



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Accession 8 migration and the proactive and defensive engagement of social citizenship*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/81286/>

---

**Article:**

Cook, J, Dwyer, P and Waite, LJ (2012) Accession 8 migration and the proactive and defensive engagement of social citizenship. *Journal of Social Policy*, 41 (2). 329 - 347. ISSN 0047-2794

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279411000766>

---

**Reuse**

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

**Authors:** Joanne Cook (University of Hull), Peter Dwyer (University of Salford) and Louise Waite (University of Leeds),

**Correspondence to:**

Peter Dwyer

Professor of Social Policy

School of Social Work, Psychology and Public Health

Room C504 Allerton Building

The University of Salford

Frederick Rd

Salford

M6 6PU

Tel: +44 (0)161 295 2812

Email: [P.J.Dwyer@salford.ac.uk](mailto:P.J.Dwyer@salford.ac.uk)

**Title: Accession 8 migration and the proactive and defensive engagement of social citizenship.**

**Abstract**

Following the expansion of the European Union in 2004 unprecedented numbers of Accession 8 migrants from Central and Eastern Europe entered the UK. These migrants are often concentrated in particular urban neighbourhoods, which are already routinely home to diverse communities and/or characterised by high levels of social deprivation. Using original data from a study in a northern English city, this paper explores the ways in which established communities experience and make sense of the local impact of new migration within their neighbourhoods. The belief that newly arrived migrants are in competition with established communities for finite local jobs and welfare resources are central to the expressed concerns of established communities about the potential for A8 migration to have a localised negative impact.

Utilising Ellison's (2000), theoretical insights the paper argues that established communities' concerns, rather than being simply an expression of xenophobic intolerance, have their basis in how the expansion of the EU facilitates opportunities for the 'proactive engagement' of citizenship status among A8 migrants, whilst often triggering a more 'defensive engagement' among members of local host communities.

**Key words:**

Migration, social citizenship, European Union, employment, housing



## Introduction

The enlargement of the European Union (EU) in 2004 extended rights to live and work in other EU Member States to nationals of the Accession 8 (A8) countries<sup>i</sup>. Consequently over one million Central and Eastern European (CEE) migrants entered the UK to take up paid work. Estimates indicate that around half of this number remain in the UK whilst the others have since either returned to their countries of origin or relocated elsewhere (Pollard, Latorre, and Sriskandarajah, 2008). The UK proved to be a popular destination for these new European citizens for several reasons. First, although transitional arrangements allowed for a phasing in period for the extension of full EU citizenship rights to A8 nationals, the UK was one of only three among the existing 15 EU Member States that granted A8 migrants immediate access to the paid labour market. Additionally, a long period of sustained economic growth (which has now ended), a favourable disparity in wage earning potential between A8 migrants' countries of origin and the UK, alongside a comparatively low and regressive tax system all made the UK an attractive proposition for A8 migrants looking to exercise their new rights to freedom of movement as EU citizens (Stenning *et al.* 2006). For A8 migrants, the expansion of the EU opened up possibilities for a diversity of new migratory movements, across a spectrum ranging from permanent residence in another Member State to more fleeting, circulatory and multiple short-term moves (Ryan *et al.* 2009). The latter led some to invoke a 'turnstile' rather than a 'floodgate' imagery of contemporary A8 migration (Pollard, Latorre, and Sriskandarajah, 2008). Nonetheless, A8 migrants have had a noticeable impact within the particular local UK neighbourhoods where they reside. In urban<sup>ii</sup> settings these have typically been inner city neighbourhoods, many of which are characterised by high levels of social deprivation and home to ethnically diverse established communities (Amas, 2008).

Rights to live and work in host Member States conferred by EU citizenship are subject to individuals meeting specified conditions. All EU nationals who wish to reside in another Member State for more than six months must be employed, self employed, or hold student status and have access to sufficient resources and health insurance to ensure they can maintain themselves without recourse to the host state's benefit/welfare system; or be a family member of a person who fits the three noted categories. Additionally, for an initial transitional period (until May 2011), the EU citizenship rights of A8 nationals are further compromised as EU15 Member States, are allowed "to decide the conditions under which EU8 [i.e. A8] and EU2 nationals access employment in their territories." (Currie, 2008 :17). The UK, government stipulated that A8 nationals are required to register with the Workers Registration Scheme (WRS) in order to legally live and work in the UK. As workers who contribute through the taxation system, A8 migrants are able to access certain social security benefits, but their entitlements are, (pre May 2011), subject to specific rules. As soon as they start to work A8 migrants registered with the WRS have the right to access child benefits and tax credits. However, in order to be eligible for income related benefits A8 workers must have worked continuously for a period of one year (CPAG, 2010).

Following an outline of the methods employed to generate the original data that informs subsequent discussions, this paper initially considers competing evidence about the impact of A8 migration upon employment opportunities and housing provision in the inner city communities that host many new migrant groups. Although some research argues that A8 migration has brought many positive gains, using new data from a study in a northern city alongside wider available literature, this paper presents evidence that many members of the established communities who live alongside A8 migrants, believe that their opportunities have been adversely affected by the arrival of the new migrants. It is then argued that the

perceptions and reactions of established communities are best understood in terms of ‘defensive’ and ‘proactive’ citizenship engagement as outlined by Ellison (2000). As A8 migrants proactively engage with their newly acquired EU citizenship rights to live and work in the UK, they engender a form of defensive citizenship among established communities who often perceive newly arrived A8 migrants as being in direct competition with themselves for certain local jobs and welfare resources.

