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Executive Summary

Introduction and aims of the research
Suffolk County Council commissioned Public Perspectives, an independent research organisation, to conduct research about the migrant population in Suffolk, including its demography, attitudes and experience of living in Suffolk and awareness and use of migrant support services such as the migrant drop-in service run by GYROS (Great Yarmouth Refugee and Outreach Support Limited).¹

The research follows on from similar research conducted in 2010 (also by Public Perspectives). The research aims to build on the available local data-sets that contain information about migrants, such as national insurance registrations and school census data, which are limited and do not include data about attitudes and experience. This research allows for a comparison over time and to generate reliable and up to date intelligence. This will help inform service planning, policies and practice and community cohesion activity, including advice and support services for migrants and help to reduce pressures on public services. The research is funded through the Controlling Migration Fund and the results will help the Council report on progress and impact of the funding.

Approach to the research
The research involved five elements:

- Collation and analysis of datasets that can give an impression of the migrant population in Suffolk, including census, school census, interpretation and national insurance registration data to provide context and inform other aspects of the research.
- Quantitative face to face survey of over 400 migrants conducted in November 2018.
- Quantitative face to face survey of 100 settled residents (i.e. the so-called indigenous population), conducted in November 2018, to provide an indicative picture of perceptions about the impact of migration and community cohesion.
- Qualitative in-depth interviews with migrants and stakeholders conducted in January 2019.

The research defined migrants as having moved to the UK aged 18+, not born in the UK and not speaking English as a first language. As in 2010, the research did not seek to engage long-established migrant groups that have moved to Suffolk decades ago and moved into long-established communities, such as Bangladeshi or Indian migrants. This is because the research is

¹ A migrant drop-in service was running in Suffolk between October 2010 and December 2016. Suffolk County Council received funding of £135,000 from the Controlling Migration Fund to deliver a migrant drop-in service across Suffolk between 2017 and 2019. GYROS (www.gyros.org.uk) was awarded the contract and the service began receiving its first enquiries in September 2017.
most interested in the demography, attitudes, experience and impact of newer migrant communities.

**Key findings**

**Changing face of migration**

The pattern of migration to Suffolk in recent years has followed the expansion of the EU. In 2010/11 nearly half of all national insurance registrations from overseas nationals were from Lithuania (18.4%), Poland (15.5%) or India (13.4%). By 2017/18, registrations from most countries were lower than the 2010/11 level except for Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary. In 2017/18, more than 4 in 10 (41.3%) registrations to overseas nationals were Romanian.

Consistently since 2013/14, around 4 in 5 overseas nationals registering for a National Insurance number in Suffolk are nationals of countries in the European Union (EU). During this period, the proportion of registrants from countries who have recently joined the EU, most notably Romania and Bulgaria, has increased (EU2 countries). In 2013/14, 1 in 5 (22%) registrants were from EU15 countries, 2 in 5 (40%) from EU8 countries and 1 in 7 (15%) from EU2 countries. In 2017/18, 1 in 7 (15%) registrants were from EU15 countries, 1 in 5 (20%) from EU8 countries and nearly half (46%) from EU2 countries. Of the 8,831 EU2 nationals who have registered in Suffolk since 2013/14, most were Romanian (84%).

### Figure 1. Proportion of National Insurance number registrations to overseas nationals by nationality in Suffolk, 2013/14 and 2017/18

![Figure 1](https://stat-xplore.dwp.gov.uk/webapi/jsf/dataCatalogueExplorer.xhtml)


---

2 The EU2 (formerly known as the EU2) are the two countries that joined the EU on 1 January 2007: Bulgaria and Romania. The EU8 (formerly known as the EU8) are the eight central and eastern European countries that joined the EU on 1 May 2004: Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia. Was the number of member countries in the European Union prior to the accession of ten candidate countries on 1 May 2004. It does not include two other countries that joined the EU at the same time – Cyprus and Malta. The EU15 was the number of member countries in the European Union prior to the accession of ten candidate countries on 1 May 2004. It comprised the following 15 countries, prior to: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom.
The following quote from a stakeholder summarise this changing face of migration:

“15 years ago it was just from the commonwealth countries, but the accession of the EU8 and then the EU2 countries changed the face of migration. There has always been a Portuguese community here, working in our factories and from 2004 [EU8 accession] lots of Poles and some Lithuanians and other East European countries came over. More recently lots of Romanians and some Bulgarians have arrived [following the EU2 accession in 2007 and the lifting of the initial immigration restrictions in 2014]. Now it feels that migration is diverse from across Europe with new migrants being drawn to the migrant communities that have become established over the past decade. It’s now easier for them – they can quickly find a home and a job and can be acclimatised to the local area by others that are established here.” Stakeholder

Based on the above experience, it is expected that migration will be affected by Brexit and other immigration rule changes, but that existing migrant communities will continue to act as a magnet to new migrants from their countries:

“I feel there will always be a need for migrants in this area and the communities that are here will attract new migrants. But Brexit has put some off and some are leaving due to the uncertainty and tensions. So we may see migration fall a bit, but I doubt it will slow down much. I think the result of Brexit though, if it happens and how it happens, is that we won’t see migrants from new communities. It will mainly be migrants from the bigger established communities, such as the Polish, Romanians, Portuguese and also those from the Commonwealth such as Indians.” Stakeholder

**Maturing and established migrant communities**

Despite the changing face of migration and new communities arriving from Romania, increasingly the migrant population in Suffolk is maturing and becoming more established, led by the Polish. This is manifesting itself in an older migrant population, whose children are increasingly joining secondary schools and who are more likely to live in non-shared and non-private rented accommodation than migrants in 2010 and newer arrivals.

These established migrants now have roots in the UK and Suffolk and are more likely to intend to stay in the UK and Suffolk than migrants in 2010 and newer arrivals.

The established migrant communities are increasingly acting as a magnet to new migrants, although work still remains the main reason for coming to the UK and Suffolk.

In contrast, newer arrivals tend to have lower qualifications and speak less English than more established migrants, which presents challenges for public services and integration and highlights the importance of ESOL (English for speakers of other languages) provision and migrant support services.
The uncertainty and impact of Brexit
Brexit has caused uncertainty and confusion amongst some migrants about both the process for leaving the EU, their settlement rights and how to apply for them.

This has encouraged migrants to apply for residency and citizenship, but it has also led to a notable proportion considering leaving the UK.

In all of this, migrant support services have played an important role in providing information and helping migrants consider their options, including applying for residency. Depending on the outcome of Brexit, the demand for this support may increase.

Satisfaction with living in Suffolk and accessible services
Migrants remain satisfied with living in Suffolk and they are satisfied with public and other key services.

Most migrants believe that public services are accessible, meet their needs and find it relatively easy to find employment and housing.

The main barrier to accessing services is language, again highlighting the importance of ESOL provision and migrant support services.

A cohesive community
Most migrants said they feel like they belong, that they get on well with different people in the area (a view shared by settled residents) and that they have not faced discrimination.

However, although most migrants know their rights and responsibilities, notable minorities do not; in particular new arrivals and those that do not speak English. This includes about a fifth not knowing what to do with litter and rubbish, what they can and cannot recycle, keeping noise to a minimum or that hanging around on the street can intimidate some people and over a quarter do not know how to get rid of bulky items. In addition, nearly two-fifths do not know when to visit their G.P or contact 111.

This above can undermine cohesion and place pressure on public services, highlighting the value of ESOL provision and migrant support services.

Settled residents have positive perceptions of migrants
Most ‘settled’ residents in Suffolk believe that migrants are good for the local area and have a positive impact on the economy and enrich the area culturally.

However, some residents are concerned that migrants place pressure on public and other services, such as advice services and local social infrastructure such as schools and doctors’ surgeries. Some of these residents said that this is more to do with population increase and stretched public services, than an issue with migration in itself.
The migrant drop-in service meeting need

The migrant drop-in service is gradually increasing momentum and starting to support the numbers of migrants expected upon commissioning, based on the volumes seen in the previous migrant drop-in service. The new service had over 1,500 interactions with migrants between September 2017 and December 2018.

There is evidence that the service is providing high quality advice due to its understanding of migrants’ culture and experiences, and the ability of advisors to engage in multiple languages. This advice is helping resolve problems and in turn helping migrants settle-in better and consequently integrate better. There is also evidence that the service is helping to reduce pressure on public and other advice services. This is both directly by taking pressure off services such as Citizens Advice, Job Centre Plus and the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP), and also indirectly by helping resolve issues before people reach crisis point and require intervention from Councils and other support services.

The consensus amongst stakeholders and service users is that a migrant drop-in service is important, especially in light of the potential implications of Brexit and continued public sector funding cuts, which could reduce the availability of alternative support and advice services.

Stakeholders said in the future, if the service does secure continuation funding, that they would like to see the migrant drop-in service increase its numbers, reach and offer.
Main Report

Section 1: Introduction

Introduction and aims of the research

1.1. Suffolk County Council commissioned Public Perspectives, an independent research organisation, to conduct research about the migrant population in Suffolk, including its demography, attitudes and experience of living in Suffolk and awareness and use of migrant support services such as the migrant drop-in service run by GYROS. (Great Yarmouth Refugee and Outreach Support Limited).  

1.2. The research follows on from similar research conducted in 2010 (also by Public Perspectives). The research aims to build on the available local data-sets that contain information about migrants, such as National Insurance registrations and school census data, which are limited and do not include data about attitudes and experience. This research allows for a comparison over time and to generate reliable and up to date intelligence. This will help inform service planning, policies and practice and community cohesion activity, including advice and support services for migrants and help to reduce pressures on public services. The research is funded through the Controlling Migration Fund and the results will help the Council report on progress and impact of the funding.

1.3. The research has covered the following subjects:
- Demographics
- Reasons for moving to the UK and Suffolk
- Intention to stay
- Satisfaction and access to services
- Community cohesion
- Perceptions, impact of, and preparation for, Brexit
- Perceptions of the migrant drop-in service run by GYROS

Approach to the research

1.4. The research involved five elements:
- **Collation and analysis of local datasets:** Suffolk County Council in partnership with Public Perspectives collated and analysed datasets that can give an impression of the migrant population in Suffolk, including census, school census, interpretation and national insurance registration data. This provided useful insight in its own right and a foundation to develop the other elements of the research (see appendix 1 for the full report).
- **Quantitative survey of migrants:** As in 2010, a face-to-face survey of 410 members of the main migrant populations across Suffolk was conducted to provide a quantitative and reliable assessment of their demography, attitudes and experience. Quotas were

---

3 A migrant drop-in service was running in Suffolk between October 2010 and December 2016. Suffolk County Council received funding of £135,000 from the Controlling Migration Fund to deliver a migrant drop-in service across Suffolk between 2017 and 2019. GYROS (www.gyros.org.uk) was awarded the contract and the service began receiving its first enquiries in September 2017.
set by geography (i.e. District/Borough areas) and minimum quotas set by country of origin/nationality (based on the above analysis of local datasets) to ensure there was representation of the main migrant communities across Suffolk. These quotas were interlocked so that there was the appropriate representation of nationalities within each District, as indicated by the local datasets. The questionnaire built on the one used in 2010 to allow for comparison over time, where relevant (see appendix 2 for the questionnaire). The interviews were conducted by experienced interviewers, with expertise in interviewing migrant and non-English speaking communities, including interviewers from the main migrant communities in Suffolk. Therefore, they were able, if required, to conduct interviews in the language of the respondent, although most interviews were conducted in English. The survey was conducted in November 2018.

- **Quantitative survey of settled residents:** In addition to the migrant survey, a face-to-face survey of 100 ‘settled’ residents (i.e. the so-called indigenous population) was conducted across Suffolk to provide an indicative picture of perceptions about the impact of migration and community cohesion. The questionnaire built on questions used nationally and in the local migrant questionnaire to allow for comparison (see appendix 3 for the questionnaire). The survey was conducted in November 2018.

- **Qualitative in-depth interviews with migrants and stakeholders:** The quantitative survey was supplemented by 10 in-depth face-to-face qualitative interviews with migrants, recruited through the survey process, to help unpack and understand the findings from the quantitative survey. In addition, four in-depth telephone qualitative interviews were conducted with stakeholders in Suffolk County Council and Citizens Advice about their understanding and experience of migration in the area. The interviews were conducted in January 2019.

- **Light-touch evaluation of the migrant drop-in service delivered by GYROS:** The research gave an opportunity to review the progress and impact of the migrant drop-in service. This involved reviewing progress reports and data, interviewing key staff involved in the delivery of the service and conducting in-depth face-to-face interviews with 10 service users in two of the main drop-in centre locations (Ipswich and Lowestoft). The review was conducted in January 2019.

1.5. The research defined migrants as having moved to the UK aged 18+, not born in the UK and not speaking English as a first language. As in 2010, the research did not seek to engage long-established migrant groups that have moved to Suffolk decades ago and moved into long-established communities, such as Bangladeshi or Indian migrants. This is because the research is most interested in the demography, attitudes, experience and impact of newer migrant communities.

1.6. It is important to note that this study does not represent a population count of migrant populations. However, it does provide an opportunity to validate the relative size of the major migrant populations identified through local datasets and identify the key demographics of migrants. It is worth noting that the indications provided by local datasets

---

4 Minimum quotas were set for nationality to ensure representation but to avoid the fieldwork being overly constricted by the potentially limited local migrant data-sets that were used to develop the quotas. This approach allowed room for the fieldwork to self-identify migrant populations for inclusion in the survey based on the ‘on the ground’ experience of our interviewers.

5 The accuracy or sample error of the 2010 and 2018 survey results is no worse than +/- 4.8% at a 95% confidence level. This means that we can be 95% confident that the ‘real’ result for any given question would be within 4.8 percentage points of those stated within the survey if a full census was conducted. This provides for robust data when the results are analysed at a headline level and over time. The figures about sample accuracy are important because they help determine whether differences in results over time are statistically significant, once sample accuracy is taken into account. This report will make it clear when differences over time are large enough to be statistically significant.

6 The relatively small sample size means that the findings have to be treated indicatively rather than conclusively or generalised to the wider population.
as to the size and location of key migrant populations were reflected in the findings of our fieldwork interviewers. They found it relatively easy to identify the key migrant populations in certain areas, while migrants of other nationalities and nationalities in other areas were harder to find. Likewise, no notable “hidden” migrant nationalities were uncovered that the local datasets had not previously identified.

1.7. The following table shows the profile of respondents to the migrant survey by nationality and area, compared to National Insurance registration data which was used to set the quotas:

### Figure 1.1: Profile of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents (2018)</th>
<th>Quotas based on local datasets</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents (2010)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Minimum 18%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Minimum 13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside EU</td>
<td>20% (including 3% Indian and 2% Bangladeshi)</td>
<td>Minimum 20%</td>
<td>24% (including 20% Indian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Minimum 7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Minimum 7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Minimum 2.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Minimum 2.5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Minimum 2.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babergh</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Heath</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Suffolk</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Edmundsbury</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waveney</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Also 3% Slovakian.

### Reporting

1.8. The main report summarises the findings of the research. Each question in the quantitative survey has been analysed against a set of key demographic and conceptual variables. Commentary is provided only where significant or meaningful findings and differences are identified. The variables are:

- Nationality
- District
- Rural vs Urban
- Length of stay in Suffolk and UK
- Length of intent to stay
- Reasons for coming to the UK
- Marital Status

7 The sample sizes for each district and individual nationalities are small, which makes comparison unreliable. Therefore, in most cases the findings are generalised across all nationalities rather than presenting results for specific districts and nationalities.
• Gender
• Age
• Whether have children
• Employment status
• Education
• Ability to speak English

1.9. The results are compared against those in 2010, where appropriate and available.
1.10. Key quotes and comments have been captured from the in-depth interviews and integrated into the report to provide further evidence and help bring the findings to life.
1.11. The results of the ‘settled’ residents survey are presented in its own section.
1.12. A separate section presents results of the light-touch evaluation of the migrant drop-in service run by GYROS.
Section 2: Demographics

Introduction
2.1. This section presents findings about the key demographics of migrants and how this compares since 2010.

