together with self-reported ethnicity.

The dataset does not provide an obvious source of statistics on migrant workers but it does have the potential to provide an informed picture of the composition of local areas based on the changing profile of pupil numbers using captured information on ethnicity and first language.

First language is a useful proxy indicator of nationality or migrant status and might be a consideration as an additional statistical entry on administrative systems, such as RIDDOR, to facilitate more informed analysis of migrant workers.

At present the National Pupil Database (NPD) which holds the Pupil Census is relatively difficult to access but summary statistics by local authority area could provide useful additional
intelligence on the presence of migrant families in the education system, to complement the workplace picture provided by WRS and NINo.

6.5.9 International Students

The Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) is the central source for the collection, management and dissemination of data and statistical publications about publicly funded UK higher education.

HESA maintains a record of all students in the UK, including those whose country of usual residence is outside the UK. These students comprise a large percentage of the annual total of immigrants coming to the UK (294,000 came from outside the EEA, for example, in 2004, according to Home Office statistics).

HESA administrative systems do not capture the residential address of international students, only the location of the institution of study. Students provide information on their expected length of stay and although nationality is requested, it is not a mandatory field and coverage is typically poor. Age and gender are recorded and ethnicity is only provided on students with a UK domicile.

A ‘flow’ picture can be produced, recording all students who arrive and depart in a particular year. In addition, by looking at all students who are studying during a particular year, a ‘stock’ picture can be produced. The picture is dynamic because of the constant churn of students by institution. The data is available for an 11-year time-series up until 2004/05.

Although HESA only provides information on a sub-set of the population, it is an important sub-set when analysing the impact of international migration and can be useful when using a combination of different datasets to understand the impact of migrants within a specific local area. Some local areas (university towns) will have large migrant populations dominated by students, others will have primarily migrant workers. The HESA data can help to understand the balance between these two key components of the migrant population.
6.6 LABOUR MARKET STATISTICS – ADMINISTRATIVE DATASETS

The potential for the increased use of administrative datasets for research and analysis into migrant workers has received increasing attention as the inadequacies of existing measurement systems have become ever more apparent (House of Commons, 2008). Previous reports have recognised the potential for increased use of administrative systems generally, whilst highlighting the data protection issues involved to maintain confidentiality and the legal issues involved in sharing data between government departments and other agencies (ONS, 2005).

In support of the National Data Strategy for Research in the Social Sciences, Jones and Elias (2006) conducted an audit of a selection of the key administrative datasets in education, health and the labour market. This audit has provided useful detail on the potential for drawing new evidence on migration and migrant workers from existing sources.

The DWP is responsible for the management of a number of labour market datasets that provide a range of statistics on economic activity. A unique data sharing agreement with the HMRC, initiated by the DWP, has allowed statistics from the following administrative systems to be brought together into a rich source of intelligence on the labour market:

- Pay-as-you-earn (PAYE) taxation
- National Insurance (NI) contributions
- Benefits payments

The Work and Pensions Longitudinal Study (WPLS) is a large database containing a history (from 1998 onwards) of an individual’s contact with the DWP, providing 100% coverage of the labour market. It combines information on benefits payments with earnings information drawn from HMRC income tax systems. An individual’s NINo provides the UPRN from which DWP data records are matched directly to those from HMRC.

The main groups of variables held within the WPLS are:

- Demographic data (age, gender, ethnicity and place of residence)
- Benefits data (all types)
- Employment and earnings data
- Savings and pension provision

The Lifetime Labour Market Database (L2 or LLMDB2) is a smaller dataset than the WPLS, but it contains a fully representative sample of around 600,000 people from NIRS2 that includes statistics on NI contributions and tax records. It provides a complete employment, earnings and contributions record of each sampled individual and has been used as input to micro-simulation models which analyse future pension provision.

The variables held within the L2 database include:

- Annual earnings
- Tax contributions
- Pension contributions collected under employer schemes
- NI contributions
- Number of weeks of employment / self employment and unemployment
- Timing, type and amount of benefits received
- Industry of employment
At present there is no explicit identification of migrant workers within the WPLS or L2 datasets. However, the NINo provides the key UPRN from which country of origin and date of first registration could be used to specifically identify migrant workers in the labour force. In addition, the NINo provides the link to other government systems and to any other dataset which collects this unique person identifier.

The DWP through its Industrial Injuries Disablement Benefit (IIDB) scheme provides HSE with a direct source of statistics on work-related illness and injury. This data is available for an extended time-series that runs from the 1980s but, at present, provides no information on ethnicity or migrant status. Explicit use of individual NINo references would again allow IIDB data to be linked directly to NIRS2, to identify migrant workers within the sample.

The NIRS2 data could also potentially track new migrants as they move addresses within the UK, giving an indication of the patterns of onward movement and an insight into the process of integration within local communities.

The DWP has undertaken exploratory work on these datasets, primarily on the L2 sample dataset. Of much greater benefit would be data matching against the full 100% NIRS2 population, for which further investigation is required. The L2 investigation has sought to track the work and benefit pattern of migrants to establish intelligence on the actual length of stay in the UK. Results of this preliminary investigation have yet to be published. This is a critical piece of information for better understanding the ongoing impact of short-term migration and for producing a more accurate measure of the number of migrants resident at any single point in time. This analysis could potentially provide improved measures of migrant worker numbers by geographical area and by industry of employment, although biases will remain for those migrants who do not register for a NINo.

At present the DWP provides summary statistics from NIRS2 on NINo registrations for migrant workers, aggregated to local authority area. The linkage of HMRC datasets to the NIRS2 data is a potentially very important development in migration statistics that could provide a much richer source of intelligence on migrant worker numbers and profiles.
6.7 HEALTH STATISTICS

National Statistics on the health of the UK population draw from a range of survey sources (ONS, 2008e). Published statistics on health in the workplace are derived from the LFS, RIDDOR and the IIDB. Data from NHS patient health records do not typically provide statistics on workplace health.