### **Study outline and methods**

The qualitative data presented in this paper was generated in a study concerned with the needs, perceptions and experiences of A8 migrants and established communities in a northern English city. In the past 20 years, this former industrial city has attracted significant investment and, at the time of the study (prior to the economic downturn of 2009), featured a diverse and dynamic service based economy with retail, call centres, office work and media all important to the local labour market. The city retains sizeable low-skilled and low-paid labour market sectors i.e. hospitality, construction, manufacturing, food-processing. (See Table 1 for recent size changes in different sectors of the PLM). The parts of the city that are characterised by poverty and multiple deprivation are also shaped by ethnic, racial and class dynamics, and the city’s history of migration, particularly from the South Asian continent, has contributed to its current demographic profile. New, more recent, waves of immigration (including refugees and A8 migrants), have led to greater diversity among the city’s population.

Insert table 1 here

A qualitative methodology was chosen because we wanted to explore how A8 migration was perceived and experienced by both A8 migrants and the established local communities in the

localities where many CEE migrants reside. Qualitative research is about exploring and understanding “peoples’ own accounts of situations and events, [and] with reporting their perspectives and feelings;” (Hakim,1987 :8). People’s perceptions and feelings about others may be based on any number of factors (for example, limited or flawed information, political rhetoric, public policy, hearsay, bigotry etc.), nonetheless, attempting to explore and understand perceptions, particularly in relation to issues such as migration, is important as “concerns have to be tackled and misperceptions have to be cleared up, without presenting an overly optimistic view of the migration challenge” (Canoy *et al.* 2006 :4).

Purposive sampling was used to recruit 89 respondents. A8 migrants and established community members were recruited following contacts with local community centers and key informants and service providers identified after discussions with the project's sponsor. In total 11 focus groups, with between 6 and 9 respondents, and 10 semi structured interviews with key informants (e.g. recruitment agencies, employers, community support workers) were undertaken. Semi structured question guides were developed and piloted/refined in initial sessions.

Focus groups were chosen as the main research instrument because they allow for differences of opinion and experience within groups to emerge but also facilitate a collective understanding of the particular social norms and values that a specific group brings to the research (Morgan,1993). Three focus groups with A8 migrants (i.e. Polish men, Polish women and Slovak mixed gender). were convened in local community centers. We initially intended to hold a focus group with Roma migrants, however, it was necessary to modify our original approach to gain their trust. They agreed to participate provided that interviews were not audio recorded and conducted in their homes. Four parallel focus groups were also



conducted with members of established, West Indian, Pakistani (differentiated by gender) and ‘white’ host communities in neighborhoods that had experienced the arrival of significant numbers of A8 migrants. Additionally, three further focus groups were held with agencies involved in the provision and/or administration of local public services e.g. City Council services, primary care trusts, housing providers and schools.

Two basic principles, informed consent and anonymity, underpinned the fieldwork.

Information and consent sheets were translated as necessary and participants were briefed about the aims of the research. Experienced interpreters were present as required. Interviews were routinely recorded on audiotape, transcribed verbatim (translated into English by interpreters as appropriate), and analysed using grid analysis and thematic coding techniques (Ritchie and Spencer, 2003).

### **Exploring the local impact of A8 migration on jobs and housing**

The overall positive economic benefits of increased migration into the UK in recent years have been widely recognised and should not be easily dismissed (CLG, 2008; Pollard, Latorre, and Sriskandarajah, 2008). A8 workers were welcomed by many British employers, who prior to the economic downturn, struggled to fill ‘dirty, dangerous and dull’ jobs with locally available workers (Favell, 2008). However, the impact of increased migration on the UK labour market remains the focus of much debate. Coates argues, there is little evidence “to suggest that migration is having a significant negative impact on the UK labour market” (2008 :5). Lemos and Portes, (2008) similarly assert that A8 migration has had no noteworthy impact on claimant unemployment, no adverse effect on vulnerable sub groups within the working age population (such as young people and low skilled workers), and

perhaps only a limited impact on wages. Although many agree that there is limited evidence to suggest that migration has a significant, general long-term negative impact on the employment rates or wages of established workers, a number of commentators argue that A8 migration may, in the short term, have more damaging effects for the most disadvantaged groups within the established workforce, particularly those with histories of long term unemployment (TUC, 2007; HoLSCEA, 2008; Jurado, and Bruzzone, 2009; Reed and Latorre, 2009). As Goodhart notes, even if much analysis highlights that, generally, increased migration has been beneficial to the UK; “not everyone benefits from high levels of low-skill immigration” (2006 :38).

Andrews *et al.* (2009) analysis, exploring the quality of English local authorities’ delivery of public services, notes that “results suggest that [A8] worker migration is significantly associated with worse service performance and citizen satisfaction” (:32). They go on to argue that local authorities experiencing a sudden influx of people from CEE states, faced with the subsequent increases in both the quantity and variety of needs to be met within a locale, struggle to maintain service standards. This is likely to mean, particularly when constrained budgets are the norm, that existing services to established communities have to be cut to meet these new needs and/or that available resources have to be spread more thinly, leading perhaps to resentment among more established groups. Andrews *et al.* (2009) clearly believe A8 migration presents challenges for certain local communities and those local authorities who are charged with managing needs and delivering services in what are increasingly ethnically diverse populations.