Gender
There is almost an even split of male and female migrants, consistent with 2010
2.2. In the 2018 survey, 53% of migrants are men and 46% women, compared in 2010 with 56% men and 44% women.8
2.3. This compares to a Suffolk wide population of 49% men and 51% women.

Figure 2.1: Gender

Number of respondents: 404.
Question asked: How would you describe your gender?

---

8 Not all results add up to 100% due to rounding.
Age

The age profile of migrants is maturing, although it remains much younger than the wider Suffolk population

2.4. In the 2018 survey, 46% of migrants are aged 34 or under, with 50% aged 35-54.

2.5. The age of migrants appears to be older since 2010, which may reflect the ageing of migrants that first came to the country several years ago, whereas many migrants in 2010 had only recently come to the UK following accession of the EU8 counties in 2004 and EU2 countries in 2007.

2.6. The age profile of migrants is much younger than that for the wider Suffolk population, of which 8% are aged 18-24, 15% aged 25-34, 15% based 35-44, 18% aged 45-54, 16% aged 55-64 and 29% aged 65+ (percentages based on 18+ population).

Figure 2.2: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents: 398.
Question asked: What is your age?
Marital status

Less migrants are single and more are married than in 2010

2.7. In the 2018 survey, 35% of migrants are single, 11% are unmarried couples, 48% are married and 5% are married and living away from their partner.

2.8. There has been a decrease in single migrants and an increase in married migrants since 2010, with 50% single and 32% married in 2010. This perhaps represents the maturing nature of migrants as per their age profile.

Figure 2.3: Marital status

Number of respondents: 406.
Question asked: Are you single, living with a partner, married or married but living away from your partner?
Religion
Most migrants are Christian

2.9. As in 2010, the majority of migrants are Christian – 79% in 2018 and 68% in 2010.

Figure 2.4: Religion

Number of respondents: 404.
Question asked: Please can you tell me what is your religion or faith, if any?
**Children**

Nearly half of migrants have children and about two-thirds of these have their children living with them

2.10. In the 2018 survey, 47% of migrants have children (31% in 2010).

2.11. 62% of these migrants have their children living with them. This compares to 80% in 2010.

**Figure 2.5: Children living in UK with migrant**

Number of respondents: 246 (only migrants with children).

Question asked: Are your children living with you in Britain?
The age of children living with migrants is increasing, although the majority are aged 10 or under.

2.12. In the 2018 survey, 15% of children living in the UK with migrants are aged 0-1, 37% aged 2-5, 31% aged 6-10 and 17% aged 11-19. The age profile of children is increasing compared to 2010, perhaps reflecting the maturing nature of the migrant population.

Figure 2.6: Ages of children living in UK with migrant

Number of respondents: 246 (only migrants with children).
Question asked: How many children are there in the household that are dependent on you and what are their ages?
Education

Migrants are less qualified in 2018 compared to 2010

2.13. In the 2018 survey, 42% of migrants do not have any formal qualifications and 13% have at least degree or equivalent level qualifications. This compares to 26% in 2010 without formal qualifications and 33% with at least degree qualifications. This change reflects the changing nature of migration, with more Indians and Polish migrants in the 2010 survey who tend to have higher qualifications than some other migrant groups more prevalent in the 2018 survey.

2.14. There is also a link between length of stay and qualification level. For example, 25% of migrants that have lived in the UK for 5 years or more have no formal qualifications, compared with 50% of other migrants i.e. more established migrants have better qualifications.

Figure 2.7: Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other post-graduate degree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional qualification</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Levels (or other post 16 qualifications)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE (or other 16 and under qualifications)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal qualifications</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents: 402.

Question asked: What is the highest academic qualification you have attained (or equivalent)?
Less migrants claim they speak English well in 2018 compared to 2010, although over half said they speak English well

2.15. In the 2018 survey, 55% said they speak English at least well, 44% said not well and 1% said not at all. This compares to 79% in 2010 that said they speak English at least well. This difference is likely to reflect the lower qualification level of migrants in the 2018 survey because there is a close link between qualification level and English language level. There is also a link between length of stay and English language level.

Figure 2.8: English language

Number of respondents: 406.
Question asked: How well can you speak English?
**Employment**

**Most migrants are employed and only a small proportion are unemployed and available for work**

2.16. In the 2018 survey, 97% of migrants are employed or in training, education or doing something else i.e. they are not unemployed and available for work. This compares to 89% in 2010. 4.2% of the Suffolk population overall are unemployed (September 2018, Nomis).

2.17. There has also been an increase in part-time employment, from 15% in 2010 to 32% in 2018.

2.18. In addition, 11% of migrants that are in work have two jobs.

2.19. Under 1% of migrants, those that are not in employment, said they rely on benefits to support themselves.

**Figure 2.9: Employment status**

![Employment status chart]

Number of respondents: 406.

Question asked: What is your current work status?

2.20. 24% of migrants said it was easy to find work (33% in 2010), 54% said it was neither easy nor difficult (42% in 2010) and 19% said it was difficult (25% in 2010). Those with lower qualifications and lower levels of English were more likely than other migrants to say they found it difficult.

2.21. The following quotes summarises the ease and challenges with finding employment:

"I had a friend here already and they found me a job before I’d even arrived." Male, Portuguese

"At first it was difficult to find work, but we spoke to a few people and to some recruitment agencies and we’re now all working. My daughter
works in a factory with me and my wife does cleaning, so it has worked out well in the end.” Male, Romania

Migrants continue to work in several industries, with retail/tourism, food processing, cleaning and construction most common

2.22. In the 2018 survey, 22% of migrants work in retail/tourism, 20% in food processing, 17% in cleaning and 15% in construction. There are variations over time, with an increase in retail/tourism and construction and a decrease in food processing.

Figure 2.10: Industry

Number of respondents: 386 (only those in work).
Question asked: What type (s) of industry do you work in? Respondents could select more than one response.

2.23. Migrants in 2018 described the work they do as follows:
- Manager: 6%
- Professional: 4%
- Technician and associate professionals: 2%
- Clerical support workers: 4%
- Service and sales workers: 36%
- Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers: 9%
- Craft and related trades workers: 1%
- Plant and machine operators and assemblers: 4%
- Elementary occupations, such as cleaners and labourers: 37%

2.24. In 2010, 73% described their work as manual, 18% non-manual and 9% managerial.
Most migrants work locally and only a minority travel by car/van

2.25. All respondents in the 2018 survey worked in Suffolk, with most working in the same district as where they live or in the neighbouring district. This was also the case in 2010.

2.26. Most respondents travel by means other than car or van, similar to 2010. For example, in 2018, 33% travel by car or van as a driver and 5% as a passenger, 32% travel by bus or coach and 18% on foot.

Figure 2.11: Location and travel to work

![Figure 2.11: Location and travel to work](image)

Number of respondents: 402.
Question asked: How do you usually travel to work?

2.27. The decrease of respondents that travel on foot from 35% in 2010 to 18% in 2018 and the increase in those that travel by bus from 18% in 2010 to 32% in 2018 is perhaps the result of migrants travelling further to work. The qualitative interviews suggest this is the result of a maturing migrant population, where initially they live close to their work but over time they choose to live elsewhere in locations they prefer and travel a little further to their jobs. As one person said:

“Initially I lived in a house that my employer provided. It was a good start, but I’ve since got a better job and found somewhere better to live, which isn’t as close to my work.” Male, Lithuanian
Housing

Most migrants live in shared accommodation, although this has decreased since 2010

2.28. In the 2018 survey, 66% of migrants live in shared accommodation (a property in multiple occupation), this compares to 74% in 2010. In 2018, 33% live in non-shared accommodation, compared with 21% in 2010.

2.29. Migrants with children living with them are less likely to live in shared property (this was also the case in 2010) – 51% of migrants with children live in shared accommodation compared with 85% of migrants without children.

Figure 2.12: Type of accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation Type</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat in shared property</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room in shared property</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced house or bungalow</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached house or bungalow</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached house or bungalow</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-contained flat or maisonette</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group living arrangement e.g. YMCA, Hostel, Farm Bunkhouse</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents: 408.
Question asked: Which of the following best describes your current home . . .?

2.30. 21% of migrants have lived in their current property for under a year, 39% for 1-2 years, 28% for 3-5 years and 11% for over 5 years. This is closely related to length of living in the UK and Suffolk. For example, 79% of migrants that have lived in Suffolk for 5 years or more have also lived in the same property for five years or more.

2.31. Similarly, migrants that have lived in the UK or Suffolk for longer are more likely to live in non-shared accommodation. For example, 82% of migrants that have lived in Suffolk for under a year live in shared accommodation, compared with 37% of migrants that have lived in Suffolk for five years or more. This suggests the housing situation of migrants is changing as migration matures and migrants become more established.

2.32. 47% of migrants said it was easy to find suitable accommodation (59% in 2010), 50% said it was difficult (40% in 2010), and 3% said they do not have suitable accommodation (1% in 2010).
2.33. The following quotes summarise the ease and challenges with finding housing, with the essence being that it is easy to find somewhere to stay, but more difficult to find somewhere suitable:

“When I arrived I stayed with a friend, so it wasn’t a problem.” Male, Polish

“It is easy to find a ‘place to stay’ but not easy to find the right type of accommodation. Housing that is safe and nice and you can afford. It took us a long time to be in the house we’re in now. Now we’re happy, but before that we had to share with other people and other families or stay in places that were not as nice. It takes a while to get the money to rent a nice place – you need a deposit, regular income and references before you can find the right place to live.” Female, Polish
Most migrants live in private rented accommodation, although this has decreased since 2010 and more live in social rented accommodation or are owner-occupiers

2.34. In the 2018 survey, 60% of migrants live in privately rented accommodation, compared to 74% in 2010.

2.35. 16% in 2018 live in social rented accommodation, compared with 7% in 2010, which is linked to length of stay and becoming eligible to receive social housing. For example, 9% of migrants that have lived in the UK for under a year live in social rented accommodation, compared with 27% of migrants that have lived in the UK for 5 years or more.

2.36. 12% in 2018 are owner occupiers (either with or without a mortgage), compared with 5% in 2010, which again is linked with length of stay and a maturing migrant population. For example, 4% of migrants that have lived in the UK for under a year are owner-occupiers, compared with 24% of migrants that have lived in the UK for 5 years or more.

Figure 2.13: Home ownership

![Home ownership chart]

Number of respondents: 410.

Question asked: Is your home owned or rented?
Household size has remained consistent since 2010, with the average household containing 3-4 people

2.37. Household size remains broadly similar since 2010, despite some changes in housing type and ownership. For example, the average number of people living in a household is 3.55 in 2018, compared with 3.29 in 2010.

Figure 2.14: Number of people living in household

![Bar chart showing number of people living in household](chart)

Number of respondents: 398.

Question asked: How many people are there in your household (including yourself and any children)?
Health
Migrants report high positive levels of health and low levels of disability and caring roles

2.38. In the 2018 survey, 84% of migrants said their health is at least good, compared with 88% in 2010.

2.39. In addition, just 3% of migrants said they are disabled (2% in 2010) and 5% said they are carers (1% in 2010). These figures are below those in the wider population.

2.40. This positive self-reported health is closely related to age and the relatively low age of migrants helps account for the high positive levels of self-reported health.

Figure 2.15: Health

Number of respondents: 402.
Question asked: How is your health in general?

![Health Survey Chart](chart.png)
Section 3: Length of stay and reasons for migration

Introduction
3.1. This section presents findings about the length of stay of migrants and their reasons for migration to the UK and Suffolk.

Length of stay
Most migrants on arrival in the UK move straight to Suffolk and most have lived in the area for three years or more

3.2. The majority of migrants in the 2018 survey sample have lived in the UK for three years or more (61%) and in Suffolk for three years or more (55%). Length of stay for the UK and Suffolk are closely matched showing that most migrants living in Suffolk came straight to the area on arrival in the UK.9

3.3. Migrants from the EU8 countries are more likely to have lived longer in Suffolk than migrants from the EU2. For example, 76% of Polish people have lived in Suffolk for three years or more compared with 34% of Romanians and only 6% of Polish people had arrived in the last year compared with 33% of Romanians.

Figure 3.1: Length of stay in UK and Suffolk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 3 months</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months to 1 year</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1 year but less than 2 years</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2 years but less than 3 years</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents to each question.
Question asked: How long have you lived in the United Kingdom? / How long have you lived in Suffolk?

---

9 These results are not directly comparable with those from 2010 because the 2010 survey targeted migrants that had arrived within the previous three years to understand the experience of new arrivals, given that the EU8 had acceded to the EU in 2004 and the EU2 in 2007 and migration from the EU was relatively recent at the time. This was no longer the case in 2018 and consequently migrants that have lived in the UK for longer were engaged in the research to capture the perceptions of the maturing migrant population as well as new arrivals.
**Reasons for migration**

**Most migrants migrate for work, consistent with 2010**

3.4. In the 2018 survey, 79% of migrants moved for work (86% 2010). 6% moved to be with friends, 5% with a partner and 4% to study (13% aged 18-24 migrated to study compared with 2% of older residents).

**Figure 3.2: Reasons for migration**

![Chart showing reasons for migration]

Number of respondents: 402.

Question asked: What were your reasons for moving to the United Kingdom? Respondents could select more than one answer.

3.5. The following quote highlights that work, combined with contacts in the UK, attract migrants:

“There isn’t much work in Romania. We had friends here and my daughter was here and so we knew there would be more opportunities for us as a family. We knew it would be quite easy to find work here because we knew people here already that would help us.” Male, Romanian
Work opportunities, increasingly combined with the magnet of family and friends draw migrants to Suffolk

3.6. In the 2018 survey, 59% of migrants moved to Suffolk for a particular job (77% in 2010) and 30% to be with friends and family already in the area (21% in 2010). This change since 2010 may reflect that over time migrant communities have become established in Suffolk and act as magnets to friends and families to migrate to the area. It may also reflect that employers are reaching out less to potential migrants abroad, because they can meet their employment needs from within the existing migrant communities and referrals to friends and families of existing migrant employees.

Figure 3.3: Reasons for moving to Suffolk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For a particular job</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As my friends/family were already here</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a particular course</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents: 396.
Question asked: And why in particular did you move to Suffolk? Respondents could select more than one answer.

3.7. The combination of work and established communities attracting migrants to Suffolk is highlighted below, helping new migrants overcome barriers to employment, housing and language difficulties:

“I’d never heard of Ipswich or Suffolk before, but my friend was here and they told me to come. They said they could help me find work and when I first came here I stayed with them. It was made easy for me. My English wasn’t very good when I first arrived, so it helped to know someone here so they could help you settle.” Female, Polish
**Intention to stay**
As migrants become established, they are increasingly likely to stay in the UK for longer as they establish roots

3.8. In the 2018 survey, 27% of migrants intend to stay in the UK permanently, compared with 12% in 2010 and, similarly, 20% intend to stay for over five years compared with 13% in 2010.

3.9. The intention to stay is closely linked with how long migrants have lived in the UK. For example, 35% of migrants that have lived in the UK for three years or more intend to stay permanently, compared with 14% that have lived in the UK for under three years. This greater likelihood of staying in the UK reflects the growing maturity and established nature of the migrant population.

**Figure 3.4: Intention to stay in UK**

![Graph showing percentage distribution of intention to stay in the UK for different length of stays between 2010 and 2018.]

Number of respondents: 410.
Question asked: How much longer do you intend to stay in the United Kingdom?
The longer a migrant has lived in Suffolk the more likely they intend to remain in the area

3.10. In the 2018 survey, 40% of migrants intend to remain in Suffolk for all of their remaining stay in the UK, compared with 26% in 2010. 43% intend to spend most of their time in Suffolk, compared to 35% in 2010.

3.11. As with the intention to stay in the UK, the intention to remain in Suffolk is closely linked with how long migrants have lived in the UK and Suffolk. For example, 50% of migrants that have lived in Suffolk for three years or more intend to remain in Suffolk for all of their remaining stay in the UK, compared with 27% that have lived in Suffolk for under three years. Again, this reflects that an increasingly established migrant population are putting down roots in Suffolk.