The NHS is the richest source of information on patient health and well-being in the UK, and GP surgeries and hospitals are at the front-line in dealing with injuries and illness that relate to the workplace. The database of Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) is managed by the NHS, providing an episode-level dataset on all patient contact with the NHS. Each HES record holds over 100 items of information that relate to an episode of care including an ‘external cause code’ which records the initial reason for injury or illness (HES online, 2008a; 2008b).

However, individual health records and summary statistics produced from the HES database are not a general source of intelligence on workplace health, other than through recognised health surveillance programmes.

…hospitals are treating people for occupationally acquired injuries and diseases, but the H&S authorities in those same localities are largely in the dark about both the scale of the occupational health issues both generally, and specifically in respect of particular employers or trade sectors.

Source: Brock (2007) BERR ‘ideas’ website

Recognising the value of data derived directly from health records, HSE has part-funded a number of health surveillance programmes to monitor the incidence of work-related ill-health. These schemes, known as The Health and Occupation Reporting (THOR) network are managed by the Centre for Occupational and Environmental Health (COEH) at the University of Manchester (COEH, 2008) and provide anonymised information on new cases of occupational ill health from a sample of hospital specialists (Figure 22).

**Figure 22: The Health and Occupation Reporting (THOR) network**

Source: Centre for Occupational and Environmental Health, University of Manchester. [http://www.medicine.manchester.ac.uk/coeh/thor/](http://www.medicine.manchester.ac.uk/coeh/thor/)
Since 2005, a supplementary surveillance scheme has been run with a sample of 300 GPs, known as THOR-GP and HSE provides specific guidelines for GPs to record and monitor workplace injury and illness (HSE, 2007e). The THOR surveillance statistics provide the following detail on individual cases:

1. Age and gender
2. Postcode location
3. Job title
4. Industry
5. Illness
6. Cause of illness

None of the THOR schemes captures information on the ethnic status of patients plus there is no information on the nationality or country of birth of the patients being monitored.

Despite ethnic monitoring being a recognised activity within the NHS, the capture of information on patients’ ethnicity remains sporadic (Association of Public Health Observatories, 2005). Within the NHS, there appear to be only a limited number of health-related datasets that routinely capture ethnicity. It has been demonstrated that the incompleteness of ethnic coding varies substantially across datasets, with hospital episode statistics achieving a maximum of 36% coverage. The coverage varies between regions, driven not by the density of ethnic populations, but by other organisational and administrative factors. In 2005, there was still evidence of different classifications of ethnicity being used in different systems and between regions.

Clearly with an inadequate classification of ethnicity evident in health records, the additional identification of statistics on the health and well being of specific migrant populations will be difficult. Health records do not capture additional data on country of birth or nationality or other indicators such as ‘first language’ which might provide differentiation between migrant populations.

There is only limited access, therefore, to NHS statistics on workplace-related health issues and no information that explicitly identifies migrant populations, other than that provided by ethnic coding.

However, the use of more general injury statistics, has received far greater attention within the health service. Members of the Association of Public Health Observatories (APHO) have combined to create a more collaborative structure for dealing with the incidence of injuries in the UK. The South West Public Health Observatory (SWPHO) has led the creation of the Injury Observatory for Britain and Ireland (IOBI) established to provide a focal point for injury prevention. This includes responsibility for the creation of an evidence base to support the analysis of injury trends between regions. A similar function is played by the Collaboration for Accident Prevention and Injury Control (CAPIC) in Wales. In Scotland the Information Services Division (ISD) is the statistical observatory for health data, whilst the Ireland and Northern Ireland Public Health Observatory (INIsPHO) provides a combined focal point.

A useful summary of sources of injury data plus a short guide to the interpretation of these statistics is provided by the Welsh Observatory (CAPIC, 2008). Sources identified include the following:

- Public Health Mortality File
- Hospital in-patient data
• Accident and emergency department data
• Road traffic accident statistics
• Fire injury statistics

More extensive surveillance programmes have been used to capture data from different sources and to report regularly on the incidence of injury. The Trauma and Injury Intelligence Group (TIIG) in the North West provides an example of such a process, collecting and reporting on injuries in A&E departments across Merseyside. There is no evidence of any extensive analysis of the ethnic dimension to the incidence of injury and certainly none which incorporates the migrant worker dimension.

The APHO is also responsible for the production of local ‘Health Profiles’ (Association of Public Health Observatories, 2008). Drawing on data from across the NHS, these profiles provide a common and visual framework for reporting on health inequalities for each individual local authority. Using a series of key health indicators, the profiles are able to benchmark each area against the UK average and to provide a focus for policy development, planning and practice. The profiles do incorporate a summary illustration of the ethnic composition of each area, although these do not link directly to health outcomes. These profiles are an example of how effective use of data from a number of different sources can be drawn together to create a much more insightful picture than would be discernible from each source in isolation.
6.8 MACRO-LEVEL STATISTICS

In the absence of a single source of data that provides a complete and accurate source of information on migrant workers and their health outcomes in the workplace, an alternative approach is to build a more systematic statistical picture from a range of alternative sources available at a macro level.

The New Migrant Databank (NMD) concept has been proposed as an interim solution to the difficulty of measuring the impact of international migration (Rees and Boden, 2006). The NMD combines all sources of data on international migration to provide an analytical framework from which individual local authority districts, unitary authorities and London Boroughs (LB) can derive a complete and up-to-date view of the impact of migration upon their particular geographical area. The GtLA has produced its own preliminary report on the NMD approach (Hollis, 2008) whilst the NMD concept has now been developed further by a research team at the School of Geography at the University of Leeds (Rees et al, 2007-09). An example ‘Area Profile’ from the prototype development of the NMD is illustrated (Figure 23), with summary notes describing each component (Figure 24).