Evidence from our study tends to support the views of more pessimistic commentators who argue that A8 migration may have had a negative impact on the job opportunities and

services available to established host communities. Across all of the focus groups we conducted with members of established communities the general consensus was that they were in direct competition with newly resident A8 migrants for any available, low and semi-skilled jobs. The chef below (who was unemployed when interviewed), and others who participated in discussions, linked their situation to employers' wider exploitation of migrant labour in order to reduce costs.

*R1: I am, a bar chef... 10 years ago my job, the certain skills involved, were worth more than they are now because Eastern European people come in and do my job cheaper than I'll do. I don't know how they live and support themselves because you know £5-£6 an hour is not a good amount of money... people will do jobs cheaper. So the kind of jobs I can do to support myself - there's less of them about. ... That's how I'm uncomfortable with it. But if we're in a European Union with open borders then it's like anything else. They are closing factories, call centres here and send them to India.*

*R2: They've been brought in and its keeps the wages down... There are a lot of jobs that they will take, for low wages. It's like, if I could get you, as an employer, for £5 an hour or pay somebody English £10 an hour, and you could do the same job, I'd have you for £5. (FG8<sup>iii</sup> white residents)*

*R1: Most of our kids cannot get a job and these people [A8 migrants] do a job for £2 - £4 an hour. Kids born in this country won't take a job for £4. The minimum wage is £5 something, so these people are taking their jobs. (FG5 Pakistani men)*

Members of established communities clearly believe that, not only are they losing out to A8 migrants in local labour markets, but that the new arrivals are reducing the wage levels for

low and semi-skilled work. Indeed, new migrants are often identified by employers as hard working and cheap, not only in terms of wages but also in respect of the costs of the reproduction of labour (Spencer *et al.* 2007). This view is endorsed by several employers in our study who commented on A8 migrants' superior '*work ethic*' and their willingness to '*go the extra mile*' (KI4 logistics/distribution company). For employers, looking for a competitive advantage within a flexible economy, the availability of new migrant labour from CEE, that is often willing to work hard for less than the locals, is too good an opportunity to miss (Mackenzie and Forde, 2009).

*Housing: the most contentious issue?*

Amas's assertion that "competition over scarce resources, and specifically housing, in socio-economically deprived neighbourhoods is at the heart of tensions between established communities and new migrant groups" (2008 :17), highlights another contentious area that consistently featured in discussions with established community members. In a situation where local demand for accommodation outstrips supply, participants routinely outlined the view that A8 migration had negatively impacted on their local housing options. Newly arrived migrants were consistently blamed for pushing up neighbourhood house prices and inflating private sector rental costs.

*Houses have got more expensive because of them. Prices of houses have risen, rent is more expensive. (FG6 Pakistani women)*

*Rent is going up...a lot of private landlords, getting on the bandwagon. (FG8 West Indians)*

The potential for housing related issues to fuel resentment between established communities and their newly arrived neighbours was further emphasised when members of the established

white community discussed social housing. Central to their concerns was a strongly held perception that A8 migrants were receiving preferential treatment in respect of accessing social housing and allied support.

*R1: Some moved into the estate where I am.... a few of the families were a bit narked off because you were seeing all these vans turn up and they were getting the houses totally kitted out. It caused a bit of an atmosphere, to put it nicely.... Then we found out talking to them, 'Yes the council have got all this for us'.*

*R2: They were getting that provision from the social, the council and everything but anybody else from here, from England, was getting told, take your little social grant or whatever and buy second hand. (FG8 White residents)*

Further debate revealed that the newly arrived migrants in question were not A8 migrants, but asylum seekers housed and supported under the separate system UK Borders Agency system.

Nonetheless, the data above is important for two reasons. First, it is indicative of a widespread lack of knowledge about rights to housing and welfare for migrants that have arrived in recent years. Such misunderstandings are hardly surprising given, the complicated rules that govern varied entitlements to social housing (Rooney, 2008; Garner, 2009).

Second, it illustrates how access to, and the allocation of, scarce public resources can breed resentment among established residents who perceive their rights and needs to be secondary to those of new arrivals.

Such sentiments are not unique to our study. Hostility and resentment among sections of established communities in the East End of London, particularly the white working class, towards the Bangladeshi community are noted elsewhere (Dench, Gavron and Young, 2006). In a later piece written to defend his work in the face of fierce criticism (see Moore, 2008),

Dench notes that the perceived prioritisation of the needs of newcomers above and beyond the claims of established community members is,

*regarded with great suspicion by most people with local family connections, including international migrants who had been living there long enough to have experienced its consequences (2008 :340).*

However, available evidence on the occupancy of social housing challenges the perception that new migrant groups are likely to be allocated social housing before more established residents. Robinson's (2007) analysis shows that less than 1% of social rented lettings across England are allocated to A8 nationals. The majority of A8 migrants do not have sufficient priority housing needs to qualify for social housing (ICoCo, 2007) and decisions on A8 nationals' applications for housing and homelessness support (including those deemed to be ineligible) represented only 0.5% of local authorities' total judgements in the period May 2004 to June 2008.

Nationwide, A8 migrants typically live in privately rented properties and make little use of social housing (Amas, 2008). Many initially, live in housing provided by an employment agency but often quite rapidly exit this to seek out privately rented accommodation that is cheaper or of a better standard. This additional demand for housing may push up rents and house prices which, as noted above, many 'locals' see as detrimental. Additionally, our study confirms that the majority of A8 migrants have problems accessing social housing due to limited eligibility, the general shortage of social housing stock and long waiting lists.

Rutter and Latorre (2009), similarly found that foreign migrants were not being given preferential access to social housing. However, they also acknowledge the persistent belief

among many established communities that new migrants are afforded preferential treatment.