**Figure 3.5: Intention to stay in Suffolk**

![Chart showing intention to stay in Suffolk]

Number of respondents: 404.
Question asked: How much of this stay do you expect to be living in Suffolk?

3.12. The intention to stay in the UK and Suffolk because migrants have established roots, is highlighted below:

“I want to stay here [UK and Suffolk]. This is my home now. I have a job, a house, friends and my children were born here and go to school here. There is nothing for me from where I came from. We think we can make a good life for ourselves here.” Female, Portuguese
Section 4: Brexit

Introduction
4.1. This section presents findings about the impact of Brexit on migrants.

Informed about Brexit
Most migrants feel informed about Brexit and its implications, although notable minorities are not well informed

4.2. The majority of migrants (54%) feel at least quite well informed about the UK’s plans to leave the EU (the survey was conducted in November 2018), while 42% do not feel informed.

4.3. Half of migrants (50%) feel informed about the process for staying in the UK and 41% do not feel informed.

4.4. Migrants that have lived in the UK for longer are better informed. For example, 77% of migrants that have lived in the UK for 5 years or more feel informed about the process for staying in the UK, compared with 39% of other migrants.

4.5. Similarly, migrants that said they speak English well are better informed. For example, 62% of migrants that said they speak English well feel informed about the process for staying in the UK, compared with 34% of other migrants.

Figure 4.1: Informed about Brexit plans and process for staying in UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How well informed do you feel about Brexit and the UK’s plans to leave the EU? (408)</th>
<th>How well informed are you about the process for staying in the UK i.e. your rights to remain? (404)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well informed</td>
<td>Quite well informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents to each question.
Impact of Brexit

Brexit has had an impact on the majority of migrants, with about a quarter considering options to leave the UK, although migrants that feel informed are less likely to consider leaving

4.6. The majority of migrants said that Brexit had at least some impact on them (17% big impact and 46% some impact). Interestingly, migrants that feel less informed are less likely to say that Brexit has had an impact on them (i.e. perhaps ignorance is bliss). For example, 45% of migrants that do not feel informed about the process to stay in the UK said that Brexit has had an impact on them, compared with 82% of migrants that feel informed.

4.7. In response, 16% of migrants have applied for the permanent right to stay and 14% for citizenship. 30% have sought information or advice, while 24% have considered options to move away from the UK. Migrants that are better informed are less likely to consider options to move away from the UK. For example, 12% of migrants that feel informed about the process to stay in the UK have considered options to move away, compared with 33% of other migrants.

Figure 4.2: Impact of Brexit

![Impact of Brexit Diagram]

Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents to each question. Respondents could select more than one answer to the second question.

4.8. Respondents were asked to identify the information or support they would find helpful about Brexit:

- Information about how Brexit may affect them: 40%
- Know more about settlement rights: 23%
- The process for staying in the UK: 18%
- The timescale for the UK’s withdrawal: 10%
4.9. The above results are reflected in the following comments by stakeholders and migrants, some of whom used words such as being ‘scared’, ‘confused’ and ‘uncertain’, although ultimately most migrants said they thought it would ‘be OK’ and are philosophical about it:

“Brexit has caused a lot of confusion, which is the main problem. Some people are concerned about deportation, others about their settlement rights and how Brexit will affect their rights to access services like schools and health services. People require advice about all this and we’re helping people with their settlement status.” Stakeholder

“[Brexit] is scary. I don’t know what is going to happen. I don’t want to have to leave, I want to stay in the UK, this is my home. I hear lots of things, but I don’t really know what I need to do to stay here or if I can stay here.” Female, Lithuanian

“It’s the uncertainty and confusion that is the problem. I think it will be OK, and we’ll be able to stay but I don’t really know what we’ll need to do to make sure we can stay.” Female, Romanian

“I’m not worried. I think we will be able to stay and we will get residency. Even if we don’t it won’t be the end of the world, we can go back to Romania or somewhere else in Europe. But a lot of our friends are worried because they don’t know what’s happening.” Male, Romanian

“The main impact for us has been the trouble and cost of getting our residency papers. We know we can stay, but we were worried for a while so we invested the time and money to make sure we’d be OK.” Male, Polish
Section 5: Satisfaction and access to services

Introduction

5.1. This section presents findings about satisfaction with living in Suffolk and access to local support and services.

Satisfaction with the local area

Most migrants are satisfied with Suffolk as a place to live, consistent with 2010

5.2. In the 2018 survey, 79% of migrants are at least satisfied with the local area as a place to live and 2% dissatisfied. This compares to 55% of residents in general that are satisfied with their place to live, as identified in the 2016 Suffolk Residents’ Survey (this was a postal survey and so like for like comparison is problematic due to the different data collection methods).

Figure 5.1: Satisfaction with local area

Number of respondents: 408.
Question asked: Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your local area as a place to live?

5.3. The following quote summarises migrants’ satisfaction with living in Suffolk, the reasons why and how this encourages them to stay in the area:

“I really like living here. There are more opportunities here than back in Romania. Everything is good here, the doctors, the hospitals, the streets, the shops. It is all better. I feel very grateful to be here. I want to live here for the rest of my life. I think I can have a good life here.” Male, Romanian
Safety

Most migrants feel safe outside

5.4. Over three quarters (78%) of migrants feel safe outside, and 5% feel unsafe.

Figure 5.2: Safety when outside

![Safety when outside graph]

Number of respondents: 394 (excludes ‘don’t know’ responses).

Question asked: How safe or unsafe do you feel when outside in your local area?
Satisfaction with the local public services

Most migrants are satisfied with local public services

5.5. Across all key public services, migrants have high levels of satisfaction and low levels of dissatisfaction. For example, 85% of migrants are at least fairly satisfied with local public services overall, and none are dissatisfied.

5.6. These results are consistent or an improvement upon the level of satisfaction in 2010: 78% were satisfied with their local G.P in 2010 compared with 87% in 2018 and 76% were satisfied with their local hospital in 2010 compared with 78% in 2018. The exception to this is satisfaction with the dentist, which has declined from 73% satisfied/6% dissatisfied to 58% satisfied/13% dissatisfied.

5.7. In addition, in 2018, 92% had registered with a G.P. compared with 80% in 2010. This perhaps reflects a more established migrant population (for example, 96% of those that have lived in Suffolk for three years or more are registered with a G.P compared with 86% of other migrants).

Figure 5.3: Satisfaction with services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Fairly satisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Not used service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your local Doctor/G.P (406)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your local dentist (404)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your local hospital (406)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Police (404)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacies in the local area (408)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools (404)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local public services overall (398)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents to each question. Please note that the satisfaction figures are based on those respondents that use the service and also excludes ‘don’t know’ responses.

Question asked: How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following public services in your local area?

5.8. Migrants’ in the in-depth interviews spoke positively about public services and key local amenities:

“My children go to school here and they really like it. The school are good at trying to help them fit in and help them with their English.”
Female, Polish

“We have everything we need here. The doctors are good and we feel safe here. The public services are better than at home.” Female, Romanian

5.9. One migrant hinted at why slightly more respondents were dissatisfied with dentists than other services:

“The services here are good, but the only problem are the dentists. They’re just so expensive and I don’t think they’re as good as they are back home. So I just wait to have my check-ups when I go home to visit family.” Female, Polish
Access to services

Most migrants are aware of key services

5.10. Migrants are aware of key services as follows:
- Local bus services: 95% aware and 72% have used.
- Sports leisure services: 90% aware and 36% have used.
- Libraries: 93% aware and 45% have used.
- Parks/open spaces: 92% aware and 68% have used.
- Housing information/advice: 90% aware and 28% have used.
- ESOL/language services: 88% aware and 27% have used.
- Adult education: 84% aware and 24% have used.
- Children’s centres: 87% aware and 20% have used.
- Benefits and advice services: 85% aware and 18% have used.

Figure 5.4: Awareness and use of key services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>I am not aware of it</th>
<th>I am aware of it but do not know much about it</th>
<th>I know about it but have not used it</th>
<th>I have used</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local bus services (396)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport/leisure facilities (396)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries (396)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and open spaces (406)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on housing/housing advice (404)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL/language services (406)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education (excluding ESOL) (400)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s centres (398)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and advice services (400)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents to each question.

Question asked: Are you aware of or have you used any of the following?
Only a small proportion of migrants find it difficult to access local public services, although language is the main barrier to accessing services

5.11. 48% of migrants said they find it easy to access the services they require and just 6% said they find it difficult. This compares in 2010 with 52% that said it was easy to access services and 11% that said it was difficult.

5.12. Language affects ease of access, with 57% of migrants that speak English well stating that they found it easy to access public services, compared to 40% of other migrants.

5.13. Most migrants find out about services through word of mouth (i.e. their existing communities and networks), cited by 70%.

**Figure 5.5: Accessing key services**

![Accessing key services chart]

Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents to each question.

5.14. Respondents were asked about the barriers they face in accessing local public services. In line with the above finding, language was cited as the main barrier:

- Language: 43% (26% in 2010)
- Not knowing what services are available: 31% (24% in 2010)
- Not knowing where to go: 24% (12% in 2010)
- Not being eligible: 7% (5% in 2010)
- Discrimination from staff because of nationality, race or background: 2% (3% in 2010)
- Unhelpful staff: 2% (3% in 2010)

5.15. 27% of migrants said there were not any barriers and just 2% said they or their family or friends have needs that are not being met by local public services.
5.16. The following quotes summarise how migrants find out about and access services and the barriers that can be faced:

“My friends told me and helped me find out all I needed to know, like registering with the doctor and getting a bank account. I don’t think there are many problems.” Male, Polish

“The main problem is language for me. Booking doctors’ appointments or going to the bank are problems. So I need to bring someone with me who can speak English. I have paid people to help me in the past.” Female, Romanian
Section 6: Cohesion

Introduction

6.1. This section presents findings about rights and responsibilities, community cohesion and discrimination.

Rights and responsibilities

Most migrants know their rights and responsibilities, although there is scope to improve knowledge and information, targeting newer arrivals and those that do not speak English well.

6.2. Migrants said the following about their rights and responsibilities:

- Knowing what to do with litter and rubbish: 80% at least quite well, 19% not well.
- Knowing the days to put out rubbish/recycling: 79% at least quite well, 19% not well.
- Knowing what can and cannot recycle: 77% at least quite well, 22% not well.
- Knowing how to get rid of bulky items: 70% at least quite well, 27% not well.
- Knowing when to visit G.P or contact 111: 57% at least quite well, 39% not well.
- Keeping noise to a minimum: 82% at least quite well, 17% not well.
- Knowing that hanging around on streets can intimidate some people: 77% at least quite well, 21% not well.
- Rules about car tax and insurance: 75% at least quite well, 22% not well.
- Minimum wage: 57% at least quite well, 38% not well.

6.3. Migrants that speak English well or have lived in the UK for longer are more likely than other migrants to know their rights and responsibilities. For example, 92% of migrants that speak English well said they know what to do with litter and rubbish, compared to 69% of other migrants. And 99% of migrants that have lived in the UK for 5 years or more know the days to put out rubbish and recycling, compared to 73% of other migrants.

Figure 6.1: Rights and responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What I have to do with litter and rubbish (408)</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Quite well</th>
<th>Not that well</th>
<th>Not well at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The days I need to put out my rubbish and recycling (408)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I can and cannot recycle (402)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to get rid of bulky items (396)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I should visit my G.P or contact 111 instead of visiting the hospital if I have a medical problem (404)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping noise to a minimum so not to disturb neighbours (404)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How hanging around on the streets in groups may intimidate some people (400)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules about car tax and insurance (398)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The minimum amount I can be paid under the UK minimum wage (402)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in brackets are the number of respondents to each question.

Question asked: How well do you know about each of the following?
6.4. The following quotes from a stakeholder and a migrant summarise the challenges that migrants can face in understanding their rights and responsibilities and how this can affect cohesion:

“It can be difficult for some migrants, the language and cultural barriers can make it particularly difficult for them to settle. They are not used to some of the customs and things you have to do here, so they need help to learn about what they have to do to live here and be a good citizen.” Stakeholder

“You have to learn by fault about what you can and can’t do and what you should do. Simple things like putting your bins out and what to put in your bins. We want to do it right and to fit in, but it takes time and no one really tells you what you can and can’t do.” Male, Romanian
Getting on well with different communities

Most migrants agree that they get on well with people from different backgrounds, consistent with 2010

6.5. In the 2018 survey, 89% of migrants definitely or tend to agree that they get on well with people from other backgrounds (87% in 2010).

Figure 6.2: Getting on well with different communities

On average over 90% of migrants have friends of the same nationality as them in the local area, although approximately 50% of them also have friends of other nationalities including 28% British and Irish.

Similarly, where migrants live with other people, approximately 25% live with people from different nationalities to their own.

39% of married migrants are married to a UK born UK citizen, which equates to 18% of all migrants in the 2018 survey sample.

The above results are reflected in the following comments by stakeholders and migrants:

“In my experience migrants tend to integrate well. Some don’t and language can be the biggest barrier. So it’s important to provide help for people to integrate and navigate effectively around the UK public and private services. We also need to improve their English so they can be self-sufficient in the future and integrate better.” Stakeholder
“I feel like I belong. I’ve never experienced any problems from other people here. Maybe after Brexit it felt a bit strange at first, but that was in my mind and I didn’t experience any problems. I have friends from all over the world, including British friends, so I feel like this is home now.”
Female, Polish
Discrimination

Most migrants have not experienced discrimination, but it may have affected just under a fifth of migrants

6.10. In the 2018 survey, 3% said they have definitely been discriminated against based on their religion, race or country of origin and 15% said they think so. This compares to 6% and 10% respectively in 2010.

6.11. Migrants that have lived longer in the UK are more likely to experience discrimination, which is probably because they have had a greater chance of being exposed to it. For example, 23% of migrants that have lived in the UK for 5 years or more think they have experienced discrimination, compared with 15% of other migrants.

Figure 6.3: Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes definitely</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think so</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents: 398 (excludes don’t know responses).

Question asked: Whilst living in the local area, have you ever felt discriminated against because of your religion, race or your country of origin?

6.12. Some stakeholders highlighted increased community tensions and discrimination as a result of Brexit:

“Brexit has led some people to think they can articulate what they were probably always thinking. There is definitely a sense of antipathy towards migrants from some local people. It has caused tension and anxiety between migrants and other residents and I understand there has been an increase in hate crime and far right sentiment.”

Stakeholder
Section 7: ‘Settled’ residents survey results

Introduction
7.1. This section presents results of the survey amongst 100 ‘settled’ residents (the indigenous population).\textsuperscript{10} The relatively small sample size means that the findings have to be treated indicatively rather than conclusively or generalised to the wider population.

Impact
Suffolk residents have positive perceptions of the impact of migration on the local area, economy and culturally
7.2. Most residents have a positive perception of the impact of migration on the local area in general – 74% positive, 10% neutral, 16% negative. This compares to Ipsos-Mori’s March 2018 national result of 44% positive, 20% neutral and 30% negative (6% didn’t know).\textsuperscript{11}

7.3. Similarly, most Suffolk residents believe migration is good for the local economy – 71% said it is good, 9% neutral and 20% said it is bad. This compares to the national picture as identified through the 2017 British Social Attitudes survey, with 40% stating it is good, 22% neutral and 36% bad.

7.4. Lastly, most Suffolk residents believe migration enriches the local area culturally – 66% said it enriches it, 16% were neutral and 18% said migration undermines the area culturally. This compares to the 2017 British Social Attitudes results of 43% enriched, 17% neutral and 38% undermined.

7.5. The above results are summarised by the following comments made by respondents:

“Migration is good – it is good for the economy and I like their food.” Male, aged 35-44

“Migrants tend to be hard working and skilled, they do jobs others don’t want to do and they give something back to the local area.” Female, aged 45-54

“Migrants take away jobs from local people, especially young people. We need to prioritise British people first.” Male, aged 55-64

\textsuperscript{10} To qualify for inclusion in the survey, respondents had to not fit the definition of a migrant used in the migrant survey and also had to have lived in Suffolk for at least a year.

\textsuperscript{11} The national results are included for context, however comparison should be caveated because the national surveys use different data collection methods, sample sizes and ask questions about migration and its impact nationally rather than locally as in the case of this survey.
Number of respondents: 100.