The NMD provides a common reporting format at national, regional and local level, to enable appropriate benchmarks to be established and to allow specific datasets to be incorporated at whichever geographical level they were available.

The NMD can provide a ‘real-time’ view of data, reducing the dependency on ‘snapshot’ studies and providing a comprehensive picture of both the geographical distribution of migrants and the changes that are taking place over time. In addition, the NMD could include statistics from other organisations, sharing the combined benefit of a broader data view, with a much wider group of stakeholders.

The local authority focus of the NMD would facilitate further analysis between datasets to establish ecological relationships between variables; an approach demonstrated in an innovative analysis of the impact of migrant workers upon local unemployment and wages using WRS statistics by local authority in combination with Job Centre data on unemployment and wages (Lemos and Portes, 2008).

Researchers at Leeds University, using the NMD concept, are aiming to produce synthetic ‘best’ estimates of international migration, using various estimation methods to disaggregate total counts by age, sex and ethnic groups for use in ethnic population projections. This system of synthetic estimation could be extended, in principle, to provide estimates of new migrants by labour force status.
Figure 23: New Migrant Databank – an illustration

1. New Migrant Counts

2. MYE - Internal and International Migration


4. NINO Profile

5. WRS Profile (2006/7)

Source: Rees, Norman and Boden (2007-9)
### Figure 24: New Migrant Databank – data description

1. **New Migrants Counts**  
   This summary chart illustrates both change over time and the differences that exist between four alternatives sources: the 2001 Census, TIM statistics used within official mid-year population estimates, GP registrations to foreign nationals and NINo registrations to foreign workers. The NINo data is disaggregated to illustrate the total number of registrations and those to non-Accession migrants.

2. **MYE – Internal and International Migration**  
   This second chart illustrates the net flow picture for both internal and international migration. The statistics are drawn from the migration assumptions that underpin the mid-year population estimates produced by ONS. International migration is derived from TIM statistics, internal migration is based on data from GP registration data between local authority areas in the UK.

3. **Alternative Sources (2006)**  
   These two illustrations are designed to give a snapshot of the migrant counts that are produced from alternative sources and to illustrate whether the local area has a consistent share of the regional total. Any inconsistencies in the regional share may be evidence of the presence of a large number of short-term migrants or may be an indication of error in the TIM estimates.

   Data is displayed for; the TIM estimates that are used in the ONS mid-year estimates and those that have been used as the long-term assumptions in the ONS sub-national projections, 2001 Census, WRS, GP registrations and NINo registrations, for both Accession and non-Accession migrants.

4. **NINo Profile**  
   This chart gives an indication of the changing profile of migrant workers registering for a NINO since 2002-03. It groups migrants by country of origin: Old Commonwealth, New Commonwealth, A8, Other Europe and Other Countries.

5. **WRS Profile (2006/07)**  
   The WRS profile records Accession migrants who work within the local authority (they may live elsewhere). The charts illustrate the count of migrants by industry and by nationality.

The NMD is similar in concept to the Health Profiles produced by the NHS which bring together a range of health indicators:

> To provide a consistent, concise, comparable and balanced overview of the population’s health that informs local needs assessment, policy, planning, performance management, surveillance and practice.

Source: (Association of Public Health Observatories, 2008)

For the HSE, regulatory and advice agencies and other local organisations, the NMD approach could potentially provide a consistent and timely view of data on migrant workers and the basis for operational planning and intervention at a local level.

Evidence presented by the Commission on Integration and Cohesion (2007) suggested that new migrants were having a differential effect across the UK and identified a broad typology of geographical areas based upon their socio-economic characteristics and the recent profile and impact of migrant populations. The NMD database would enable the creation of this typology, identifying local areas with similar statistical evidence on industry/accident/migrant profiles to
provide a higher-level perspective on key patterns and trends and the basis for more targeted policy development and enforcement that cuts across traditional administrative boundaries.
7 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 GENERAL VIEW OF MIGRANT WORKER RESEARCH

There is a general view that statistics on international migration provide an incomplete and often confusing picture of population movement to and from the UK. National Statistics on annual migration flows are produced from data captured primarily from the IPS but they exclude short-term migrants, have limited information on the profile of migrants and are less robust at a local level. The LFS provides the most complete view of migrant worker profiles, including year of arrival, country of birth and a range of workplace variables, but it is unrepresentative of the majority of short-term migrants and has an insufficient sample size for robust analysis at a sub-regional level. The NIRS2 database records all migrant workers who register for a national insurance number in any year by country of origin, providing robust local area data but with little additional information on worker profiles. The WRS provides local area statistics on A8 employment by industry but excludes the self-employed. The LFS, NIRS2 and WRS provide no information on emigration from the UK.

Statistics on accidents in the workplace, captured through the RIDDOR process, are subject to considerable under-recording, particularly for the self-employed, for smaller businesses and, the evidence suggests, for migrant workers. In addition, no information is captured to differentiate workers based upon their ethnicity, nationality, country of birth or first language.

Health records are generally only accessible through health surveillance schemes providing limited coverage on health and the workplace. The capture of ethnicity information in general health statistics is extremely variable across the UK and there is no evidence of data capture to differentiate individuals based on their nationality, country of birth or first language (Figure 25).