A view reiterated by in our research,

*There is a perception that if you come in as an immigrant group, and A8s are a big group at present, you will get preferential treatment for services ... I don't think we could build enough to meet demand [even] without the additional pressure of people coming to [city]. This causes a lot of conflict. If the son/daughter of someone who has lived on an estate for 20 years can't access a property it breeds resentment and frustration... Many of the emails I see about discrimination are usually people perceiving the letting system as an unfair process. Ultimately this is because housing goes to the person with most priority, based on housing need. (SPI, Social housing provider).*

Media scare stories play their part and the sale of former council housing stock to private landlords, which is subsequently privately let to new migrants, may also fuel misconceptions (Rutter and Latorre, 2009). However, as affordable social housing stock in many urban neighbourhoods has diminished in recent decades, simultaneously, those same neighbourhoods have become home to increasingly diverse populations. Some additional demand for local social housing is bound to occur when new migrant groups, including A8 migrants, become eligible for social housing. Many established white and minority ethnic communities, therefore, view themselves as competing with recently arrived migrants for scarce housing resources. The additional demands generated by new migrant groups on the available social resources of certain neighbourhoods, and the needs emerging from the 'super diversity' emerging in the UK's larger cities need to be acknowledged (Vertovec, 2007).

Debates about recently arrived migrants having to compete with established communities for scarce, local resources such as jobs and housing, have a long history. Burney's (1967) study,

highlights the disadvantages and discrimination faced by 'Commonwealth immigrants' in London trying to secure reasonable accommodation against a backdrop of a local housing shortages. She provides a strong critique of allocation mechanisms (often based on of length of residence and local connection), that prioritise 'local people's' rights to social housing above the often greater needs of newcomers.

Banton's (1983) rational choice approach to understanding how different ethnic groups compete for scarce resources and how discriminatory and racist practices may be invoked as one group seeks to defend, what it regards as its interests and entitlements, against those of others is also relevant here. Central to Banton's theory is the idea that it is in the process of competing for scarce resources that ethnic and racial groups coalesce and assume significance. Individuals find common ground with those they view as being like themselves whilst excluding "others whom they define as ineligible to belong to their group" (1983 :106). Banton's discussion specifically highlights the housing and employment markets as two sectors where competition for resources are routinely played out between groups. He is also aware that it is often the poorer sections of majority populations that are most likely to resort to exclusive tactics, as it is almost certainly they who will be most affected by increased competition, and they often lack the social and cultural capital to pursue other options.

Discussions in this paper indicate that the boundaries between groups are not always mobilised around simple white/non white divides. boundaries can be articulated around residence, locality or a perceived lack of appropriate prior contribution (Garner, 2009). Those deemed to lack a legitimate claim for scarce local resources may also be white, as is the case with many A8 migrants. Similarly, the exclusive rhetoric among disadvantaged



urban communities is not solely limited to white populations. Although Garner (2009) reports, the white working class see themselves as the 'exclusive victims' of local disempowerment and abandonment our study perhaps illustrates that these feelings are also a feature of other non white established communities' perceptions and that they too are fearful that A8 migration may negatively impact on the already limited local resources they are able to access. The social change occurring in certain neighbourhoods as a result of A8 migration is played out against the backdrop of past migration and the common structured disadvantages faced by established white and minority ethnic working class communities.

### **A question of citizenship?**

The arrival of unprecedented numbers of A8 migrants has triggered unease among some members of the more established communities who live and work alongside their new neighbours. Two linked factors have been identified as central to their concerns. First, increased competition for scarce resources, more specifically, jobs and housing. Second, a perception that new migrants are given preferential treatment, often to the detriment of more established citizens, when accessing those resources. It has been widely acknowledged that such issues can play a role in promoting resentment and intergroup tensions, particularly in relatively deprived urban settings, across the UK (Zetter et al, 2006; Amas, 2008; Jurado, and Bruzzone, 2008). The key question of how we might best understand the attitudes and concerns raised by the members of established communities remains. A consideration of discussions related to citizenship is required.

A8 migration into the UK came about as a direct result of the 2004 enlargement and the extension of EU citizenship rights to A8 nationals. This opened up new opportunities for

many CEE Europeans to exercise the mobility inherent in their newly acquired (supra-national) EU citizenship status. In the past citizenship status and the social rights that subsequently ensue have been closely linked to membership of a nation state. Today local, national and supra-national communities are all important sites in which people seek to exercise their citizenship status (Faist, 2001). Any meaningful understanding of the tensions that A8 migration may engender between established white and minority ethnic locals and A8 migrants needs to take into account both the plurality and contested character of contemporary citizenship (Joppke, 2007).

### *Proactive and defensive citizenship engagement*

As Ellison notes, contemporary citizenship is characterised by changing modes of participation and belonging where citizen engagement is played out in a range of spaces from local to global. *“Rapid change transforms the nature of citizen participation and ‘encourages’ engagement, willing or not, in the pursuit, or defence, of particular interests and/or social rights.”* (2000 :1.1). Making a distinction between two different types of citizen activity, Ellison notes that, *‘proactive engagement’* occurs when specific groups are able to utilize a particular set of social resources and conditions to enhance their interests (or those of others). In contrast, *‘defensive engagement’*, is often triggered as citizens, in the face of ongoing economic, social and political change, mount a defence against *“the erosion of their social rights”* (Ellison, 2000 :1.4). In short, proactive engagement is often linked to the expansion of citizenship and an extension of the rights that citizenship brings to others, whilst defensive engagement routinely occurs when certain citizens are looking to preserve or maintain their existing entitlements and interests.