Questions asked: On a scale of 0 to 10, has migration had a positive or negative impact on your area? (0 is “very negative”, 10 is “very positive”) / On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is extremely bad and 10 is extremely good, would you say it is generally bad or good for the local economy that migrants come to the area from other countries? / And on a scale of 0 to 10, would you say that the cultural life locally is generally undermined or enriched by migrants coming to live here from other countries? As per convention, a score of 0-4 is labelled negative, 5 as neutral and 6-10 as positive.
Pressure on services

More residents believe migration increases pressure on public services than said it reduces pressure

7.6. In contrast to the above positive perceptions of the impact of migration, Suffolk residents are less positive about the impact of migration on public services. 26% said that migration reduces the pressure on public services, while in contrast 43% said it increases pressure.

Figure 7.2: Pressure on services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduces pressure a lot</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces pressure a little</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither increases nor reduces pressure</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases pressure a little</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases pressure a lot</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents: 100.

Question asked: Many migrants work in the public sector, in hospitals, schools and for local government, for which they pay taxes. While living here migrants also make use of public services, such as the NHS and schools. Do you think that, on balance, migration to your area reduces or increases pressure on local public services?

7.7. The above result is summarised by the following comments made by respondents:

“I don’t have a problem with migration in itself, but I think it does place pressure on public services, which are already stretched. This is more to do with public sector funding than migration.” Female, aged 25-34

“In my experience, most migrants are hard working and independent people, but naturally they will put pressure on schools and hospitals just because they increase the number of people living in the area. So the Council needs to make sure it is prepared.” Male, aged 45-54
Cohesion

Most residents believe there is community cohesion

7.8. Most Suffolk residents agree that people from different backgrounds get on well together – 20% definitely agree and 52% tend to agree, with 15% tending to disagree and 13% definitely disagreeing.

7.9. This compares with migrants’ perceptions as follows - 28% definitely agree and 61% tend to agree, 10% tend to disagree and 1% definitely disagree.

Figure 7.3: Cohesion

Number of respondents: 91 (excludes don't know responses).
Question asked: To what extent do you agree or disagree that your local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?
Section 8: Migrant drop-in service

Introduction and background

8.1. This section presents the light-touch evaluation findings of the migrant drop-in service managed by GYROS (Great Yarmouth Refugee and Outreach Support Limited).

8.2. A migrant drop-in service was running in Suffolk between October 2010 and December 2016 (delivered by a different provider to GYROS). During this period over 10,000 client interactions took place providing information and signposting about any topic. In the year to November 2016 the previous migrant drop-in service had 1,690 client interactions, which was an average of 141 interactions per month.

8.3. Suffolk County Council received funding of £135,000 from the Controlling Migration Fund to deliver a migrant drop-in service across Suffolk between 2017 and 2019.12

8.4. GYROS (www.gyros.org.uk) was awarded the contract and the service began receiving its first enquiries in September 2017.

Aims and structure of the service

8.5. The drop-in service aims and intended outputs, adapted from the service specification, are:

- The drop-in service will deliver multi-lingual information and advice about topics including: housing, benefits, education, employment, health and other services including basic immigration advice to ensure that migrant service users receive high quality advice from advisers who can converse with them in a shared language other than English.
- The drop-in service will operate at weekends and evenings and may include other days of the week at times that meet the needs of migrant communities.
- The drop-in service will ensure, in addition to responding to the issues that the service users bring to the drop-in sessions, that the advisers proactively engage with the clients re checking awareness of the NHS, registering with a GP; linking families to children’s centres; highlighting topics such as driving regulations and other rights and responsibilities when living in the UK.
- The success criteria will include a minimum of 120 interactions at drop-in sessions countywide per month averaged over each year. The service will need to keep a count of how many people are signposted to the drop-in by other organisations and the topics discussed to demonstrate the reduction in pressure on frontline service providers.

8.6. The intended outcomes include:

- The service helps reduce pressure on appointments and interpreting costs.
- There are reduced community tensions in areas where there are high concentrations of migrants alongside resident communities.
- There is a greater understanding among migrant communities regarding rights and responsibilities.
- This service is intended to help meet need until migrants have developed English skills to enable them to access services independently and become self-sufficient.

---

12 The funding covers both delivery of the service, as well as other costs including funding this research to help assess the impact of the funding on migrants and residents in Suffolk.
8.7. The aims of the service are summarised by this stakeholder:

“It is important to provide advice which is free, specialist and tailored to migrants and where the advisors understand the issues and speak the languages. In short filling the gap between public services and migrants and meaning that people do not have to use poor or paid for advice from within their communities. This can only help provide better advice to resolve people’s issues, help migrants integrate better, understand their rights and responsibilities, become self-sufficient and reduce pressure on public services.” Stakeholder

8.8. The service operates in four areas: Ipswich, Lowestoft, Bury St. Edmunds and Haverhill. Attempts at providing the service in Brandon were abandoned due to low levels of demand. Details of service provision as of February 2019 are:

- Ipswich: Mondays 10:30 - 12:30 and 13:00 - 16:00 / Saturdays 10:30 - 12:00.
- Lowestoft: Tuesdays 10:30 - 12:30 and 13:00 - 16:00.
- Bury St Edmunds: Every 4th Tuesday of each month 17:00 - 19:00.
- Haverhill: Every 4th Tuesday of each month.
- The service also provides outreach to two schools in Ipswich.

Outputs

8.9. The migrant drop-in service had 1,568 interactions since inception, mainly across two locations, equating to an average of 98 per month. Interactions are increasing each quarter – for example, 285 in quarter 1 2018, 367 in quarter 2 2018, 376 in quarter 3 2018 and 387 in quarter 4 2018.

8.10. 43 different nationalities have been engaged, mainly Portuguese, Romanian, Polish, Lithuanian and Latvian.

8.11. The main subjects are benefits, tax credits and pensions (31%), immigration (29%) (which is mainly Brexit related advice and helping people apply for the right to remain), employment and education advice (10%), advice with paying utility and other bills (7%) and debt advice (6%).

8.12. Almost three-quarters of people (74%) refer via themselves or friends, but in addition referral came from outreach (9%), Citizens Advice (6%) and the remainder from approximately 20 different organisations/groups including councils, social services and community/voluntary organisations.

8.13. There is a mix of employment status, gender, age and marital status among users of the service.

---

13 The migrant drop-in service said this is because the year gap in service provision between the two different providers led to migrants in the area seeking out advice through informal sources within their communities, consequently reducing demand.
### Figure 8.1: Outputs – September 2017 to December 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key outputs</th>
<th>Number/%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (September to December)</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2018</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2018</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2018</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 2018</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2017-2018</td>
<td>1568 (1022 in Ipswich and 428 in Lowestoft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per month</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationalities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese (inc. from East Timor and Guinea Bissau)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of different nationalities engaged</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits, tax credits and pensions</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and education advice</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice with utility and other bills</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referral sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-referral</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Advice</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed/self-employed</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-34</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Migrant drop-in service via Suffolk County Council as part of monthly grant monitoring requirements.
**Awareness and use**

8.14. According to the 2018 survey, over a fifth of migrants (22%) are aware of the migrant drop-in service, including 2% that have used it. Results are consistent across different nationalities and length of stay. Awareness is lowest in St. Edmundsbury and Suffolk Coastal districts.

8.15. 7 of the 8 respondents that said they used the service live in Ipswich. 6 of the 8 were satisfied with the support they received.

![Figure 8.2: Awareness and use](image)

*Number of respondents: 408.
Question asked: Have you heard about the information and advice service available to you, the migrant drop in service run by GYROS?*

**Outcomes**

8.16. In-depth interviews with people that have used the migrant drop-in service provides evidence of high levels of satisfaction, effective enquiry resolution, helping people resolve financial and immigration issues, which in turn helps improve their lives and their emotional wellbeing. There is also evidence of helping people develop their skills and experience and supporting people into work, providing a holistic service.

8.17. There is also evidence that the migrant drop-in service is helping people to settle and integrate and taking pressure off other services. This includes directly taking pressure off Citizens Advice, Job Centre Plus and the Department of Work and Pensions, but also indirectly off other services by helping people resolve issues that, if left unattended, could result in multiple contacts to multiple organisations and potentially crisis.

8.18. The following mini-case studies, based on ten in-depth interviews with people that have used the migrant drop-in service, highlight the above points:
| Gender | Female |
| Age | 30s |
| Nationality | Polish |
| Location | Ipswich |
| Referral | Friend |
| Issue | Universal Credit, residency status and volunteering |
| In own words: | “In the past I got help from Citizens Advice, but I thought it would be better to come here [the migrant drop-in service] because they deal with people in my situation. They helped me appeal successfully to get Universal Credit and they’re helping me with my residency status. I’m also volunteering with them now to provide language support. I think they provide very good help, they resolved everything for me and I’m in a better place now.” |

| Gender | Male |
| Age | 30s/40s |
| Nationality | Hungarian |
| Location | Ipswich |
| Referral | Citizens Advice |
| Issue | Residency status |
| In own words: | “I used to go to Citizens Advice for help, but I always felt like they were fobbing me off. I came here [migrant drop-in service] because I wanted to get permanent residence, I was worried about Brexit. I’ve been here a while and my case was complex, but they were very helpful and patient and managed to get permanent residence for me. I feel much better now because it means I can stay here with my son.” |

<p>| Gender | Female |
| Age | 20s |
| Nationality | Romanian |
| Location | Ipswich |
| Referral | Friend |
| Issue | Universal Credit |
| In own words: | “Before I came here [migrant drop-in service] I used to get help from friends or just try to do things on my own. But my language isn’t very good and I’ve had to cancel G.P. appointments because I can’t speak to the doctor. I once paid someone to go to the G.P and bank with me. So coming here is really good. They speak my language and they helped me, I like that it is free and you can trust their advice. I feel confident they will deal with my enquiry properly and resolve it for me.” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender: Female</th>
<th>Gender: Male/Female (Husband and wife)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: 30s</td>
<td>Age: 40s/50s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality: Polish</td>
<td>Nationality: Romanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Ipswich</td>
<td>Location: Ipswich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral: Friend</td>
<td>Referral: Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue: Universal Credit</td>
<td>Issue: Universal Credit, letters, utility bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In own words:</td>
<td>In own words:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My friends used to help me in the past, some take money, others don’t. They [the migrant drop-in service] do more than just translate. The language support is important, but they really understand the situation and they help resolve issues. I think it is a very good service and I’m glad it is here.”</td>
<td>“Language is the main barrier for us. I heard about it [the migrant drop-in service] through a friend who had a positive experience. We’ve also had a positive experience. They’ve done everything we needed and helped resolve our problems. If it wasn’t here, I’m not sure where we’d go for help or how good it would be.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 60s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality: Lithuanian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Ipswich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral: Friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue: Pensions, letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In own words:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My English isn’t very good, so they’ve [the migrant drop-in service] helped me with lots of different things. They helped me apply for a pension and with translating letters. Before I used to get help from friends, but I didn’t know if I could trust it and sometimes I had to pay. This [the migrant drop-in service] has been really good, 10 out of 10, they are very nice, very helpful and helped me in lots of ways and at different times.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20s/30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Apply for residency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In own words:</td>
<td>“In the past I would have paid for help from lawyers or gone to the Council or Citizens Advice. It’s [the migrant drop-in service] been a big help to me. I was confused about what to do and they explained it all, helped me get the residency card and resolved my issue. I hope this service carries on for others in the future.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20s/30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Universal credit and residency status for child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In own words:</td>
<td>“I don’t know what I would have done without their help. I’d have had to keep going back to the job centre to ask about Universal Credit, but they weren’t helping me. This [migrant drop-in service] helped me apply for it and we got it, which has helped us financially. And they helped me get residency for my daughter, which makes her future here more secure. I don’t know what I would have done without their help.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Helped with C.V, volunteering and to get first paid job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In own words:</td>
<td>“It’s a really important service, helping with translation and dealing with complex issues. Even if you can speak English they help you. I volunteered with them and they helped with my C.V. They helped me get my first paid job and I’ve gained so much from them for that.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender: Female
Age: 20s
Nationality: Portuguese
Location: Lowestoft
Referral: Word of mouth
Issue: Apply for national Insurance number, Universal Credit, Utility bills

In own words:
“My main problem is my English. I don’t understand everything, especially all the forms and how to apply for everything. They [the migrant drop-in service] have always helped me. They explain everything and I always feel assured that they will resolve everything. They really help you settle in and deal with any problems you may have.”

8.19. Migrant drop-in service staff (from herein referred to as stakeholders) and other stakeholders identified several positive outcomes, including meeting needs and demand, overcoming language barriers, understanding the cultural background of migrants and their experiences, providing good quality advice that resolves issues, helping people integrate and reducing pressure on other services

Meeting needs and demand

“There is clearly a need for such a service, shown by the numbers of people that are using it. Without this service, these people would not have their needs met and issues resolved, which could affect their ability to integrate or they could become a crisis issue – in both instances they would be putting pressure on other services”
Stakeholder

Overcoming language and cultural barriers to provide holistic advice and help migrants settle and integrate

“They’re [GYROS] very experienced and understand the cultural backgrounds of migrants and their experiences and issues, and importantly are able to speak in multiple languages. So they’re well placed to provide the right type of support to effectively resolve people’s issues.” Stakeholder

“I think a drop-in service is important, and that it should be free and delivered by people that understand migrants culturally and linguistically. From what I’ve seen so far I think they [migrant drop-in service] do a good job. They know and understand migrants and they’re helping people with their problems by providing high quality advice.”
Stakeholder

“It is more than just translation – it is the cultural understanding of the background of the person and their experience as a migrant. We provide a holistic service. The problem people present with is normally obvious, but there can be other fundamental issues that need to be
addressed to really help people settle and become independent.”
Stakeholder

“It’s an important service, it removes language barriers and helps
people navigate the different and complex systems and bureaucracy,
which they’re not used to. This helps them integrate, get into work and
helps them avoid falling into a crisis situation and putting pressure on
other services.” Stakeholder

Reducing pressure on other services

“There was a gap in provision between the current migrant drop-in
service and the old one and they were coming to us and other services,
which was placing a lot of pressure on our services and other public
services. We were dealing with immigration, Brexit, benefits and debt
issues. We can deal with all this and some people prefer to work with
us, but in most cases we can now refer them to the migrant drop-in
service, especially where people don’t speak English. I feel that the
migrant drop-in service is complementary to the other provision already
available, it takes the pressure off us, especially with non-English
speakers and provides free and specialist support from advisers that
really understand migrant issues and the culture and languages of
migrants. This can only be a good thing and help resolve issues better
and take pressure off public services and other advice services.”
Stakeholder

Learning and the future

8.20. Stakeholders supported the continuation of the migrant drop-in service in the future,
especially in light of the potential consequences of Brexit and reduced funding for public
and voluntary sector advice services.

8.21. Stakeholders wanted the focus to be on securing funding and helping the service increase
its reach, numbers and offer with the ultimate aim of helping migrants become independent
and self-sufficient. Some stakeholders also said they would like to see the service enhance
its outreach and promotional activity. One stakeholder also said they would like to see the
service work more closely with local partners (different council departments, other public
services, other local advice services and other community and voluntary organisations):

Support for continuing the service to meet need and demand and
reduce pressure on other services

“The service needs to continue and Brexit and its consequences may
only increase the need for a while as people seek help to get settled
status and to deal with any tensions that may arise.” Stakeholder

“With public and advice services being squeezed all the time, and
migration continuing and changing, especially with Brexit on the
horizon, I think it is essential that a service like the migrant drop-in
service continues. Otherwise, where will all these people go for help? It
will only put pressure on already stretched services.” Stakeholder
Secure funding to increase the service

“The service needs to carry on but we need security of funding for the future once the existing funding runs out. That is the priority before we can start growing or changing the service.” Stakeholder

Increase reach and numbers and grow the service to help people become independent and self-sufficient

“I’d like to see the numbers increased and I think there is more that could be done to promote the service, especially in areas outside of Ipswich and Lowestoft. I’d like to see the service increase its reach.” Stakeholder

“I’d like to see the service carry-on and grow – more drop-in sessions in different locations to increase its reach and deal with the demand because we sometimes have to turn people away. And I’d like to see it increase the range of services, advice is one thing but to really empower people and help them become independent I’d like to see ESOL classes, training and job clubs. The overall aim is to get to a place where a migrant advice service is not needed, because people have become independent and self-sufficient.” Stakeholder

Partnership working

“I’d like to see closer working between different partners in the council and community so that we can reach all the people that need help and provide advice and support to help them as much as possible. We do work well with some partners, but there is more that could be done for all of us to work well together.” Stakeholder
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Introduction

Demographic overview of Suffolk

Suffolk is a large county covering approximately 1,466 square miles. It contains a mix of vibrant market towns and includes Britain’s biggest and busiest seaport in Felixstowe. The total population in mid-2017 was 757,000.