Figure 25: The constraints on migrant worker research

- Inadequate measurement systems
- Complexity of migrant definition
- Sampling issues when capturing migrants, particularly transient groups
- No record of nationality, country of birth or first language
- Some statistics on ethnicity
- Little evidence on work-related health issues
- Health records and summary data generally inaccessible
- General under-reporting of accidents
- No record of ethnicity, nationality, country of birth or first language
- Casualisation and self-employed status exacerbating the data coverage issue
The result of these combined inadequacies in the available data is a dearth of UK studies that make an explicit link between migrant workers, the workplace and health outcomes, confirming the evidence presented in the European literature (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, 2007).

Section 5 provided a summary of the more recent studies of migrant workers, identifying a wide range of national, regional and local analyses. The small number of studies which looked explicitly at the relationship between migrant status and occupational injury and illness have typically reported inconclusive evidence on the effect of migrant workers upon issues of health and safety, primarily due to inadequate data capture and coverage of the target population. However, most studies that have examined the impact of the recent influx of migrants from outside the UK have reinforced the general view that migrant workers, engaged in low-skilled jobs, are more at risk of accident and injury due to the nature of the work they are doing and the conditions in which they are doing it.

A persistent problem facing research into international migration is the difficulty of generating new data due to poor rates of survey participation and the complexities involved in trying to achieve a representative research sample of the diverse migrant community. To generate a truly representative, unbiased sample requires a full list of potential respondents belonging to the target population. In the absence of a population register or similarly comprehensive administrative system there is no reliable record of the migrant population from which to base such a sampling process.

A number of the recent studies have used a combination of secondary datasets (LFS, NINo, WRS, Work Permit statistics, GP registrations) to produce a summary view of the level, profile and distribution of migrants. These studies have provided commentary, presentation and interpretation of the available statistics but have generated no new data and have not attempted to synthesise locally the different sources of statistics into a ‘one number’ count of new migrants.

A more substantial number of studies have supplemented the national statistics with data generated from surveys and/or interviews with a sample of migrant workers, employers, labour providers and other associated organisations. The focus of research has typically been on the impact of migrant workers upon the economy and the workplace, integration and cohesion in the community and the effect of the new workforce upon local service provision. In a number of cases attempts have been made to produce improved estimates of migrant worker numbers but have been constrained by an inadequate sampling process.

Section 5 identified a number of common characteristics of these studies:

- **A small sample** size with various methods used to select respondents.

- Different definitions of the **migrant population**.

- **One-off studies**, with data generated for a specific time-period with no system of ongoing measurement or analysis.

- Studies designed primarily to understand the phenomenon and processes associated with recent migration through **qualitative analysis**.

- New data **not statistically representative** of a target ‘population’ of new migrants, with any quantitative statistics derived from the samples subject to substantial bias.
Because of the variety of purposes and methodologies used in the local surveys, only a qualitative synthesis, informed by local expertise and views, is possible.

The research evidence suggests that there remain significant difficulties associated with the capture of new and reliable data on the geographical distribution and socio-economic profile of migrant workers. **There is no substantive evidence that provides robust and representative data to improve existing estimates of migrant numbers and their relative health and safety risk.**

### 7.2 RISK OF WORKPLACE INJURY AND ILLNESS

The studies that have been reviewed in this report have demonstrated that employers maintain a positive view towards migrant workers, praising the reliability and flexibility of the workforce. Migrant labour is helping some businesses to remain competitive in difficult economic conditions whilst providing others with a cheap alternative to the local labour force. However, a general concern remains the potential for employer exploitation of the migrant workforce. A large, transient migrant population involved in low-skilled, low wage and demanding work that employs few locally-based workers, is substantially more vulnerable to exploitation and inappropriate working conditions and therefore at a greater risk of injury and workplace-related illness.

The small number of migrant worker studies which have had an explicit health and safety focus have identified that migrants are more likely to be working in sectors or occupations where there are existing health and safety concerns, although the studies have typically not found conclusive evidence of a higher incidence of accident and injury to migrants in the workplace. However, the failure of migrant workers to report accidents and the inadequate coverage of the migrant population in the LFS, COS and smaller surveys has affected the outcome of these studies.

In the qualitative analyses that have been completed on migrant workers a number of studies have touched on issues of migrant worker vulnerability giving further indication that migrant workers are more at risk to health and safety incidents in the workplace:

- Migrant workers make up a large proportion of the workforce involved in **low-skilled occupations**. In parts of the horticulture and food processing industries the workforce is almost exclusively foreign-born.

- The type of work in which migrant workers are employed is typically that which the local workforce is reluctant to do. Jobs can be physically demanding, with evidence of migrant workers being given the **toughest jobs** and being set **higher productivity** targets.

- The evidence suggests that migrant workers are **working longer hours** and may take second jobs to boost income, increasing both their health and safety risks in the workplace and the quality of their service delivery.

- There is an increased **casualisation** of the workforce, with teams of workers often moved between jobs and often to jobs in other industries.

- There is also evidence of migrants working in **dangerous conditions**, without prior industry experience, particularly in construction, despite explicit guidelines to prevent...
This. But there is no conclusive evidence that this is more likely to be true for migrant workers than other workers.

- The complexity of the supply chains that exist, particularly in the construction industry, continue to blur the lines of responsibility for health and safety.

- The language barrier has been identified as the biggest factor affecting the risk to migrants, particularly when workers are new to a particular workplace. The risk is accentuated when combined with a lack of prior experience and the ambiguous lines of responsibility evident in long supply-chains.

The report identified that the relative inexperience of new migrant workers was placing them at a greater risk of accident or injury in the workplace.

- Migrant workers often suffer ignorance of the contractual arrangements under which they are employed and their pay is often subject to deductions to cover poor quality, tied accommodation and other services. This type of employment relationship is not conducive to a healthy and safe working environment.