How useful is this insight when considering the local impact of A8 migration and the, at times, exclusive response of host communities? This paper primarily focuses on the ways in which established communities experience and make sense of the local impact of migration within their neighbourhoods. Nonetheless, a brief discussion of the motivations underpinning A8 respondents' decisions to migrate to the UK, and, the ways in which they look to access health services is important in illustrating how A8 migrants are able to proactively engage with EU citizenship to enhance their interests. A desire to find work, reinforced by a favourable disparity in wage earning potential between their countries of origin and the UK, was the pre-eminent motivation across all the A8 migrant groups we interviewed.

*There're no jobs in Slovakia and wages are very low. One week's wage is as much as one month's in Slovakia. (FG1 Slovaks)*

*We're doing easy work for small money. But small money here is big money in Poland. If we did the same in Poland - we would have no money. (FG2 Polish men)*

From 2004, the relative economic advantages available, for the first time, to A8 nationals looking for work in a booming UK labour market were undoubtedly a strong pull factor in many initial decisions to migrate. Among the Roma participants within our study this was also augmented by a strong desire to escape the endemic persecution and discrimination that they faced within in their country of origin.

*I came to England to escape the racism in Slovakia... We are normal human beings, but [in Slovakia] I could not work in a restaurant, people would not take food from me. (Roma 2, Mother)*

This position was endorsed when two other Roma participants described previous, unsuccessful attempts to relocate their families to the UK by claiming asylum prior to EU enlargement. All the Roma families intended to settle permanently in England and rebuild their lives.

Within our study, A8 respondents were registered with local doctors and had used hospital services as necessary. However, the level of additional demand from A8 migrants for health services appears to be significantly reduced by two factors. First, many migrant workers are young and healthy. Second, the majority of A8 migrants, consistently preferred to return to their home country to more quickly access familiar, and in their view, more appropriate healthcare services.

*When we go home on holidays we all see doctors, especially the dentist. (FG1 Slovaks)*

*R1: When I go to Poland I always have three visits; to the dentist, the doctor for me, and with my kids and the gynaecologist.*

*R2: Like all Poles. We go to Poland for medical treatment.*

*R3: I went to the doctor here and he advised me to take Paracetamol 4 times a day. So next week I am going to Poland to see a specialist. (FG4 Polish women)*

*The vast majority of them still go back for dental care, for any operations because they believe it's better and they don't have to wait so long. (KI5a human resources manager, logistics/distribution company).*

This brief consideration of the motivations that underpin A8 migrants' movements is important because it illustrates the particular type of proactive engagement that EU expansion has made possible for A8 nationals. A8 migrants exercise their new rights as EU citizens to live and work in a host member state whilst simultaneously utilizing their status as national citizens of a particular state, in order to access what they consider to be better healthcare

services in their country of origin. These movements are indicative of a distinct type of citizenship engagement where individual migrants make a series of proactive choices about how their particular needs may be best served by the opportunities that EU expansion has offered. It is not, at present, about identifiable groups demanding collectivised social rights.

Mobile A8 nationals are proactively engaging with their newly acquired rights to free movement within the EU. For many, relocation offers certain financial and lifestyle advantages<sup>iv</sup> (Authors, 2011). As new EU citizens they are, quite legitimately, looking to exploit the tangible benefits that their new opportunities for mobility may bring. However, the unprecedented and largely unpredicted numbers of A8 citizens who subsequently chose to exercise their rights to live and work in the UK caught the British government by surprise and evidence suggests that in particular locations this movement has a significant impact on local job markets, housing and certain public services (ICoCo, 2007; TUC, 2007).

Against the backdrop of A8 migrants proactively engaging with their new supra-national rights, members of established local host communities start to engage defensively to protect what they perceive to be a threat to, *their* rights to local jobs and housing. In doing so they consistently seek to justify their stance by legitimatising the exclusion of newly arrived A8 migrants on the basis that jobs and welfare should be reserved primarily for those national citizens who are seen as having previously contributed to the common good of the national community.

*R1: I don't care what colour, creed anybody is but it does seem sometimes to be a little bit hypocritical. When you've got so many things over here already that the government won't help with*

*R2: All the tax that people have paid from this country...That [pointing to a cup], will only hold so much. If you start trying to take more and more out of it, you can't because it's not there. Why should we support all these people, when we've got plenty of our own people to support? (FG8 White residents)*

*There's too many people here and it's difficult to get houses and it's very difficult to get work...First priority for jobs and things should be to the people who are residents of England. (FG6 Pakistani women).*

Underpinning such attitudes is the view that the social rights of established community members are being usurped by newcomers whose claims are seen as less valid. Established residents are seeking to defend their position by invoking a restricted understanding of social citizenship tied to a principle of reciprocity, where claims to collective entitlement demand prior contribution (Dwyer, 2000; Taylor-Gooby 2005). Allied to this, is an underlying fear that the already limited resources available to local host communities will diminish further still if the claims of new arrivals are allowed.

*R1: There are people that are genuine. They come over here, pay their taxes, pay their dues. Then there's people who come over here and live on benefits. There is in every culture, English, Muslim, Eastern European but there's got to be a balance.*

*R3: We're in this country. We want to be included.*

*R1: It's not so much excluded as ignored... There is only a pot so big, like you mentioned... it's perceived they get more. If we feel we're being ignored then we're going to make a stink about it. Because that is when we start thinking, it's our country, they shouldn't be here. I don't think it's because of racism. I think it's because we are British. (FG8 White residents)*

As A8 migrants actively look to assert their new supra-national (EU) rights, established community members, who feel their needs are subsequently being marginalised seek to defend their local rights to goods and services by invoking a national logic of territorialised prioritisation and concern (Morley, 2000).