Suffolk has a larger proportion of older people compared to England. Children and young people aged under 16 make up 18% of the population (compared with 19% nationally) and adults aged 65+
make up nearly 23% (compared with 18% nationally). Over 3% (approx. 24,000) of Suffolk’s residents are aged 85 and over.¹

Over the next 25 years the population of Suffolk is expected to increase by around 10%. The number of older people will increase at a faster rate than for younger people. For example, currently 1 in 5 Suffolk residents are aged 65+ but this is expected to increase to 1 in 3.²

The limitations of using data to estimate migrant populations resident in Suffolk

There is no single data source that can comprehensively describe the resident population of Suffolk in 2018. However, by collectively looking at several data sources we can build of picture what the population is likely to look like.

This report begins with a review of Census data, which provide a detailed snapshot of the population and its characteristics. However, the Census data has limitations. The 2011 Census data was conducted seven years ago, so it doesn’t account for migration patterns since then. Also, some groups may be underrepresented in the Census for reasons such as language difficulties with completing the questionnaire.

The report goes on to consider several other data sources which, although not as comprehensive as the Census, can offer a useful guide to the migrant groups currently resident in Suffolk. Data we consider include the Suffolk School Census, National Insurance number registrations to overseas nationals, births among non-UK born mothers, and service usage figures from migrant drop-in centres and an interpretation and translation service available across the county.

National Census

Ethnic origin recorded in the 2011 Census

At the time of the 2011 Census, around 1 in 10 (9.2%) Suffolk residents were of Black or Minority Ethnic (BME) group origin i.e. any ethnic group other than White British. This proportion is lower than the East of England (14.7%) and England (20.2%). The proportion of residents from BME groups was higher in urban areas compared to rural areas. A particularly high proportion of residents from BME groups were found in areas of Forest Heath, which is likely to be associated with the United States military forces bases in the area (Figure 1). After White British, the most common ethnicities were Other White (4.4%), Asian (1.8%) and Mixed heritage (1.7%) (Table A1). Forest Heath and Ipswich were the only districts with a higher than county average proportion of residents from all BME groups; all other districts had lower than county average proportions from BME groups.
Changes in ethnic origin recorded between the 2001 Census and 2011 Census

Suffolk became more ethnically diverse between 2001 and 2011, with the proportion of residents from BME groups increasing from 6.3% to 9.2%. The number of residents from BME groups increased by 24,900 to 66,700 (an increase of 60%). Of the additional 24,900 residents from BME groups, around half were resident in Ipswich (48%) and one in five (19%) were resident in St Edmundsbury (Table A2).

The only area to see a decrease in the proportion of residents from BME groups was Forest Heath (from 23.4% to 22.8%). As noted above, this is likely to be associated with the United States military forces bases in the area.

There is no guarantee that the increasing trend in Suffolk residents from BME groups between 2001 and 2011 will continue. However, if the 60% increase continued in the period 2011 and 2021, this would equate to an additional 50,000 residents from BME groups across the county by 2021.

Main language recorded in the 2011 Census

At the time of the 2011 Census, 96.7% of Suffolk residents spoke English as their main language (679,500 out of 702,700). This is a higher proportion compared to the East of England (94.5%) and England (92.0%). Of the 23,200 residents who spoke a main language other than English, around two-thirds (15,800 people) spoke a European language and a quarter (6,400 people) spoke an Asian language.
The localities with the highest proportion of people who spoke a language other than English were Ipswich (7.6%), Forest Heath (5.5%) and St Edmundsbury (3.5%). Across all languages, Ipswich, Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury had a higher proportion of speakers than the Suffolk average. All other districts had a higher than average proportion of English speakers (Table A3).

**Suffolk School census**

**Ethnic origin recorded in the January 2018 Suffolk School Census**

At the time of the Suffolk School Census in January 2018, there were 59,100 pupils of primary school age and 43,100 of secondary school age. Across the whole county of Suffolk, around 8 in 10 (81.5%) primary school children were of White British heritage. A slightly higher proportion of secondary school pupils (84.2%) were White British. Across all school ages the second and third most common ethnic groups were Other White and Mixed heritage.

The localities with the highest proportion of primary school age children from BME groups were Ipswich (35.8%) and Forest Heath (30.9%) (Figure 2). Among secondary school age children, only Ipswich had a notably higher proportion of children from BME groups (30.5%) (Figure 3).

**Changes in ethnic origin recorded between the 2010 and 2018 Suffolk School Census**

Between 2010 and 2018 the Suffolk School Census captured a decrease in the proportion of children who are White British and a corresponding increase in the proportion of children of all other ethnic groups. The main increase in numbers were seen among White Other and Mixed heritage ethnic groups living in Ipswich and Forest Heath. The number of school age children in Suffolk from Asian, Black and Other ethnic groups have also increased over the period but from a lower starting point (Tables A4-A7).

**Main language recorded in the 2018 Suffolk School Census**

At the time of the Suffolk School Census in January 2018, more than 9 in 10 (91.4%) children attending a school in Suffolk spoke English as their main language. In order, the most commonly spoken non-English languages were Polish (1.5%), Portuguese (0.9%), Romanian (0.7%), Lithuanian (0.5%) and Bengali (0.5%). Ipswich had a higher proportion of school children speaking all non-English languages than other districts, with just two exceptions (Polish and Urdu were higher in Forest Heath).
Figure 2. Proportion of primary school age pupils attending a school by ethnic group and district, Suffolk 2018

Source: 4

Figure 3. Proportion of secondary school age pupils attending a school by ethnic group and district, Suffolk 2018

Source: 4
Changes in main language recorded between the 2010 and 2018 Suffolk School Census

Between 2010 and 2018, the proportion of children attending a school in Suffolk whose main language was English decreased from 94.7% to 91.4%. While the number of English speakers remained stable at 93,400, the additional 3,700 children attending a school spoke a language other than English. The actual number of children attending a school in Suffolk who spoke a non-English language increased by 244% to 7,960.

In 2010 a total of five non-English languages were spoken by at least 100 school children (Table A8). By 2018 this had risen to 16 languages (Table A9). In general, all non-English languages were spoken by more children in 2018 compared with 2010, except for Bengali which dropped from first to fifth most spoken non-English language spoken. The most notable increases in non-English languages were seen in European languages such as Polish, Portuguese, Romanian and Lithuanian.

General Practice registrations

General Practice (GP) surgeries record information about individuals who register to use their services. Here we present the recorded ethnic group entries of individuals registered at GP surgeries within Ipswich & East Suffolk CCG and West Suffolk CCG.

These figures should be used as an indication only because there are several caveats relating to the data quality. Data is taken from a clinical recording system which was not primarily designed for collecting population characteristics; note that ethnic group entries were incomplete for nearly 1 in 4 people (24%). The clinical recording system (called SystmOne) is used by around 80% of GPs across Suffolk; data for the remaining 20% of GPs were not available. Data was not available for Waveney. These caveats combine to mean the data are not representative of the whole county. Individuals with missing ethnic group entries are excluded from Table A8. While this means the counts will underestimate the true population, the proportions within each ethnic group can be used as a proxy.

Comparing the proportion of registered individuals in each ethnic group (Table A10) with the proportions in the 2011 Census (Table A1), there appear to be higher proportions of people from all BME groups in all districts. This suggests that the trend of increasing diversity seen between the 2001 Census and 2011 Census is continuing. There is one exception to this; the GP data suggests that Forest Heath has a lower proportion of GP registered individuals from BME groups than at the time of the 2011 Census. As noted above, this is likely to be associated with the United States military forces bases in the area.

National Insurance number registrations to adult overseas nationals entering the UK

National Insurance number registrations by district

Demand for National Insurance number registrations to overseas nationals has increased in Suffolk since 2014. Nearly all the increase in demand has been seen in Ipswich. In all other districts of Suffolk, the trend has been stable over the period 2008-18 (Figure 4).
The main caveat with this data is that a person may register in one district whilst residing elsewhere. This could account for some of the increase in Ipswich which has not been seen in other districts.

Figure 4. National Insurance number registrations to overseas nationals by district/borough in Suffolk, 2008/09 to 2017/18

Source: 5

National Insurance number registrations by country of origin

In 2010/11 nearly half of all registrations from overseas nationals were from Lithuania (18.4%), Poland (15.5%) or India (13.4%). By 2017/18, registrations from most countries were lower than the 2010/11 level except for Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary. In 2017/18, more than 4 in 10 (41.3%) registrations to overseas nationals were to Romanians. The ten most common countries of origin for National Insurance registrations are shown in Tables A11 and A12.

Consistently since 2013/14, around 4 in 5 overseas nationals registering for a National Insurance number in Suffolk are nationals of countries in the European Union (EU). During this period, the proportion of registrants from countries who have recently joined the EU, most notably Romania and Bulgaria, has increased (Figure 5). In 2013/14, 1 in 5 (22%) registrants were from EU15 countries, 2 in 5 (40%) from EU8 countries and 1 in 7 (15%) from EU2 countries. In 2017/18, 1 in 7 (15%) registrants were from EU15 countries, 1 in 5 (20%) from EU8 countries and nearly half (46%) from EU2 countries. Of the 8,831 EU2 nationals who have registered in Suffolk since 2013/14, most were Romanian (84%).a

Source: 5

EU15 countries: Ireland, Portugal, Spain, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Austria, Italy, Greece.
EU8 countries: Slovenia, Hungary, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia
EU2 countries: Romania, Bulgaria.

---
a EU15 countries: Ireland, Portugal, Spain, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Austria, Italy, Greece.
EU8 countries: Slovenia, Hungary, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia
EU2 countries: Romania, Bulgaria.
Births to non-UK born mothers

Of all live births in 2016 to mothers usually resident in Suffolk, 2 in 10 (21%) mothers were born outside the UK (1,667 out of 7,864). This proportion is lower compared to the East of England (26%) and England (29%). Districts with the highest proportion of births to mothers born outside the UK were Forest Heath (45%), Ipswich (29%) and St Edmundsbury (21%) (Figure 6).

The notably high proportion in Forest Heath is likely to be driven by families linked with the United States military bases in the district. Over a quarter of all recorded births were to mothers from the United States (Table A13). After the United States (4.1% of all births in Suffolk), the most common countries that mothers were born in were Poland (3%), Romania (1.9%) and Lithuania (1.3%).

Figure 6. Proportion of babies born to mothers born outside the UK by district/borough of usual residence, 2016
Migrant populations in Suffolk: desk research

Migrant drop-in centres

In the ten-month period September 2017 to June 2018, the migrant drop in service received 875 separate queries from 250 individuals (who accessed the service with multiple queries and/or on multiple occasions). Most individuals accessed the drop-in centres in Ipswich (60%), Lowestoft (26%) or Brandon (11%). Of the 250 individuals who accessed the migrant drop in service, around 1 in 4 were Romanian (25%) and Portuguese (23%), around 1 in 8 were Polish (14%) and Lithuanian (11%) and 1 in 20 were Latvian (5%) (Figure 7).

Of all 875 queries received, the most common issues raised were immigration (22%) and housing benefit/need (12%). The topics of enquiries received are summarised in Figure 8, with more common queries represented by a larger font size.

Figure 7. Nationality of individuals who accessed the migrant drop in centre, September 2017 to June 2018

Source: 

Source: 

Figure 8. Topics of enquiries received, September 2017 to June 2018
Figure 8. Subject of enquiries to the migrant drop in service (larger font size represents a higher number of enquiries), September 2017 to June 2018

Note: the two most common enquiry subjects (immigration and housing benefit/need) have been scaled down for formatting purposes.

Source: 7

Interpretation and translation service

In the period April to June 2018, several organisations within Suffolk accessed interpretation and translation services through INTRAN. Of all face to face translation requests, most were booked in Ipswich (51%) or Bury St Edmunds (36%). Of all fulfilled translation service requests, the most common languages translated were Romanian (25%), Polish (22%), Portuguese (13%) and Lithuanian (9%) (Figure 9). Note that 1 in 10 (10%) translation service requests related to Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children. These requests have been excluded when calculating percentages.

When only interpretation and translation services requested by Suffolk County Council are considered, the most commonly requested language was Romanian. Over the last three years the proportion of translations in Romanian has increased from 1 in every 5 (20%) request to 1 in every 3 (35%).
Figure 9. Proportion of fulfilled translation service requests in Suffolk by language translated, April to June 2018

Source: 8
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## Appendix A. Data tables