- Accommodation in which workers are housed is often of a poor standard. The quality of HMO and other forms of temporary accommodation have been identified as having a potentially detrimental impact upon the health and well being of migrant workers.

Whilst recognising the potential risks to which migrant workers are being exposed, evidence suggests that they are generally willing participants, seeking to capitalise on the available economic opportunities. In addition, the youthful age profile of the migrant workforce, suggests that they are typically relatively healthy, unlikely to register with a GP and less likely to report accidents and injuries in the workplace.

### 7.3 DEVELOPING TRENDS

The size of the migrant inflow that followed the extension of the EU in 2004 was considerably in excess of all expectations. Whilst the inflow continues to bring large numbers of new economic migrants to the UK, the research review presented here has identified a number of recent trends that may play a significant part in determining the future scale, profile and distribution of the migrant workforce.

- The economic outlook for the UK remains unclear. Whilst employers enjoy the flexibility of migrant workers, it is also evident that this characteristic is symptomatic of a workforce that will constantly be evaluating economic opportunities at home, in the UK and in other European countries. Economic development in central and eastern Europe and the relaxation of barriers to movement in Germany and France, could alter the dynamics of European labour migration.

- There is evidence that the peak in the inflow of migrants to the UK has been reached. The most recent NINo statistics suggest a reduction in new registrations, whilst studies of A8 migrants have suggested that up to 40-50% of those who arrived since 2004 have subsequently returned.
• In some sectors of the economy the workforce is almost exclusively foreign born. Any interruption to this ready supply of labour would create real problems for those businesses whose competitiveness now depends upon it.

• Evidence in the North of England suggests that migrant workers have begun to seek more appropriate housing accommodation, moving out of traditional HMOs into properties located within ‘Pathfinder’ sites, an affordable alternative and one which demonstrates that some migrants are seeking a more permanent stay in the UK.

• Union representation remains low in those sectors where labour providers have greatest control. However, unions and other agencies are increasingly active in seeking support and a stronger regulatory framework for vulnerable workers.

• A number of studies highlighted a hierarchy that is developing within the migrant workforce. In London, this was demonstrated with a definite ‘hiring queue’ evident for specific jobs. In other studies, some migrant groups have been establishing themselves in more senior positions with responsibility for overseeing the work of other nationalities.

• The effectiveness of the migrant workforce is likely to improve with experience and as language skills develop. This may help future waves of new migrants to integrate into the workplace, thereby reducing the risks associated with lack of industry expertise and poor English language skills.

• The RSMPs have been established as a secondary tier through which the government’s immigration policy can be managed and monitored. They are severely constrained by a lack of empirical evidence and by the diversity of issues associated with migrant workers and have yet to become effective as a focal point for research and analysis.

• There is a universal message being given concerning the quality and availability of statistics on international migration. There are no quick and easy solutions to this problem but there is a need for creativity in the use of existing data systems to provide improved intelligence on the migrant worker population.
7.4 OPTIONS FOR IMPROVED DATA COLLECTION

7.4.1 Summary
The inadequacy of systems for measuring migration has been identified as the major factor affecting the quality of population statistics in the UK (House of Commons Treasury Committee (2008). The Committee’s recommendations included: the replacement of the IPS with a new survey that is more comprehensive and more appropriate; to utilise and better link data held by the Government and by local government in order to provide a more accurate picture of the population; and to develop administrative databases to provide a more accurate and cost effective method of monitoring the population. Implementation of these recommendations will take time. Whilst data sources on international migration remain inadequate, research into the impact of migrant workers will remain constrained.

The enhancement of the evidence base from which HSE develops policies for investigation and enforcement, requires new and improved sources of data to be made available. A number of alternatives are discussed in the following sections and the report concludes with a series of specific recommendations to the HSE.

7.4.2 Existing systems and data linkage
RIDDOR is an established data collection process, to which all organisations have to comply. It suffers from under-reporting, particularly for small businesses and for occupational illness. The issues of under-reporting are difficult to resolve but the existing process could be used to enhance the amount of data collected, to provide the basis for more informed reporting on recorded incidents involving migrant workers.

Specifically, RIDDOR could be extended to capture one or more items of information on nationality, country of birth, first language or date of entry to the UK. This would provide additional differentiation to the analysis of risk associated with migrant worker populations.

An alternative, but one which would require additional data matching, would be for RIDDOR to capture a UPRN for each recorded incident. The capture of a National Insurance Number and/or NHS number as part of the RIDDOR process, could provide additional intelligence on migrant workers and their health risk by linking directly to other administrative datasets. This type of linkage would need a form of ‘inter-departmental’ agreement and safeguards to protect individuals from any abuse of information but the DWP and HMRC data sharing protocol has demonstrated how such an agreement has worked to produce enhanced intelligence for labour market research and analysis.

With a National Insurance Number captured against each RIDDOR entry, HSE could commission the DWP to link this data directly to its national database of workers, identifying migrant workers based on country of origin and date of registration and providing the basis for further risk analysis. For example, this would enable an analysis of type of injury or illness by employer location, country of origin or length of latest work-spell in the UK. This would provide HSE with an alternative picture of risk, subject to the biases and under-coverage of RIDDOR.
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Patient health records provide the most comprehensive data on injury and illness but for research and analysis of workplace accidents and illness, with the exception of recognised surveillance schemes, the data remains generally inaccessible. Health records do not capture data which differentiates individuals based on nationality, country of birth or first language, precluding an analysis specifically of migrant workers.

The feasibility of additional data capture through the existing THOR and THOR-GP health surveillance schemes might be considered. This could include the additional capture of nationality, country of birth or first language information or again the capture of a National Insurance Number to facilitate linkage with the NIRS2 database.