Much work highlights racism, particularly white racist hostility and violence, as a continuing problem for members of the diverse ethnic minority communities resident in Britain.

Hemmerman *et al.* (2007) point out the complex ways in which racism is played out in inner city communities and also racists' propensity to explain away, or deny, racist intent when defending exclusive opinions. Similarly, both cultural and economic factors have been identified as key elements in the discourse of those white Britons who seek to justify prejudice (Valentine and McDonald, 2004). Elsewhere work also highlights that racially motivated harassment is part of the everyday experience of many A8 migrants; particularly those of Roma origin with darker skin (Authors, 2010). The continuing existence of overtly racist views, and the contrived ways in which they operate within some majority white communities is graphically illustrated by one of our Roma respondents who explained that he had few problems with his neighbours - once they had realised he was not of Pakistani origin. *"First, they think we're Muslim. When they find out I'm from Europe and Christian it's fine"* (Brother, Roma 1).

Within the white residents focus group participants were keen to state that racism had little to do with their concerns about the impact of A8 migration. However, it needs to be recognised that, on occasions, some within this group drew upon racist stereotypes to justify their position. Most notably, one person referred to the criminal tendencies of some Eastern Europeans and cited the 'robust action' of the Italian authorities (following a murder of an

Italian national), to support his view that migrants involved in criminal activity should face deportation.

It is not our intention to make excuses for racists, nor to downplay the impact of racism. However, despite the examples noted above, it would be wrong to view the concerns expressed by the majority of respondents as simple expressions of xenophobic intolerance. Across the focus groups with established community members the most dominant concern was that new migrants ultimately increase competition for the limited jobs and finite welfare resources available to local residents. Fearing that A8 migration would be detrimental to their future needs (as the finite resources within the citizenship 'pot' become more thinly spread), many members within established communities embark on a defensive engagement of what they perceive to be the primacy of '*their*' claims, as established local residents by prioritising '*their*' rights as national citizens above and beyond any supra-national rights that may accrue to A8 migrants by virtue of their new European citizenship status.

## **Conclusions**

Recent migration into the UK has consequences for established populations living in the specific local areas where new A8 migrants are concentrated (HoLSCEA, 2008). In spite of certain evidence which suggests a disjuncture between established communities' perceptions and the impact of A8 migration, an exploration of the views of host populations is important because they reflect the concerns of the established residents who participated in our study; concerns that have been more widely acknowledged (TUC, 2007; Amas, 2008; Jurado and Bruzzone, 2008). The belief that newly arrived A8 migrants are in competition with established communities for finite local jobs, and housing remains a central issue for



established residents; many of whom originally migrated to the UK and/or are members of established black and minority ethnic communities.

Although, it has been asserted elsewhere that there is “no evidence that migration from A8 countries has had any adverse impact on native workers” (Lemos and Portes, 2008 :3), many in established communities believe that the arrival of A8 migrants enabled employers to contain or reduce the wages paid to unskilled/semi-skilled workers. Additionally, established residents believe that they have to compete directly with A8 migrants for available local jobs. Similarly, there is a belief that the increased demand for housing pushed up prices in the private sector. Also, despite convincing evidence to the contrary, there is a strongly held misconception that A8 migrants receive preferential access to social housing. In a situation where social housing stock is in short supply, and long waiting lists ensue, social housing is the cause of much discontent. An allied issue for established communities is the principle by which access to social housing is governed. Social housing is allocated according to *priority need*, assessed according to criteria that may vary between different local authorities. This sits uncomfortably alongside the *reciprocal* principle (where claims for welfare are linked to prior contribution), as emphasised by the majority of established community members in our study.

Given the ongoing global recession and attendant rising unemployment, it is likely that the concerns of members of the established, and relatively deprived, communities that host A8 migrants will intensify (Jurado and Bruzzone, 2008; German Marshall Fund *et al.* 2009). It is hard for any government to make a convincing case for encouraging high levels of migrant labour as redundancies among the established workforce increase. In the UK, building on the restrictive approach of New Labour (Cheong *et al.*, 2007), the Coalition government has

implemented strict immigration quotas for non-EU labour migrants (UKBA, 2010). Perhaps established communities are taking a lead from the rhetoric of politicians in respect of non-EU labour migration into the UK. However, the EU is an increasingly important policy actor that limits the ability of individual Member States to set their own parameters in relation to citizenship and migration policy (Lister, 2008). In some ways, therefore, the mobility at the heart of EU citizenship that is the focus of host community concerns runs counter to more exclusive UK government policies which seek to curtail rights of entry for non-EU nationals.

Certain commentators are highly critical of recent work which utilises simplistic, racialised discourses that emphasise different ethnic groups competing for scarce communal resources (Sveinsson, 2009). Too much focus on the ethnic differences that exist between groups of commonly marginalised citizens can obscure the wider class based inequalities that structure the lives of poor citizens regardless of their ethnicity (Bottero, 2009). It is vital to ensure that debates about the implications that increased migration may have on the resources available to disadvantaged citizens do not merely repeat the misinformed view of some commentators that the white working class “are the losers struggling for scarce resources, while minority ethnic groups are the winners – at *the direct expense* of the white working class” (Sveinsson, 2009 :5). Class remains central to understanding how people are able to access decent jobs and housing in the UK. Even in recession, Britain is a rich nation, but one which finds it harder to share resources between groups; this in turn promotes a politics of mistrust and fear of others (Dorling, 2009), including newly arrived A8 migrants.