### Table A1. Number of Suffolk residents by ethnic group and district, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Babergh</th>
<th>Forest Heath</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk</th>
<th>St Edmundsbury</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal</th>
<th>Waveney</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>83,666</td>
<td>46,142</td>
<td>110,624</td>
<td>92,747</td>
<td>101,239</td>
<td>116,655</td>
<td>110,385</td>
<td>661,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>8,765</td>
<td>7,972</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>5,376</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>31,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>4,816</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>12,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>5,740</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>13,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>3,096</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>6,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All usual residents</td>
<td>87,740</td>
<td>59,748</td>
<td>133,384</td>
<td>96,731</td>
<td>111,008</td>
<td>124,298</td>
<td>115,254</td>
<td>728,163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* [3]
Table A2. Number of Suffolk residents by ethnic group and district, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Babergh</th>
<th>Forest Heath</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk</th>
<th>St Edmundsbury</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal</th>
<th>Waveney</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>80,726 (96.7)</td>
<td>42,428 (76.4)</td>
<td>106,309 (90.8)</td>
<td>84,524 (97.3)</td>
<td>93,095 (94.8)</td>
<td>110,291 (95.8)</td>
<td>109,368 (97.4)</td>
<td>626,741 (93.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>1,663 (2)</td>
<td>9,716 (17.5)</td>
<td>3,072 (2.6)</td>
<td>1,453 (1.7)</td>
<td>3,168 (3.3)</td>
<td>2,718 (2.4)</td>
<td>1,574 (1.4)</td>
<td>23,364 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>482 (0.6)</td>
<td>1,354 (2.4)</td>
<td>2,658 (2.3)</td>
<td>455 (0.5)</td>
<td>716 (0.7)</td>
<td>792 (0.7)</td>
<td>599 (0.5)</td>
<td>7,056 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>212 (0.3)</td>
<td>322 (0.6)</td>
<td>2,113 (1.8)</td>
<td>112 (0.1)</td>
<td>459 (0.5)</td>
<td>461 (0.4)</td>
<td>237 (0.2)</td>
<td>3,916 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>159 (0.2)</td>
<td>1,044 (1.9)</td>
<td>2,159 (1.8)</td>
<td>94 (0.1)</td>
<td>341 (0.3)</td>
<td>287 (0.2)</td>
<td>232 (0.2)</td>
<td>4,316 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>219 (0.3)</td>
<td>646 (1.2)</td>
<td>758 (0.6)</td>
<td>199 (0.2)</td>
<td>414 (0.4)</td>
<td>592 (0.5)</td>
<td>332 (0.3)</td>
<td>3,160 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All usual</td>
<td>83,461 (100)</td>
<td>55,510 (100)</td>
<td>117,069 (100)</td>
<td>86,837 (100)</td>
<td>98,193 (100)</td>
<td>115,141 (100)</td>
<td>112,342 (100)</td>
<td>668,553 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 9
Table A3. Number of Suffolk residents by main language spoken and district, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main language</th>
<th>Babergh</th>
<th>Forest Heath</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk</th>
<th>St Edmundsbury</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal</th>
<th>Waveney</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>83,890 (98.5)</td>
<td>54,020 (94.5)</td>
<td>117,903 (92.4)</td>
<td>92,497 (98.8)</td>
<td>103,202 (96.5)</td>
<td>118,221 (98)</td>
<td>109,762 (98.4)</td>
<td>679,496 (96.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>73 (0.1)</td>
<td>77 (0.1)</td>
<td>157 (0.1)</td>
<td>61 (0.1)</td>
<td>101 (0.1)</td>
<td>88 (0.1)</td>
<td>47 (0)</td>
<td>604 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>39 (0)</td>
<td>345 (0.6)</td>
<td>893 (0.7)</td>
<td>42 (0)</td>
<td>401 (0.4)</td>
<td>68 (0.1)</td>
<td>318 (0.3)</td>
<td>2,106 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>56 (0.1)</td>
<td>111 (0.2)</td>
<td>130 (0.1)</td>
<td>35 (0)</td>
<td>119 (0.1)</td>
<td>78 (0.1)</td>
<td>50 (0)</td>
<td>579 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European (EU)</td>
<td>610 (0.7)</td>
<td>1,859 (3.3)</td>
<td>4,270 (3.3)</td>
<td>523 (0.6)</td>
<td>1,987 (1.9)</td>
<td>1,054 (0.9)</td>
<td>685 (0.6)</td>
<td>10,988 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European (non-EU)</td>
<td>109 (0.1)</td>
<td>145 (0.3)</td>
<td>691 (0.5)</td>
<td>78 (0.1)</td>
<td>232 (0.2)</td>
<td>117 (0.1)</td>
<td>128 (0.1)</td>
<td>1,500 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>9 (0)</td>
<td>10 (0)</td>
<td>131 (0.1)</td>
<td>10 (0)</td>
<td>48 (0)</td>
<td>39 (0)</td>
<td>5 (0)</td>
<td>252 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West/Central Asian</td>
<td>22 (0)</td>
<td>22 (0)</td>
<td>856 (0.7)</td>
<td>17 (0)</td>
<td>40 (0)</td>
<td>44 (0)</td>
<td>17 (0)</td>
<td>1,018 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>116 (0.1)</td>
<td>237 (0.4)</td>
<td>1,553 (1.2)</td>
<td>103 (0.1)</td>
<td>347 (0.3)</td>
<td>417 (0.3)</td>
<td>149 (0.1)</td>
<td>2,922 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>202 (0.2)</td>
<td>244 (0.4)</td>
<td>766 (0.6)</td>
<td>153 (0.2)</td>
<td>384 (0.4)</td>
<td>421 (0.3)</td>
<td>289 (0.3)</td>
<td>2,459 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>45 (0.1)</td>
<td>61 (0.1)</td>
<td>191 (0.1)</td>
<td>46 (0)</td>
<td>71 (0.1)</td>
<td>84 (0.1)</td>
<td>43 (0)</td>
<td>541 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13 (0)</td>
<td>24 (0)</td>
<td>74 (0.1)</td>
<td>45 (0)</td>
<td>36 (0)</td>
<td>28 (0)</td>
<td>15 (0)</td>
<td>235 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All usual residents aged 3+</td>
<td>85,184 (100)</td>
<td>57,155 (100)</td>
<td>127,615 (100)</td>
<td>93,610 (100)</td>
<td>106,968 (100)</td>
<td>120,659 (100)</td>
<td>111,508 (100)</td>
<td>702,700 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 10
Table A4. Number of primary school age pupils attending a school by ethnic group and district, January 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Babergh N (%)</th>
<th>Forest Heath N (%)</th>
<th>Ipswich N (%)</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk N (%)</th>
<th>St Edmundsbury N (%)</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal N (%)</th>
<th>Waveney N (%)</th>
<th>Suffolk N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>5,665 (90.8)</td>
<td>2,615 (77)</td>
<td>7,935 (74.3)</td>
<td>6,291 (89.9)</td>
<td>6,806 (81.4)</td>
<td>7,838 (89.7)</td>
<td>8,076 (92.2)</td>
<td>45,226 (85.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>167 (2.7)</td>
<td>355 (10.5)</td>
<td>643 (6)</td>
<td>204 (2.9)</td>
<td>794 (9.5)</td>
<td>235 (2.7)</td>
<td>206 (2.4)</td>
<td>2,604 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>145 (2.3)</td>
<td>217 (6.4)</td>
<td>899 (8.4)</td>
<td>152 (2.2)</td>
<td>291 (3.5)</td>
<td>327 (3.7)</td>
<td>191 (2.2)</td>
<td>2,222 (4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>33 (0.5)</td>
<td>25 (0.7)</td>
<td>626 (5.9)</td>
<td>30 (0.4)</td>
<td>106 (1.3)</td>
<td>129 (1.5)</td>
<td>44 (0.5)</td>
<td>993 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>13 (0.2)</td>
<td>26 (0.8)</td>
<td>204 (1.9)</td>
<td>11 (0.2)</td>
<td>35 (0.4)</td>
<td>21 (0.2)</td>
<td>10 (0.1)</td>
<td>320 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16 (0.3)</td>
<td>24 (0.7)</td>
<td>132 (1.2)</td>
<td>20 (0.3)</td>
<td>48 (0.6)</td>
<td>15 (0.2)</td>
<td>23 (0.3)</td>
<td>278 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>201 (3.2)</td>
<td>132 (3.9)</td>
<td>247 (2.3)</td>
<td>287 (4.1)</td>
<td>281 (3.4)</td>
<td>171 (2)</td>
<td>209 (2.4)</td>
<td>1,528 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,240 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,394 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,686 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,995 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,361 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,736 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,759 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,171 (100)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 11

Table A5. Number of secondary school age pupils attending a school by ethnic group and district, January 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Babergh N (%)</th>
<th>Forest Heath N (%)</th>
<th>Ipswich N (%)</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk N (%)</th>
<th>St Edmundsbury N (%)</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal N (%)</th>
<th>Waveney N (%)</th>
<th>Suffolk N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>4,573 (94.4)</td>
<td>2,161 (89.2)</td>
<td>7,410 (81.6)</td>
<td>6,617 (95.7)</td>
<td>6,367 (90.2)</td>
<td>7,060 (93.9)</td>
<td>7,128 (94.6)</td>
<td>41,316 (91.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>68 (1.4)</td>
<td>102 (4.2)</td>
<td>325 (3.6)</td>
<td>88 (1.3)</td>
<td>315 (4.5)</td>
<td>103 (1.4)</td>
<td>98 (1.3)</td>
<td>1,099 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>107 (2.2)</td>
<td>78 (3.2)</td>
<td>765 (8.4)</td>
<td>98 (1.4)</td>
<td>186 (2.6)</td>
<td>174 (2.3)</td>
<td>199 (2.6)</td>
<td>1,607 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>21 (0.4)</td>
<td>13 (0.5)</td>
<td>261 (2.9)</td>
<td>24 (0.3)</td>
<td>47 (0.7)</td>
<td>73 (1)</td>
<td>23 (0.3)</td>
<td>462 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8 (0.2)</td>
<td>15 (0.6)</td>
<td>137 (1.5)</td>
<td>16 (0.2)</td>
<td>40 (0.6)</td>
<td>19 (0.3)</td>
<td>10 (0.1)</td>
<td>245 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 (0.1)</td>
<td>16 (0.7)</td>
<td>94 (1)</td>
<td>15 (0.2)</td>
<td>28 (0.4)</td>
<td>17 (0.2)</td>
<td>21 (0.3)</td>
<td>196 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>60 (1.2)</td>
<td>37 (1.5)</td>
<td>86 (0.9)</td>
<td>57 (0.8)</td>
<td>79 (1.1)</td>
<td>69 (0.9)</td>
<td>55 (0.7)</td>
<td>443 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,842 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,422 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,078 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,915 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,062 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,515 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,534 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,368 (100)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 11
Table A6. Number of primary school age pupils attending a school by ethnic group and district, January 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Babergh</th>
<th>Forest Heath</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk</th>
<th>St Edmundsbury</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal</th>
<th>Waveney</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>6,008  (90)</td>
<td>3,019  (69.1)</td>
<td>8,366  (64.2)</td>
<td>6,624  (91.7)</td>
<td>7,510  (82.4)</td>
<td>7,990  (86.8)</td>
<td>8,656  (91.5)</td>
<td>48,173  (81.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>239  (3.6)</td>
<td>750  (17.2)</td>
<td>1,790  (13.7)</td>
<td>235  (3.3)</td>
<td>793  (8.7)</td>
<td>367  (4)</td>
<td>269  (2.8)</td>
<td>4,443  (7.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>261  (3.9)</td>
<td>324  (7.4)</td>
<td>1,438  (11)</td>
<td>263  (3.6)</td>
<td>386  (4.2)</td>
<td>531  (5.8)</td>
<td>320  (3.4)</td>
<td>3,523  (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>41  (0.6)</td>
<td>112  (2.6)</td>
<td>647  (5)</td>
<td>23  (0.3)</td>
<td>155  (1.7)</td>
<td>161  (1.7)</td>
<td>46  (0.5)</td>
<td>1,185  (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>36  (0.5)</td>
<td>62  (1.4)</td>
<td>307  (2.4)</td>
<td>20  (0.3)</td>
<td>39  (0.4)</td>
<td>42  (0.5)</td>
<td>21  (0.2)</td>
<td>527  (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21  (0.3)</td>
<td>50  (1.1)</td>
<td>351  (2.7)</td>
<td>9  (0.1)</td>
<td>86  (0.9)</td>
<td>26  (0.3)</td>
<td>31  (0.3)</td>
<td>574  (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>69  (1)</td>
<td>55  (1.3)</td>
<td>135  (1)</td>
<td>51  (0.7)</td>
<td>146  (1.6)</td>
<td>91  (1)</td>
<td>122  (1.3)</td>
<td>669  (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,675  (100)</td>
<td>4,372  (100)</td>
<td>13,034  (100)</td>
<td>7,225  (100)</td>
<td>9,115  (100)</td>
<td>9,208  (100)</td>
<td>9,465  (100)</td>
<td>59,094  (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 4

Table A7. Number of secondary school age pupils attending a school by ethnic group and district, January 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Babergh</th>
<th>Forest Heath</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk</th>
<th>St Edmundsbury</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal</th>
<th>Waveney</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>5,467  (87.8)</td>
<td>1,814  (81.9)</td>
<td>5,751  (69.5)</td>
<td>5,521  (88)</td>
<td>6,194  (85.4)</td>
<td>5,997  (87.9)</td>
<td>5,563  (91.9)</td>
<td>36,307  (84.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>233  (3.7)</td>
<td>218  (9.8)</td>
<td>874  (10.6)</td>
<td>156  (2.5)</td>
<td>433  (6)</td>
<td>274  (4)</td>
<td>208  (3.4)</td>
<td>2,396  (5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>233  (3.7)</td>
<td>99  (4.5)</td>
<td>726  (8.8)</td>
<td>193  (3.1)</td>
<td>293  (4)</td>
<td>213  (3.1)</td>
<td>155  (2.6)</td>
<td>1,912  (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>64  (1)</td>
<td>28  (1.3)</td>
<td>435  (5.3)</td>
<td>19  (0.3)</td>
<td>102  (1.4)</td>
<td>83  (1.2)</td>
<td>31  (0.5)</td>
<td>762  (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>44  (0.7)</td>
<td>8  (0.4)</td>
<td>185  (2.2)</td>
<td>19  (0.3)</td>
<td>47  (0.6)</td>
<td>51  (0.7)</td>
<td>17  (0.3)</td>
<td>371  (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34  (0.5)</td>
<td>18  (0.8)</td>
<td>106  (1.3)</td>
<td>9  (0.1)</td>
<td>61  (0.8)</td>
<td>35  (0.5)</td>
<td>16  (0.3)</td>
<td>279  (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>152  (2.4)</td>
<td>30  (1.4)</td>
<td>203  (2.5)</td>
<td>357  (5.7)</td>
<td>121  (1.7)</td>
<td>172  (2.5)</td>
<td>64  (1.1)</td>
<td>1,099  (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,227  (100)</td>
<td>2,215  (100)</td>
<td>8,280  (100)</td>
<td>6,274  (100)</td>
<td>7,251  (100)</td>
<td>6,825  (100)</td>
<td>6,054  (100)</td>
<td>43,126  (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 4
Table A8. Number of Suffolk school children by main language spoken and district, January 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main language</th>
<th>Babergh N (%)</th>
<th>Forest Heath N (%)</th>
<th>Ipswich N (%)</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk N (%)</th>
<th>St Edmundsbury N (%)</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal N (%)</th>
<th>Waveney N (%)</th>
<th>Suffolk N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12,371 (95.9)</td>
<td>5,661 (85.9)</td>
<td>16,867 (79.1)</td>
<td>13,219 (97.9)</td>
<td>15,050 (92)</td>
<td>15,281 (95.3)</td>
<td>15,012 (96.7)</td>
<td>93,461 (91.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>120 (0.9)</td>
<td>270 (4.1)</td>
<td>622 (2.9)</td>
<td>54 (0.4)</td>
<td>350 (2.1)</td>
<td>92 (0.6)</td>
<td>64 (0.4)</td>
<td>1,572 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>33 (0.3)</td>
<td>80 (1.2)</td>
<td>505 (2.4)</td>
<td>10 (0.1)</td>
<td>133 (0.8)</td>
<td>33 (0.2)</td>
<td>94 (0.6)</td>
<td>888 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>23 (0.2)</td>
<td>18 (0.3)</td>
<td>565 (2.7)</td>
<td>5 (0)</td>
<td>38 (0.2)</td>
<td>45 (0.3)</td>
<td>28 (0.2)</td>
<td>72 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>17 (0.1)</td>
<td>38 (0.6)</td>
<td>367 (1.7)</td>
<td>10 (0.1)</td>
<td>42 (0.3)</td>
<td>33 (0.2)</td>
<td>29 (0.2)</td>
<td>536 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>18 (0.1)</td>
<td>10 (0.2)</td>
<td>412 (1.9)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>14 (0.1)</td>
<td>21 (0.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>482 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayalam</td>
<td>6 (0)</td>
<td>9 (0.1)</td>
<td>128 (0.6)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>99 (0.6)</td>
<td>17 (0.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>262 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>8 (0.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>208 (1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>7 (0)</td>
<td>6 (0)</td>
<td>230 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>24 (0.2)</td>
<td>11 (0.2)</td>
<td>96 (0.5)</td>
<td>7 (0.1)</td>
<td>28 (0.2)</td>
<td>14 (0.1)</td>
<td>31 (0.2)</td>
<td>211 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>20 (0.2)</td>
<td>15 (0.2)</td>
<td>110 (0.5)</td>
<td>8 (0.1)</td>
<td>26 (0.2)</td>
<td>18 (0.1)</td>
<td>10 (0.1)</td>
<td>207 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>14 (0.1)</td>
<td>5 (0.1)</td>
<td>76 (0.4)</td>
<td>10 (0.1)</td>
<td>19 (0.1)</td>
<td>43 (0.3)</td>
<td>14 (0.1)</td>
<td>181 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>16 (0.2)</td>
<td>95 (0.4)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>15 (0.1)</td>
<td>9 (0.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>145 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>14 (0.1)</td>
<td>5 (0.1)</td>
<td>43 (0.2)</td>
<td>5 (0)</td>
<td>36 (0.2)</td>
<td>19 (0.1)</td>
<td>9 (0.1)</td>
<td>131 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>9 (0.1)</td>
<td>59 (0.3)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>20 (0.1)</td>
<td>16 (0.1)</td>
<td>9 (0.1)</td>
<td>122 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>13 (0.2)</td>
<td>32 (0.2)</td>
<td>10 (0.1)</td>
<td>19 (0.1)</td>
<td>38 (0.2)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>120 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>37 (0.6)</td>
<td>40 (0.2)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>9 (0.1)</td>
<td>16 (0.1)</td>
<td>11 (0.1)</td>
<td>117 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>6 (0)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>50 (0.2)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>14 (0.1)</td>
<td>27 (0.2)</td>
<td>17 (0.1)</td>
<td>116 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>138 (1.1)</td>
<td>127 (1.9)</td>
<td>921 (4.3)</td>
<td>81 (0.6)</td>
<td>247 (1.5)</td>
<td>229 (1.4)</td>
<td>75 (0.5)</td>
<td>1,818 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>76 (0.6)</td>
<td>263 (4)</td>
<td>118 (0.6)</td>
<td>62 (0.5)</td>
<td>206 (1.3)</td>
<td>75 (0.5)</td>
<td>99 (0.6)</td>
<td>889 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12,902 (100)</td>
<td>6,587 (100)</td>
<td>21,314 (100)</td>
<td>13,499 (100)</td>
<td>16,366 (100)</td>
<td>16,033 (100)</td>
<td>15,519 (100)</td>
<td>102,220 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* counts of 5 or less persons have been suppressed to avoid deductive disclosure.