The additional capture of NHS number within the RIDDOR process, combined with the capture of a National Insurance Number, would provide the facility for linking work-based injury and illness statistics to individual health records held within NHS information systems.

The feasibility of this type of additional data capture and data linkage could be investigated with the Information Centre of the NHS. At present, there is an absence of research into the health outcomes of migrant workers and very little evidence on the propensity to use local services for treatment in preference to returning to their home country.

7.4.3 Macro-level data

HSE has sought to examine the relationship between migrant workers and relative health and safety risk using sample surveys which provide detailed data on the socio-economic profile and accident and illness profile of individual respondents. Given the sampling issues which have constrained the accuracy of this type of analysis, a complementary approach would be to build a statistical picture from a range of alternative sources at a ‘macro’ level.

The New Migrant Databank (NMD) concept has been proposed as an interim solution to the difficulty of measuring the impact of international migration at a local level, whilst ‘Health Profiles’ have been used in the NHS to provide a framework for reporting on health inequalities between local authority areas. Both approaches combine a variety of statistics into a database, referenced by local authority, with graphical representation providing visual interpretation of the differences that exist between sources and an illustration of the key patterns and trends that are evident by local area.

With a specific focus on the working age population and workers health, the ‘New Worker and Health Databank’ (NWHD) would be a more appropriate description of the concept for HSE. This type of approach, although simple in concept, would deliver a number of benefits:

- A real-time view, continuously updated as new data becomes available, reducing the dependence on snapshot studies.
- A picture of geographical variation in migrant profiles but also an illustration of change over time, a key dimension of migrant worker research
- A common reporting framework for macro areas: national, regional and local
- A consistent view of data on migrant workers and the basis for operational planning at a local level
• The basis for integrating data from other sources, sharing the benefit of a broader data view with a wider group of stakeholders

The NWHD could incorporate statistics from a number of existing sources including RIDDOR, HSE inspection statistics, LFS, WRS, NINo, TIM, DWP IIDB and the June Agricultural Census. With appropriate agreements between HSE and DWP, the NWHD could also obtain new intelligence on migrant worker activity in the labour market, including industry sector and length of stay in the UK based upon National Insurance contributions. In addition, the NWHD could potentially incorporate aggregate health statistics alongside the new migrant data, focusing on accidents and causes of death linked to the workplace. The NWHD could include statistics from other organisations with the use of data at an aggregate local authority level ensuring anonymity. Additional sources could include CAB consultations, GLA licences and interventions, GP registrations (from local PCTs) and pupil numbers (from local authorities).

There is not a huge body of evidence to illustrate the effective operation of data sharing partnerships but the GLA provides a good case study of how data from a number of stakeholder organisations might be drawn together to produce a more informed statistical picture. The HSE, working in partnership with national, regional or local organisations could establish mutually beneficial data sharing arrangements that could begin to fill some of the gaps that exist on migrant worker intelligence.

The creation of the NWHD could provide HSE with a significant improvement in its intelligence on migrant workers and although it may not provide the definitive view on the relative health and safety risk associated with migrant workers, it would certainly provide a more informed view based upon the collective evidence available. The macro-level database will enable alternative analyses to be undertaken, evaluating, for example, the ecological relationship that exists between migrant worker numbers and recorded incidents. Although studies of this type, examining the relationships between variables, are not definitive, they can show up new relationships for further detailed investigation.

At a more strategic level, it would also be possible to consider the development of area ‘clusters’ with similar industry/accident/migrant profiles to provide a higher-level perspective on key patterns and trends and the basis for more targeted policy development and enforcement that cuts across traditional administrative boundaries.

In the absence of definitive statistics to more precisely quantify the size of the migrant workforce and with no definitive evidence on the health and safety risks associated with migrant workers, the NWHD is proposed as a new source of intelligence that enables HSE to target its enforcement effort towards particular localities. In individual localities, additional intelligence can be taken from local studies on migrant worker activity and from the people and organisations on the ground who completed these studies. Statistical rigour may not be as vital at the local level where targeting of the worst risks will be key to the most effective regulation of workplace health and safety.

7.4.4 Create a new data collection mechanism

The LFS provides the most robust evidence on migrant worker profiles. But it is subject to a number of sampling issues which bring into question its ability to adequately represent the true scale of the migrant workforce. This places a constraint on its value for detailed analyses which links migrant status to the incidence and risk of accident in the workplace.
Studies have identified that it is the transient migrants, working in low-skilled but demanding jobs that are most at risk in the workplace. But it is also this group that has proved most difficult to capture in any small or large-scale survey process.

The evidence presented in this report suggests that commissioning a new national or other large-scale survey of the at-risk population of migrant workers is not an attractive option. Such a survey would be faced with a number of problems:

1. The samples are likely to be unrepresentative, as there is not a reliable, comprehensive sampling frame – i.e. a list of the population at risk or the household units in which the population at risk may be found.

2. A one-off survey will become rapidly out of date. Launching a repeated survey (e.g. each year) would be a major financial commitment. As the mix of new migrants is changing year by year, what might be relevant as a sampling frame now (e.g. interviews at work sites of employers registering workers under the WRS) may change rapidly over time.

An option already contemplated by HSE is extended data capture through its Fit3 surveys with individual employers. Draft proposals for additional questions have been considered which would need to be trialled and tested to assess the likely response rate. HSE could target surveys within a particular geographical location where the presence of migrant workers is a particular issue. However, this type of survey is unlikely to yield better evidence on migrant numbers and survey questions which seek an indication of whether migrant workers are more ‘at risk’ are unlikely to achieve a representative response from individual employers.