The enlargement of the EU and the resultant extension of EU citizenship rights to A8 nationals generated a significant and largely unexpected wave of migration into the UK. Overall, this migratory movement brought substantial economic gains for the UK. Equally, it

is crucial to appreciate that this new migration triggered significant localised challenges for local authorities and the often disadvantaged and ethnically diverse, established communities living in the areas where the majority of new A8 migrants live. The local narratives of established communities about new migration should be listened to and understood, not least to challenge some of the assumptions that can, if left unacknowledged, quickly lead to hostility being directed towards newcomers (Robinson, 2007).

In the changed circumstances of an enlarged and expanding EU it is vital that national governments acknowledge that when European citizens from new Member States seek to actively engage with their new rights by relocating to work in other EU states that such movements are likely to impact on the citizenship rights and resources available to host country nationals; particularly poorer citizens many of whom are likely to be members of established black and minority ethnic communities. We should not, therefore, be surprised if those most likely to be negatively affected by A8 migration (that is, established communities working in the lower echelons of the PLM and/or living in deprived areas), then seek to evoke exclusive and constrained notions of national citizenship in defence of a perceived 'outside' threat to their relatively disadvantaged circumstances. The ability and willingness of mobile EU citizens to negotiate contributions and rights, across geographical and social space, raises a number of challenges for the EU and the labour markets and welfare systems of Member States (Ackers and Dwyer, 2004). These challenges are most visible within the local neighbourhoods where A8 migrants and established communities live side by side. A8 migration is, therefore, a vivid example of how the complexities of contemporary citizenship engagement play out "*around the persistent (re)interpretation of interests, demands and entitlements in a transformed public sphere*" (Ellison, 2000 :8.1).

## Bibliography

- Ackers, H. L. and Dwyer, P. (2004), 'Fixed law, fluid lives: the citizenship status of post-retirement migrants in the European Union' *Ageing and Society*, 24: 3, 451-475.
- Andrews, R., Boyne, G.A. , Meier, K. J., O'Toole, L. J. and Walker, R. M. (2009), 'EU accession and public service and performance', *Policy and Politics*, 37: 1, 19-37.
- Amas, N. (2008), *Housing, New Migration and Community Relations: a Review of the Evidence Base*, London: Information Centre about Asylum and Refugees.
- Authors (2010), in *International Migration*. details anonymised
- Authors (2011), forthcoming in *Population, Place and Space* details anonymised
- Banton, M. (1984) *Racial and ethnic competition*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bottero, W. ( 2009) 'Class in the 21<sup>st</sup> century', pp. 7-14 in Sveinsson K. P. [ed] (2009) *op cit*.
- Burney, E. (1967) *Housing on Trial: A Study of Immigrants and Local Government*, London: Institute for Race Relations/Oxford University Press.
- Canoy, M., Beutin, R., Horvath, A., Hubert, A., Lerais, F., Smith, P. and Sochacki, M. (2006) *Migration and Public Perceptions*, Brussels: Bureau of European Policy Advisors, European Commission.
- Cheong, P. H., Edwards, R., Goulbourne, H. And Solomos, J. (2007), 'Immigration, social cohesion and social capital: a critical review', *Critical Social Policy*, 27: 1, 24-49.
- CLG (2008), *Managing the Impacts of Migration: a Cross-government Approach*, London: Department for Communities and Local Government.
- Coats, D. (2008), *Migration Myths: Employment, Wages and Labour Market Performance*, London: The Work Foundation.
- Commission for Rural Communities (2007) *A8 Migrant Workers in Rural Areas: Briefing Paper*, Cheltenham, The Commission for Rural Communities, available at:

<http://www.ruralcommunities.gov.uk/files/A8%20migrant%20workers%20in%20rural%20areas.pdf>

CPAG (2010), *Benefits for Migrants Handbook*, London: Child Poverty Action Group.

Currie, S. (2008) *Migration, Work and Citizenship in the Enlarged European Union*, Farnham: Ashgate.

Dench, G. (2008) 'Family, community and politics: the fertile legacy of Michael Young', *Critical Social Policy*, 28: 3, 335-348.

Dench, G., Gavron, K. and Young, M. (2006) *The New East End: Kinship, Race and Conflict*, London: Profile Books Limited.

Dorling, D. (2009) 'From housing to health-to whom are the white working class losing out? Frequently asked questions', pp. 59-65 in Sveinsson, K. P. [ed] *op cit*.

Dwyer, P. (2000), *Welfare Rights and Responsibilities: Contesting Social Citizenship*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Ellison, N. (2000), 'Proactive and defensive engagement: social citizenship in a changing public sphere', *Sociological Research Online*, 5: 3 available at:

<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/5/3/ellison.html>

Faist, T. (2001), 'Social citizenship in the European Union: nested membership', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 39: 1, :7-58.

Favell, A. (2008), 'The new face of East-West migration in Europe', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34: 5, 701-716.

Garner, S. (2009) 'Home truths: the white working class and the racialisation of social housing', pp. 45-50 in Sveinsson, K. P. [ed] *op cit*.

Gavron, K. (2009) 'Foreword', pp. 2-3 in Sveinsson, K. P. [ed] *op cit*.