Source: 4
Table A9. Number of Suffolk school children by main language spoken and district, January 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main language</th>
<th>Babergh</th>
<th>Forest Heath</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk</th>
<th>St Edmundsbury</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal</th>
<th>Waveney</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10,766  (97.1)</td>
<td>5,435 (93.4)</td>
<td>17,489 (88.5)</td>
<td>13,572 (97.6)</td>
<td>14,649 (95)</td>
<td>15,713 (96.7)</td>
<td>15,710 (96.4)</td>
<td>93,334 (94.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>12 (0.1)</td>
<td>7 (0.1)</td>
<td>441 (2.2)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>13 (0.1)</td>
<td>25 (0.2)</td>
<td>10 (0.1)</td>
<td>509 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>20 (0.2)</td>
<td>63 (1.1)</td>
<td>242 (1.2)</td>
<td>19 (0.1)</td>
<td>79 (0.5)</td>
<td>26 (0.2)</td>
<td>24 (0.1)</td>
<td>473 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>44 (0.8)</td>
<td>223 (1.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>52 (0.3)</td>
<td>6 (0)</td>
<td>57 (0.3)</td>
<td>386 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>8 (0.1)</td>
<td>13 (0.2)</td>
<td>81 (0.4)</td>
<td>16 (0.1)</td>
<td>21 (0.1)</td>
<td>37 (0.2)</td>
<td>48 (0.3)</td>
<td>224 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayalam</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>59 (0.3)</td>
<td>11 (0.1)</td>
<td>45 (0.3)</td>
<td>15 (0.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>135 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>46 (0.2)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>5 (0)</td>
<td>6 (0)</td>
<td>7 (0)</td>
<td>71 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>8 (0.1)</td>
<td>38 (0.2)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>12 (0.1)</td>
<td>8 (0)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>69 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>28 (0.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>15 (0.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>53 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>8 (0)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>21 (0.1)</td>
<td>8 (0)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>52 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>28 (0.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>6 (0)</td>
<td>11 (0.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>50 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdish</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>39 (0.2)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>46 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>24 (0.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>8 (0.1)</td>
<td>5 (0)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>44 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>8 (0)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>12 (0.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>22 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>14 (0.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>21 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>6 (0)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>17 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>10 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>41 (0.4)</td>
<td>51 (0.9)</td>
<td>570 (2.9)</td>
<td>40 (0.3)</td>
<td>162 (1.1)</td>
<td>128 (0.8)</td>
<td>50 (0.3)</td>
<td>1,042 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>220 (2)</td>
<td>177 (3)</td>
<td>416 (2.1)</td>
<td>236 (1.7)</td>
<td>336 (2.2)</td>
<td>231 (1.4)</td>
<td>365 (2.2)</td>
<td>1,981 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11,082 (100)</td>
<td>5,816 (100)</td>
<td>19,764 (100)</td>
<td>13,910 (100)</td>
<td>15,423 (100)</td>
<td>16,251 (100)</td>
<td>16,293 (100)</td>
<td>98,539 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* counts of 5 or less persons have been suppressed to avoid deductive disclosure.

Source: 4
Table A10. Number of individuals registered with a GP surgery by ethnic group and district of residence, August 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Babergh</th>
<th>Forest Heath</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk</th>
<th>St Edmundsbury</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>52,027 (94.2)</td>
<td>27,769 (80.2)</td>
<td>90,584 (73.1)</td>
<td>49,822 (94.8)</td>
<td>61,951 (88.9)</td>
<td>81,888 (91.9)</td>
<td>364,041 (85.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>1,677 (3)</td>
<td>4,351 (12.6)</td>
<td>14,273 (11.5)</td>
<td>1,567 (3)</td>
<td>4,502 (6.5)</td>
<td>3,380 (3.8)</td>
<td>29,750 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>558 (1)</td>
<td>649 (1.9)</td>
<td>4,270 (3.4)</td>
<td>488 (0.9)</td>
<td>864 (1.2)</td>
<td>1,090 (1.2)</td>
<td>7,919 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>511 (0.9)</td>
<td>1,152 (3.3)</td>
<td>8,778 (7.1)</td>
<td>369 (0.7)</td>
<td>1,472 (2.1)</td>
<td>1,794 (2)</td>
<td>14,076 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>244 (0.4)</td>
<td>378 (1.1)</td>
<td>3,627 (2.9)</td>
<td>169 (0.3)</td>
<td>509 (0.7)</td>
<td>486 (0.5)</td>
<td>5,413 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>201 (0.4)</td>
<td>305 (0.9)</td>
<td>2,392 (1.9)</td>
<td>118 (0.2)</td>
<td>360 (0.5)</td>
<td>423 (0.5)</td>
<td>3,799 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55,218 (100)</td>
<td>34,604 (100)</td>
<td>123,924 (100)</td>
<td>52,533 (100)</td>
<td>69,658 (100)</td>
<td>89,061 (100)</td>
<td>424,998 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 12

Note: there are several caveats associated with these figures:

- The SystmOne clinical record system is used by around 80% of GPs across Suffolk. Data for the remaining 20% of GPs were not available.
- Data was not available for Waveney.
- Recording of ethnic group was incomplete for nearly 1 in 4 people (24%) registered. These individuals are excluded from the table.
Table A11. Top ten countries for National Insurance number registrations to overseas nationals, Suffolk 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Babergh N (%)</th>
<th>Forest Heath N (%)</th>
<th>Ipswich N (%)</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk N (%)</th>
<th>St Edmundsbury N (%)</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal N (%)</th>
<th>Waveney N (%)</th>
<th>Suffolk N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>55 (30.1)</td>
<td>125 (21.2)</td>
<td>1,355 (52.9)</td>
<td>63 (33.9)</td>
<td>212 (34)</td>
<td>146 (26.8)</td>
<td>66 (28.4)</td>
<td>2,031 (41.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>23 (12.6)</td>
<td>77 (13.1)</td>
<td>121 (4.7)</td>
<td>7 (3.8)</td>
<td>97 (15.5)</td>
<td>47 (8.6)</td>
<td>9 (3.9)</td>
<td>382 (7.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>40 (6.8)</td>
<td>174 (6.8)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>36 (5.8)</td>
<td>36 (6.6)</td>
<td>40 (17.2)</td>
<td>339 (6.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>6 (3.3)</td>
<td>7 (1.2)</td>
<td>250 (9.8)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
<td>17 (3.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>286 (5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>8 (4.4)</td>
<td>27 (4.6)</td>
<td>113 (4.4)</td>
<td>35 (18.8)</td>
<td>35 (5.6)</td>
<td>44 (8.1)</td>
<td>21 (9.1)</td>
<td>283 (5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>6 (3.3)</td>
<td>37 (6.3)</td>
<td>104 (4.1)</td>
<td>7 (3.8)</td>
<td>36 (5.8)</td>
<td>27 (5)</td>
<td>21 (9.1)</td>
<td>235 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>7 (3.8)</td>
<td>91 (15.4)</td>
<td>9 (0.4)</td>
<td>6 (3.2)</td>
<td>35 (5.6)</td>
<td>10 (1.8)</td>
<td>7 (3)</td>
<td>159 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>14 (2.4)</td>
<td>43 (1.7)</td>
<td>11 (5.9)</td>
<td>11 (1.8)</td>
<td>60 (11)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>151 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>8 (4.4)</td>
<td>35 (5.9)</td>
<td>45 (1.8)</td>
<td>9 (4.8)</td>
<td>22 (3.5)</td>
<td>19 (3.5)</td>
<td>6 (2.6)</td>
<td>145 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>7 (3.8)</td>
<td>12 (2)</td>
<td>38 (1.5)</td>
<td>5 (2.7)</td>
<td>9 (1.4)</td>
<td>17 (3.1)</td>
<td>5 (2.2)</td>
<td>91 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>63 (34.4)</td>
<td>125 (21.2)</td>
<td>310 (12.1)</td>
<td>37 (19.9)</td>
<td>125 (20)</td>
<td>122 (22.4)</td>
<td>49 (21.1)</td>
<td>818 (16.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>183 (100)</td>
<td>590 (100)</td>
<td>2,562 (100)</td>
<td>186 (100)</td>
<td>624 (100)</td>
<td>545 (100)</td>
<td>232 (100)</td>
<td>4,920 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* counts of 5 or less persons have been suppressed to avoid deductive disclosure.

Source: 5
Table A12. Top ten countries for National Insurance number registrations to overseas nationals, Suffolk 2010/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Babergh</th>
<th>Forest Heath</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk</th>
<th>St Edmundsbury</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal</th>
<th>Waveney</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>15 (6.3)</td>
<td>90 (15.3)</td>
<td>400 (24.8)</td>
<td>62 (31)</td>
<td>87 (19)</td>
<td>29 (6.7)</td>
<td>10 (3.9)</td>
<td>696 (18.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>37 (15.5)</td>
<td>130 (22.1)</td>
<td>224 (13.9)</td>
<td>12 (6)</td>
<td>108 (23.6)</td>
<td>44 (10.1)</td>
<td>26 (10.1)</td>
<td>588 (15.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>6 (2.5)</td>
<td>89 (15.1)</td>
<td>288 (17.9)</td>
<td>5 (2.5)</td>
<td>16 (3.5)</td>
<td>43 (9.9)</td>
<td>63 (24.4)</td>
<td>507 (13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>24 (10)</td>
<td>23 (3.9)</td>
<td>177 (11)</td>
<td>17 (8.5)</td>
<td>19 (4.1)</td>
<td>18 (4.1)</td>
<td>9 (3.5)</td>
<td>278 (7.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>46 (19.2)</td>
<td>9 (1.5)</td>
<td>49 (3)</td>
<td>16 (8)</td>
<td>5 (1.1)</td>
<td>74 (17.1)</td>
<td>13 (5)</td>
<td>211 (5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>7 (2.9)</td>
<td>23 (3.9)</td>
<td>76 (4.7)</td>
<td>5 (2.5)</td>
<td>12 (2.6)</td>
<td>13 (3)</td>
<td>28 (10.9)</td>
<td>160 (4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>68 (11.6)</td>
<td>7 (0.4)</td>
<td>5 (2.5)</td>
<td>21 (4.6)</td>
<td>6 (1.4)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>107 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>33 (13.8)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>9 (0.6)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>19 (4.1)</td>
<td>17 (3.9)</td>
<td>18 (7)</td>
<td>97 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>10 (4.2)</td>
<td>7 (1.2)</td>
<td>20 (1.2)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>14 (3.1)</td>
<td>22 (5.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>83 (2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8 (3.3)</td>
<td>8 (1.4)</td>
<td>15 (0.9)</td>
<td>22 (11)</td>
<td>5 (1.1)</td>
<td>13 (3)</td>
<td>6 (2.3)</td>
<td>78 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>53 (22.2)</td>
<td>136 (23.1)</td>
<td>347 (21.5)</td>
<td>56 (28)</td>
<td>152 (33.2)</td>
<td>155 (35.7)</td>
<td>85 (32.9)</td>
<td>985 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239 (100)</td>
<td>588 (100)</td>
<td>1,612 (100)</td>
<td>200 (100)</td>
<td>458 (100)</td>
<td>434 (100)</td>
<td>258 (100)</td>
<td>3,790 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* counts of 5 or less persons have been suppressed to avoid deductive disclosure.

Source: 5
Table A13. Number of babies born by country of mother’s birth and district/borough of usual residence for the ten most common countries outside the UK, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of mother’s birth</th>
<th>Babergh</th>
<th>Forest Heath</th>
<th>Ipswich</th>
<th>Mid Suffolk</th>
<th>St Edmundsbury</th>
<th>Suffolk Coastal</th>
<th>Waveney</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>259 (25.5)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>43 (3.8)</td>
<td>6 (0.6)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>321 (4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>15 (2)</td>
<td>55 (5.4)</td>
<td>82 (4.1)</td>
<td>8 (1)</td>
<td>49 (4.3)</td>
<td>18 (1.8)</td>
<td>9 (0.8)</td>
<td>236 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>9 (0.9)</td>
<td>102 (5.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>11 (1)</td>
<td>11 (1.1)</td>
<td>10 (0.9)</td>
<td>150 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>13 (1.3)</td>
<td>62 (3.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>14 (1.2)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>100 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9 (1.2)</td>
<td>12 (1.2)</td>
<td>16 (0.8)</td>
<td>12 (1.5)</td>
<td>14 (1.2)</td>
<td>9 (0.9)</td>
<td>7 (0.6)</td>
<td>79 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>13 (1.3)</td>
<td>25 (1.3)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>13 (1.1)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>10 (0.9)</td>
<td>67 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>6 (0.6)</td>
<td>28 (1.4)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>10 (0.9)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>57 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>30 (1.5)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>38 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>33 (1.7)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>36 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>12 (0.6)</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>* -</td>
<td>31 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All births</td>
<td>739 (100)</td>
<td>1,016 (100)</td>
<td>1,985 (100)</td>
<td>823 (100)</td>
<td>1,135 (100)</td>
<td>1,005 (100)</td>
<td>1,161 (100)</td>
<td>7,864 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* counts of 5 or less persons have been suppressed to avoid deductive disclosure.

Source: 6
Appendix 2: Migrant questionnaire

Survey of migrants 2018 - Suffolk County Council

READ: Good morning / afternoon / evening. My name is … and I work for Public Perspectives and Agroni, who are research companies. (SHOW ID)

We are carrying out a survey on behalf of Suffolk County Council and partner organisations, about living in your local area.

If you take part, there may be the opportunity to take part in a more detailed interview at another time and to receive payment for that.

Can you help by taking part in a survey please? Depending on your answers the survey will take around 15 minutes to complete.

O.K, thanks. Before we get started we just want to stress that what you say is anonymous and confidential and will not be used to identify you. We are interviewing 400 people and your individual answers will not be seen by anyone at Suffolk County Council. All your data is handled in line with data protection and the MRS.

Interviewer instruction: Must be a migrant to the UK, based on moving to the UK aged 18 or over.

Interviewer instruction: Must not speak English as a first language

Interviewer instruction: Please tick one box only unless otherwise stated

Nationality and length of stay

I would like to start by asking you questions about your nationality and living in Britain . . .

Q1 What is your country of origin/where were you born? Interviewer instruction: Write in below:

_______________________________

Q2 How old were you when you moved to the UK?

- Under 18 (exclude)
- 18-29
- 30-49
- 50-69
- 70+

Interviewer instruction: If born in the UK or moved here aged under 18: Exclude/close survey.

Q3 How long have you lived in the United Kingdom?

- Under 3 months
- 3 months to 1 year
- Over 1 year but less than 2 years
- Over 2 years but less than 3 years
- 3-5 years
- 5-10 years
- Over 10 years

Q4 How long have you lived in Suffolk? Note to interviewer: Show map if required

- Under 3 months
- 3 months to 1 year
- Over 1 year but less than 2 years
- Over 2 years but less than 3 years
- 3-5 years
- 5-10 years
- Over 10 years

Q5 What were your reasons for moving to the United Kingdom? Interviewer instruction: Tick all that apply

- To work
- To study
- To be with friends
- To be with partner
- For a life experience
- For a long holiday
- Other

If other, please specify

__________________________________

Q6 And why in particular did you move to Suffolk?