An alternative approach would be the development of a smaller-scale survey, targeted specifically at measuring the ‘bias’ in national administrative datasets and their relationships. This would need to be a small, intensive interview survey with the best sample that could be devised, which captured details from each respondent on migration history, work history, health and safety history and history of registration with the UK’s major administrative registers (National Insurance, National Health, Work Permits and Worker Registration Scheme, GP registration). The purpose of this survey would be to discover the relationship between the administrative registers and the population at risk, yielding adjustment factors to use with the register counts to provide improved estimates of the target population at risk.

Another approach to data capture identified in this review has involved the collection of data directly from the records of a sample of employers. It is questionable whether the HSE, in its position as a regulator, would be appropriate for this type of data capture initiative, although an independent research study with employer collaboration could be more successful. The innovative study of businesses in the East Midlands (Anslow, 2007) demonstrated how anonymised data of this type could be generated through collaboration, to address a specific policy issue, although this analysis was again constrained by the under-reporting of incidents by migrant workers.

An alternative to the ‘snapshot’ survey is data collection through ‘longitudinal study’. This approach to migrant worker analysis has previously been recommended (Spencer, 2006) and a longitudinal study has now been initiated through the East Midlands RDA (EEDA, 2008). HSE’s collaboration on this type of initiative could begin to establish an evolving picture of migrant workers and their improved integration into the UK workplace. The DWP maintains the ultimate longitudinal data, with historical records on every NINo-registered member of the UK labour-force and their interaction with DWP (and HMRC) systems. Exploitation of this database for migrant worker analysis is in its infancy but it has the potential to provide...
intelligence on each individual’s contact with the labour market, identifying periods of employment, geographical location and type of industry.
7.5 RECOMMENDATIONS
The available statistics on migrant workers remain inadequate and incomplete, constraining effective research and analysis of workplace health and safety. In addition, new data capture is problematic due to the difficulty of capturing a representative sample of the target population and due to the continuing change in the dynamics and profile of the migrant worker labour force. A number of recommendations are made:

Labour Force Survey

- The LFS remains the primary source of information on the labour force and on the resident stock of migrants in the UK. Despite its sampling issues, the incidence of injury and illness to migrant workers should continue to be monitored through successive releases of the LFS.

Macro-level data

- HSE should consider the New Worker and Health Databank (NWHD) concept, to create a database of migrant worker statistics at national, regional and local authority level, combining ONS data on international migration with labour market statistics from NIRS2, WRS and the LFS and recorded incidents from RIDDOR.
- This database would provide a consistent geographical and time-series view of available data, avoiding the need for snapshot studies through a regular process of update as new data becomes available.
- HSE should investigate data sharing initiatives with, for example, DWP, NHS, GLA, CAB and local PCTs to establish how additional intelligence on migrant workers might be extracted for mutual benefit.
- HSE might consider the development of area clusters with similar industry/migrant/accident profiles from which to develop a more strategic perspective on labour market trends and targeted enforcement.

National targeting and local intelligence

- Macro-level data will provide the intelligence for monitoring and targeted enforcement. More local intelligence can be taken from the research studies on migrant worker activity referenced in this report and from the people and organisations on the ground who completed these studies.

New Survey

- HSE could consider the development of a small, intensive survey, targeted specifically at measuring the ‘bias’ in national administrative datasets and their relationships. This would capture migration history, work history, health and safety history and history of registration with the UK’s major administrative registers. The purpose of this survey would be to discover the relationship between the administrative registers and the population at risk, yielding adjustment factors to use with the register counts to provide improved estimates of the target population at risk. There are risks associated with running such a survey, however, and it would need a feasibility study to establish best procedures, costs and potential pay-off. The issue of how to obtain a fully representative sample of migrant workers would still need to be resolved and the survey would ideally need to be repeated periodically given the current economic uncertainty that exists and the likely change in the pattern and trend in migrant worker flows. Expertise in ONS, the National Centre for Social
Research and the Institute for Social and Economic Research could to be consulted for advice on the most appropriate methodology to employ.

Data linkage

- HSE should consider the addition of the National Insurance Number and/or NHS number to its existing RIDDOR data capture to facilitate linkage with other administrative datasets.
- **Collaboration** between HSE and DWP/HMRC is recommended to establish how additional intelligence on migrant populations might be generated in an aggregate/anonymised form and to identify how a risk analysis on RIDDOR records might be completed.