German Marshall Fund, the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, the Compagnia di San Paolo, and the Barrow Cadbury Trust (2009), *Transatlantic Trends Immigration Survey*, Washington: The German Marshall Fund of the United States.

Goodhart, D. (2006), *Progressive Nationalism: Citizenship and the Left*, London: Demos.

Hakim, K. (1992) *Research Design: Strategies and Choices in the Design of Research*, London: Routledge.

Hemmerman, L., Law, I., Simms, J. and Sirriyeh, A. (2007), *Racist Hostility and Racist Victimisation*, Research Findings, November 2007, Leeds: Centre for Ethnicity and Racism Studies, University of Leeds.

House of Lords Select Committee on Economic Affairs (2008) *The Economic Impact of Immigration: volume 1 report*, London: The Stationary Office.

ICoCo (2007), *Estimating the Scale and Impacts of Migration at the Local Level*, Coventry: Institute for Community Cohesion/Local Government Association.

Joppke, C. (2007), 'Transformation of citizenship: status, rights, identity', *Citizenship Studies*, 11: 1, 37-48.

Jurado, E. and Bruzzone, A. (2008), *Rethinking Migration: Work and Welfare in a Mobile Economy*, London: Policy Network.

Lemos, S. and Portes, J. (2008), *The Impact of Migration from the new European Union Member States on Native Workers*, Leicester: University of Leicester/Department for Work and Pensions.

Lister, M. (2008), 'Introduction: Europeanization and migration: challenging the values of citizenship in Europe?', *Citizenship Studies*, 12; 6, 527- 532.

MacKenzie, R and Forde, R. (2009), 'The rhetoric of the good worker' versus the realities of employers' use and experiences of migrant workers', *Work, Employment and Society*, 23: 1, 142-159.

- Morgan, D. L. [ed] (1993) *Successful Focus Groups*, London: Sage.
- Moore, R. (2008) 'Careless talk': a critique of Dench, Gavron and Young's 'The new East End', *Critical Social Policy*, 28: 3, 349-360.
- Morley, D. (2000), *Home Territories: Media, Mobility and Identity*, Routledge: London.
- Office for National Statistics (2009) *Annual Business Inquiry*, London: ONS, available via <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/abs/>
- Pollard, N., Latorre, M. and Sriskandarajah, D. (2008), *Floodgates or Turnstiles? Post EU Enlargement Migration Flows to (and from) the UK*, London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Reed, H. and Latorre, M. (2009), *The Economic Impacts of Migration on the UK Labour Market*, London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Ritchie, J. and Spencer, L. (2003), [eds] *Qualitative Research Practice*, London: Sage.
- Robinson, D. (2007), European Union Accession state migrants in social housing in England, *People, Place and Policy Online*, 1: 3, 98-111 available at: [http://extra.shu.ac.uk/ppp-online/issue\\_3\\_281107/article\\_1\\_full.html](http://extra.shu.ac.uk/ppp-online/issue_3_281107/article_1_full.html)
- Rooney, J. (2008), *Housing Report to the Migration Impacts Forum*, Sheffield: Sheffield City Council.
- Rutter, J. and Latorre, M. (2009), *Social Housing Allocation and Immigrant Communities*, Research report 4, Manchester: Equalities and Human Rights Commission
- Ryan, L., Sales, R., Tilki, M. and Siara, B. (2009), 'Family strategies and transnational migration: recent Polish migrants in London', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35: 1, 61-77.
- Schwartz, H., and Jacobs., J (1979) *Qualitative Sociology; a Method to Madness*, London: The Free Press.

Spencer, S., Ruhs, M., Anderson, B. and Rogaly, B. (2007), *Migrants' Lives Beyond the Workplace: the Experiences of Central and East Europeans in the UK*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Stenning, A., Champion, T., Conway, C., Coombes, M., Dawley, S., Dixon, L., Raybould, S. and Richardson, R. (2006), *Assessing the Local and Regional Impacts of International Migration*, London: Final Report of a research project for the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), formerly the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Sveinsson, K. P. [ed] (2009) *Who Cares about the White Working Class?*, London: The Runnymede Trust.

Taylor-Gooby, P. (2005) *Attitudes to Social Justice*, London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

TUC (2007) *The Economics of Migration: Managing the Impacts*, London: Trades Union Congress.

UKBA (2010), *Limits on non-EU economic migration: a consultation*, June 2010, London: UK Border Agency, available at:

<http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/documents/aboutus/consultations/limits-on-non-eu-migration/limits-on-non-eu-migration.pdf?view=Binary>

Valentine, G. and McDonald, I. (2004), *Understanding Prejudice: Attitudes to Minorities*, London: Stonewall.

Vertovec, S. (2007) , 'Super-diversity and its implications', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30: 6, 1024-1054.

Zetter, R., Griffiths, D., Sigona, N., Flynn, D., Pasha, T. And Beynon, R. (2006) *Immigration, social cohesion and social capital*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.



---

<sup>i</sup> The A8 states are: Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Slovenia, Slovakia, Hungary and the Czech Republic.

<sup>ii</sup> This paper focuses on urban areas. A8 migration has not been limited to towns and cities. Significant numbers of CEE migrants moved to rural areas to work in the agricultural and allied sectors. See Commission for Rural Communities (2007) for an overview of the rural dimension of A8 migration

<sup>iii</sup> FG6 denotes the number assigned to each focus group. R1, R2 indicates respondent 1,2 etc. and is used when data from two or more people within a focus group is presented.

<sup>iv</sup> We recognise that some labour migrants may face substantial hardship following migration.