- For a particular job
- For a particular course
- As my friends/family were already here
- Other

If other, please specify

__________________________________
Q7 How much longer do you intend to stay in the United Kingdom?
- Under 6 months
- 6 months to 1 year
- 2 to 3 years
- 3 to 4 years
- 4 to 5 years
- Over 5 years
- Permanently
- Don’t know/not sure

Q8 How much of this stay do you expect to be living in Suffolk?
- All of it
- Most of it
- Some of it
- Not sure/don’t know

Brexit

I would now like to ask you some questions about the UK’s withdrawal from the EU (otherwise known as Brexit).

Q9 How well informed do you feel about Brexit and the UK’s plans to leave the EU?
- Very well informed
- Quite well informed
- Not that well informed
- Not well informed at all

Q10 What impact has the UK’s plan to leave the EU had on you and your family?
- Big impact
- Some impact
- No impact at all
- Not sure

Please describe the impact it has had on you:

Q11 How well informed are you about the process for staying in the UK i.e. your rights to remain?
- Very well informed
- Quite well informed
- Not that well informed
- Not well informed at all

Q12 What action(s) have you taken in response to the UK’s plan to leave the EU? Interviewer instruction: select all relevant answers
- Applied for settlement: Permanent right to stay
- Applied for settlement: Citizenship
- Sought information and/or advice about my rights to stay
- Looking at options to move away from UK
- Already planning to leave UK prior to Brexit
- Other

If ‘Other’, please specify:

Q13 What, if any, information or support might you welcome about the EU’s plan to leave the EU?
- Know more about my settlement rights i.e. if I can stay in the UK
- The process for staying in the UK i.e. how to remain in the UK
- The timescale for the UK’s withdrawal
- Information about how Brexit may affect me
- Other

If ‘Other’, please specify:

Access to services and satisfaction

I would now like to ask you some questions about the local services you use and what you think of them . . .

Q14 Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your local area as a place to live? Are you . . .
- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
Q15  I am going to read out a list of services. For each service . . . How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following public services in your local area? Interview Instruction: Read out each service in turn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Fairly satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Haven't used the service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your local Doctor/G.P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your local dentist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your local hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacies in the local area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local public services overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q16  Are you aware of or have you used any of the following? Interviewer instruction: Read out each service in turn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>I am not aware of it</th>
<th>I am aware of it but do not know much about it</th>
<th>I know about it but have not used it</th>
<th>I have used</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local bus services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport/leisure facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and open spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on housing/housing advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL/language services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education (excluding ESOL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and advice services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17  How well do you know about each of the following? Interviewer instruction: Read out each in turn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Quite well</th>
<th>Not that well</th>
<th>Not well at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What I have to do with litter and rubbish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The days I need to put out my rubbish and recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I can and cannot recycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to get rid of bulky items such as mattresses, unwanted furniture or old kitchen appliances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When I should visit my G.P or contact 111 instead of visiting the hospital if I have a medical problem

Keeping noise to a minimum so not to disturb neighbours

How hanging around on the streets in groups may intimidate some people

Rules about car tax and insurance

The minimum amount I can be paid under the UK minimum wage

Q18 How easy or difficult have you found it to access the local public services (such as those listed earlier) that you want? Would you say it was . . .
- Very easy
- Easy
- Neither easy nor difficult
- Difficult
- Very difficult
- Don’t know

Q19 How do you find out about the support/service available to you? Interviewer instruction: Tick all that apply and do not prompt
- Word of mouth
- On-line: search engine
- Council website
- Service provider website
- Community website
- Social media
- Other
- If other, please specify ______________________

Q20 Have you heard about the information and advice service available to you, the migrant drop in service run GYROS? Note to interviewer: Show website if need be
- Heard of but don’t know much about
- Know about, but not used
- Used
- Not heard about

Q21 Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the help you received from GYROS? (only ask to GYROS users)
- Very satisfied
- Fairly satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Fairly dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Q22 What barriers have you faced in accessing the local public services that you want? Interviewer instruction: Tick all that apply, initially don’t prompt but if respondent is struggling, please read out.
- Not knowing where to go
- Not knowing what services are available
- Not being eligible
- Language barriers
- Staff being unhelpful
- Discrimination from staff because of my nationality, race or background
- None
- Other
- If other, please specify ______________________
Q23 Are there any needs that you, your family or friends have that are not being met by local public services (such as those listed earlier)?
- Yes
- No
If yes, please specify

Q24 To what extent do you agree or disagree that your local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?
- Definitely agree
- Tend to agree
- Tend to disagree
- Definitely disagree

Q25 Thinking of the friends you have in the local area, what nationality are they? Interviewer instruction: Tick all that apply
- British
- Irish
- Polish
- Indian
- Portuguese
- Lithuanian
- Slovakian
- Pakistani
- Bulgarian
- Hungarian
- Romanian
- Latvian
- Other
If other, please specify

Q26 Whilst living in the local area, have you ever felt discriminated against because of your religion, race or your country of origin?
- Yes definitely
- I think so
- Not sure
- No
- Don't know

Q27. How safe or unsafe do you feel when outside in your local area?
Note to interviewer: Read out response options and select one answer only
- Very safe
- Fairly safe
- Neither safe nor unsafe
- Fairly unsafe
- Very unsafe

We would like to make the results of this survey as representative of the community as a whole as possible. In order to make this possible I would like to just a few questions about yourself and your household.

SAY ONLY IF NECESSARY: The results of the survey will only be presented as combined data and your personal information cannot be associated with your answers. As with all forms of market and opinion research, your co-operation is voluntary at all times.

Household structure and housing

Q28 Which of the following best describes your current home . . .? Interviewer instruction: Tick most appropriate answer, so if live in room in shared house which is a detached house, please tick room in shared property
- Flat in shared property
- Room in shared property
- Multiple families living in the same property
- Detached house or bungalow
- Semi-detached house or bungalow
- Terraced house or bungalow
- Self-contained flat or maisonette
- Mobile home, inc. caravans and houseboats
- Group living arrangement e.g. YMCA, Hostel, Farm Bunkhouse
- Other

Q29 Is your home owned or rented? Interviewer instruction: please clarify ownership or renting type
- Owned completely freehold or leasehold
- Owned with a freehold or leasehold mortgage
- Rented from the Council or Housing Association/Trust
- Rented from Private Landlord
- Rent from employer
- Stay with relative or friend of household member
- Other
Q30 How long have you/your household lived in this home?

- Under 1 year
- 1-2 years
- 3-5 years
- Over 5 years
- Don’t know/can’t remember

Q31 Are you single, living with a partner, married or married but living away from your partner?

- Single
- Unmarried couple
- Married
- Married person living away from partner

Q32 Was your partner born in the UK and a UK citizen? (Only ask to married people)

- Yes
- No

Q33 Do you have children?

- Yes
- No

Q34 Are your children living with you in Britain?

Interviewer Instruction: Only ask if respondent has children

- Yes
- No

Q35 How many children are there in the household that are dependent on you and what are their ages? Interviewer Instruction: Only ask if children living with respondent

- Age 0 – 1
- Age 2 – 5
- Age 6 – 10
- Age 11-18

If other, please specify

Q36 How many people are there in your household (including yourself and any children)?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7 or more

Q37 How many adults aged 18 or over are living here?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 or more

Q38 How many other nationalities other than yours live in the house and what are their nationalities? Interviewer instruction: write number alongside response

- Polish
- Indian
- Portuguese
- Lithuanian
- Slovakian
- Pakistani
- Bulgarian
- Hungarian
- Romanian
- Latvian
- Other
- None

If other, please specify

Q39 How easy or difficult was it for you to find suitable accommodation? Was it . . .

- Very easy
- Fairly easy
- Fairly difficult
- Very difficult
- We don’t have suitable accommodation
Employment, education and skills

I would now like to ask you some questions about your employment . . .

Q40 What is your current work status?
- Employee in full-time job (30 hours or more per week)
- Employee in part-time job (less than 30 hours per week)
- Self-employed - full or part time
- Zero hours contract
- Government-supported training
- Unemployed and available for work
- Wholly retired from work
- Full-time education at school, college or university
- Looking after home/family
- Permanently sick/disabled
- Doing something else
If do something else, please specify

Q41 How many different jobs do you have?
Interviewer instruction: Only ask if in employment
- 1
- 2
- 3
- More than 3

Q42 If unemployed, how are you supporting yourself? Interviewer instruction: Only ask if appropriate
- Savings
- Benefits
- Help from friends, family, partner
- Other

Q43 What is the location of where you work?
Interviewer instruction: Please tick appropriate box and write in the name of the town/location mentioned
- Babergh - nearest town(s) Hadleigh
- Forest Heath - nearest town(s) Newmarket, Mildenhall, Brandon
- Ipswich
- Mid-Suffolk - nearest town(s) Stowmarket
- St. Edmundsby - Bury St. Edmunds, Haverhill
- Suffolk Coastal – Felixstowe
- Waveney – Lowestoft
- Outside of Suffolk/Other
If outside of Suffolk or other, please specify (or if in Suffolk, please write in location)

Q44 How do you usually travel to work?
Instruction to interview: Tick the box for the longest part of the usual journey to work
- Work mainly at or from home
- Train
- Bus or Coach
- Taxi
- Motorcycle, Moped or Scooter
- Driving a car or van
- Passenger in a car or van
- Bicycle
- On foot
- Mini-bus or Coach provided by employer
- Other

Q45 How easy or difficult have you found it to find employment? Was it . . .
- Very easy
- Easy
- Neither easy nor difficult
- Difficult
- Very difficult
- Don't know

Q46 What type(s) of industry do you work in?
Interviewer instruction: Tick all that apply
- Agriculture and farming
- Cleaning
- Construction
- Food processing
- Health or social care
- Hospitality
- Office based work
- Manufacturing
- Retail or Tourism
- Other
If other, please specify

Q47 How would you describe the work you do?
Interviewer instruction: Code into most relevant category it . . .
- Manager
- Professional
- Technician and associate professionals
- Clerical support workers
- Service and sales workers
- Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers
- Craft and related trades workers
- Plant and machine operators and assemblers
- Elementary occupations, such as cleaners and laborers
Q48 What is the highest academic qualification you have attained (or equivalent)?
- Doctoral Degree (eg PhD/DPhil, EdD, DPhil, DBA, DClinPsy)
- Master's Degree (eg MPhil, MRes, MA, MSc)
- Master's Degree (integrated) (eg MEng, MChem, MPhys, MPharm)
- Other post-graduate degree
- Other professional qualification e.g. teacher, nurse etc
- Bachelor's Degree with Honours (eg BA/BSc Hons)
- A-Levels (or other post 16 qualifications)
- GCSE (or other 16 and under qualifications)
- No formal qualifications

Q49 How well can you speak English? Would you say . . .?
- Very well
- Well
- Not well
- Not at all

Health
I would now like to ask you some questions about your health . . .
Q50 Are you registered with a local G.P?
- Yes
- No

Q51 How is your health in general? Would you say it is . . .?
- Very good
- Good
- Fair
- Bad
- Very bad
- Don't know

Q52 Do you have any long-standing illness, disability or infirmity? (Long-standing means anything that has troubled you over a period of time or that is likely to affect you over a period of time)
- Yes
- No

Q53 While living in Britain, do you look after, care for or give any help or support to family, friends, neighbours or others who have a long-term physical or mental illness or disability or problems related to old age? Do not count anything you do as part of your paid employment
- Yes
- No
  If yes, whom?

Demographics
Finally, I would like to ask you some questions about you to help us understand what different types of people think . . .

Q54 How would you describe your gender? Note to interviewer: use showcard
- Male
- Female
- Other

Q55 What is your age?
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65+

Q56 Please can you tell me what is your religion or faith, if any?
- Christian
- Buddhist
- Hindu
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Sikh
- No religion
- Other

Q57 So that we can map where different communities live, can you provide the first half of your post code?

Q58 Finally, this survey is part of a wider programme of consultation that the Council and its partners are undertaking to help improve the services they provide. The Council and its partners may wish to recontact you to take part in future research. Would you be willing to part in a more in-depth interview on some of the issues discussed today? If selected you would be contacted by phone over the next couple of weeks. There is no obligation to attend by saying yes now. A thank you payment would be made if you attend to cover your expenses and thank you for your time and effort.

Interviewer instruction: Please stress to respondent that their details will not be linked to their answers and that they will only be contacted for research purposes
- Yes
- No
If yes to Q58, please provide contact details:

Name

Address

Contact number

Thank you very much for your time completing the survey. Pass on interview leaflet. And if you would like to contact the Council to find out more about local services, please contact: https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/about/contact-us/

Interviewer record sample code (Location of interview):

- Babergh - nearest town(s) Hadleigh
- Forest Heath - nearest town(s) Newmarket, Mildenhall, Brandon
- Ipswich
- Mid-Suffolk - nearest town(s) Stowmarket
- St. Edmundsbury - Bury St. Edmunds, Haverhill
- Suffolk Coastal - Felixstowe
- Waveney - Lowestoft

Interviewer record sample code (Rural/Urban):

- Rural
- Urban

Interviewer record sample code (Nationality)

________________________
Appendix 3: Settled residents questionnaire

Survey about migration (settled residents)

READ: Good morning / afternoon / evening. My name is … and I work for Public Perspectives and Agroni, who are research companies. (SHOW ID)

We are carrying out a survey on behalf of Suffolk County Council and partner organisations, about migration to the area. The Council is asking these questions so that it can develop policies and services to help build community cohesion and ensure public services meet the needs of the people who live here.

Can you help by taking part in a survey please? It will just take a couple of minutes.

O.K, thanks. Before we get started we just want to stress that what you say is anonymous and confidential and will not be used to identify you. Your individual answers will not be seen by anyone at Suffolk County Council. All your data is handled in line with data protection and the MRS.

Interviewer instruction: Must be 'settled resident' and living in Suffolk i.e. they must not fit our definition of being a migrant.

Interviewer instruction: Respondent to have lived in Suffolk for at least 1 year.

Q1 On a scale of 0 to 10, has migration had a positive or negative impact on your area? (0 is “very negative”, 10 is “very positive”)

- 0 - very negative
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 - very positive
- Don't know
Q2 On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is extremely bad and 10 is extremely good, would you say it is generally bad or good for the local economy that migrants come to the area from other countries?
☐ 0 - extremely bad for economy
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ 5
☐ 6
☐ 7
☐ 8
☐ 9
☐ 10 - extremely good for economy
☐ Don't know

Q3 And on a scale of 0 to 10, would you say that the cultural life locally is generally undermined or enriched by migrants coming to live here from other countries?
☐ 0 - cultural life undermined
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ 5
☐ 6
☐ 7
☐ 8
☐ 9
☐ 10 - cultural life enriched
☐ Don't know

Q4 Read out: Many migrants work in the public sector, in hospitals, schools and for local government, for which they pay taxes. While living here migrants also make use of public services, such as the NHS and schools.

Do you think that, on balance, migration to your area reduces or increases pressure on local public services?
☐ Reduces pressure a lot
☐ Reduces pressure a little
☐ Neither increases nor reduces pressure
☐ Increases pressure a little
☐ Increases pressure a lot
☐ Don't know

Q5 To what extent do you agree or disagree that your local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together?
☐ Definitely agree
☐ Tend to agree
☐ Tend to disagree
☐ Definitely disagree
☐ Don't know

Q6 Do you have any comments about migration to your area?
______________________________________________________
About you: Note to interviewer: Re-stress anonymity and confidentiality. Stress that only ask these questions to ensure we get a good mix of respondents.

Q7 How would you describe your gender? Note to interviewer: just note down, don’t ask.
- Male
- Female
- Other

Q8 What is your age?
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65+

Interviewer record location of interview:
- Babergh - nearest town(s) Hadleigh
- Forest Heath - nearest town(s) Newmarket, Mildenhall, Brandon
- Ipswich
- Mid-Suffolk - nearest town(s) Stowmarket
- St. Edmundsbury - Bury St. Edmunds, Haverhill
- Suffolk Coastal - Felixstowe
- Waveney - Lowestoft

End interview: Thank respondent for time and reiterate that the survey will help the Council plan for the future.