General

- Given the UK-wide requirement for better statistics on migrant workers and the renewed drive for improved occupational health and well-being, it is suggested that HSE adopts a **collaborative approach** to any new data capture initiatives, sharing both the costs and benefits of generating new intelligence.
- The HSE might consider a position within a wider group of UK stakeholders, brought together to establish a **single source of intelligence** on international migrants, from which a common and consistent set of statistics from a variety of sources might be drawn.
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## GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3D</td>
<td>Dirty, dangerous and demanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Accession Eight countries in central and eastern Europe that joined the EU in 2004: Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;E</td>
<td>Accident and Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC</td>
<td>Additional Licence Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APHO</td>
<td>Association of Public Health Observatories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS</td>
<td>Annual Population Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Black and Minority Ethnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERR</td>
<td>Department of Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMRB</td>
<td>British Market Research Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP</td>
<td>British National Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAB</td>
<td>Citizens Advice Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPIC</td>
<td>Collaboration for Accident Prevention and Injury Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>Confederation of British Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Commission on Integration and Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLG</td>
<td>Communities and Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COEH</td>
<td>Centre for Occupational and Environmental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td>Construction Omnibus Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSLA</td>
<td>Convention of Scottish Local Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVE</td>
<td>Commission on Vulnerable Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Commission for Rural Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCS</td>
<td>Construction Skills Certification Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURDS</td>
<td>Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCSF</td>
<td>Department for Children, Schools and Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFRA</td>
<td>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMAG</td>
<td>Data Management and Analysis Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>Department of Works and Pensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>European Economic Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEDA</td>
<td>East of England Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFS</td>
<td>Expenditure and Food Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFTA</td>
<td>European Free Trade Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERY</td>
<td>East Riding of Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>English for Speakers of Other Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETI</td>
<td>Ethical Trading Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU14</td>
<td>The 14 members of the EU from 1995 through 2003 (excludes UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit3</td>
<td>Fit for Work, Fit for Life, Fit for Tomorrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA</td>
<td>Food Standards Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHS</td>
<td>General Household Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>Gangmaster Licensing Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GtLA</td>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOR</td>
<td>Government Office Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>General Practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVA</td>
<td>Gross Value Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>Higher Education Statistical Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMO</td>
<td>Houses of Multiple Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMR</td>
<td>Housing Market Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMRC</td>
<td>Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMR</td>
<td>Housing Market Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSE</td>
<td>Health and Safety Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSL</td>
<td>Health and Safety Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSMP</td>
<td>Highly Skilled Migrant Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iCoCo</td>
<td>Institute of Community Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDeA</td>
<td>Improvement and Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFD</td>
<td>Information Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIDB</td>
<td>Industrial Injuries Disablement Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHS</td>
<td>Integrated Household Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INisPHO</td>
<td>Ireland and Northern Ireland Public Health Observatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOBI</td>
<td>Injury Observatory for Britain and Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPR</td>
<td>Institute for Public Policy Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS</td>
<td>International Passenger Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRSS</td>
<td>Immigration Research Statistics Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Information Service Division (NHS Scotland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRF</td>
<td>Joseph Rowntree Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>Job Seekers Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Lifetime Labour Market Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADUA</td>
<td>Local Authority District / Unitary Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>London Borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Local Education Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFS</td>
<td>Labour Force Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLMDB2</td>
<td>Lifetime Labour Market Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>Long and Short-Term Combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Migration Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDL</td>
<td>Migrant Division of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>META</td>
<td>Mobile Europeans Taking Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIF</td>
<td>Migration Impacts Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIGWAG</td>
<td>Migrant Worker Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWNW</td>
<td>Migrant Workers North West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIO</td>
<td>Merseyside Social Inclusion Observatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYE</td>
<td>Mid Year Estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDPB</td>
<td>Non-departmental Public Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPHO</td>
<td>North East Public Health Observatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>National Health Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>National Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINo</td>
<td>National Insurance Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRS2</td>
<td>National Insurance Recording System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMD</td>
<td>New Migrant Databank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMW</td>
<td>National Minimum Wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOSHC</td>
<td>National Occupational Safety and Health Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRS2</td>
<td>National Insurance Recording System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPD</td>
<td>National Pupil Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCEMH</td>
<td>National Resource Centre for Ethnic Minority Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSOS</td>
<td>National Statistics Omnibus Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONS</td>
<td>Office of National Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYE</td>
<td>Pay as you earn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT</td>
<td>Primary Care Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHO</td>
<td>Public Health Observatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRDS</td>
<td>Patient Registration Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>Regional Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDDOR</td>
<td>Reporting of Injuries Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMT</td>
<td>Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoSPA</td>
<td>Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSMP</td>
<td>Regional Strategic Migration Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWs</td>
<td>Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>Sector Based Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEDA</td>
<td>South East England Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIM</td>
<td>Skills and Learning Intelligence Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small and Medium Sized Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNPP</td>
<td>Sub-national Population Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Standard Occupation Classifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPHO</td>
<td>South West Public Health Observatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOR</td>
<td>The Health and Occupation Reporting (Network)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOR-GP</td>
<td>The Health and Occupation Reporting (Network) for General Practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIIG</td>
<td>Trauma and Injury Intelligence Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM</td>
<td>Total International Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLWG</td>
<td>Temporary Labour Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUC</td>
<td>Trades Union Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCATT</td>
<td>Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRN</td>
<td>Unique Person Reference Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHMS</td>
<td>Working Holiday Makers Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMSMP</td>
<td>West Midlands Strategic Migration Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPLS</td>
<td>Work and Pensions Longitudinal Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>Workers Registration Scheme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improving the reliability of estimates of migrant worker numbers and their relative risk of workplace injury and illness

This study has reviewed the literature on migrant workers for substantive evidence that migrant workers are more susceptible to injury and illness in the workplace. The study has examined the sources of data available to facilitate this type of analysis and has evaluated their relative quality and availability.

Survey sources typically fail to adequately capture migrant populations, whilst administrative sources lack the richness of data content. Statistics on accidents in the workplace (RIDDOR) are subject to considerable under-recording, particularly for the self-employed, for smaller businesses and, the evidence suggests, for migrant workers. No information is captured to differentiate migrant workers by their nationality, country of birth or first language. Health records are generally only accessible through health surveillance schemes; providing limited coverage on health and the workplace and with no statistics on nationality, country of birth or first language. These combined inadequacies result in a dearth of UK studies that make an explicit link between migrant workers, the workplace and health outcomes.

The few studies which looked explicitly at the relationship between migrant status and occupational injury/illness have typically reported inconclusive evidence on the effect of migrant workers upon issues of health and safety, primarily due to inadequate data capture and coverage of the target population. However, a number of studies that have examined the impact of the recent influx of migrants from outside the UK have reinforced the general view that migrant workers, engaged in low-skilled jobs, are more at risk of accident and injury due to the nature of the work they are doing and the conditions in which they are doing it.

The research evidence suggests that there remain significant difficulties associated with the capture of new and reliable data on the geographical distribution and socio-economic profile of migrant workers. There is no substantive evidence that provides robust and representative data to improve existing estimates of migrant numbers and their relative health and safety risk. This study provides a number of options for enhanced data collection as a basis for improved local intelligence for HSE’s monitoring and targeted enforcement.

This report and the work it describes were funded by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). Its contents, including any opinions and/or conclusions expressed, are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily reflect HSE policy.