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Executive summary

After a further 10 nations acceded to the European Union in 2004, net migration to the UK not only rose but became increasingly complex, with migrants\(^1\) coming in greater numbers, from a wider range of source countries, and settling and working in a variety of locations and sectors. But over the past two years, the story has changed significantly. With the worsening of the economic situation, net migration has actually fallen from its peak due to increased levels of emigration.

Far from being an urban phenomenon, migrants have increasingly settled in the countryside, with some rural areas\(^2\) and sectors employing a high number of migrant workers. Given the changes to migration patterns in the UK over recent years, the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) commissioned Experian to identify those rural local areas recording a high number of migrant workers, and estimate their economic contribution to the rural economy.

International migrants play an important role in some local rural economies

We found that places such as Herefordshire, East Cambridgeshire and Forest Heath, among others, have a high percentage of migrants as part of the workforce. Sectors found to employ a large number of migrant workers are agriculture, hospitality and manufacturing. Notably, findings suggest that areas with a high concentration of migrants in agriculture (particularly in the East of England) employ a larger share of migrants relative to other industries.

In addition, our estimates show that migrants contribute to approximately 6 per cent of rural areas’ Gross Value Added. We found the contribution of recent migration to have been particularly high in the East of England.

Gross inflows of migrants, particularly ‘new’ migrants to rural areas, as captured by Workers Registration Scheme data, have declined by over 20 per cent between 2008 and 2009

Gross inflows of migrants to rural areas have declined over recent years, particularly in the last two years (Workers Registration Scheme applications posted declines of over 20 per cent both between 2007 and 2008, and 2008 and 2009). This is consistent with trends at national level.

\(^1\) Throughout this report the term ‘migrant’, or ‘migrant worker’, refers to international migrants, that is, people who change their country of residence, moving across international boundaries. Any references to internal migration are clearly labelled as such. Although people migrate for a variety of reasons, our main concern in this report is with migration for the purposes of work (that is, economic or labour migration). For a more detailed discussion on definitional issues, see Green, A. E., Owen, D. and Jones, P. (2008) Migrant Workers in the South East. Regional Economy Institute for Employment Research. Warwick: University of Warwick.

\(^2\) In this report, a ‘rural area’ is defined as having at least 50 per cent of its population in rural settlements or larger market towns. For a more detailed definition, see appendix A.
Using scenario analysis (based on Experian employment forecasts) we estimated that if migrants were to leave and arrive in fewer numbers following fewer employment opportunities, rural areas would see a slight decrease in the Gross Value Added contribution of migrants to their local areas which would only pick up after 2013.

**Should levels of migration to rural areas continue to decline the agriculture sector and parts of the UK where the labour market remains tight are likely to be most affected**

During the economic downturn, job losses within the agriculture sector appeared to be somewhat lower than in other sectors of the economy (in fact Labour Force Survey) data suggests that employment in agriculture rose by around 3 per cent between Q4 2008 and Q4 2009) and in some areas with high numbers of migrants employed in the agriculture sector, the claimant unemployment rate is quite low. This suggests it may be difficult to replace migrant workforce with local labour in these areas.

One area that we touched on in this report but deserves further study is whether investment in capital could address potential labour shortages. Through our qualitative research we found that there are processes within agriculture that are more difficult to replace with investment in machinery, such as harvesting and fruit-picking. Through case study work on businesses’ production models – particularly using contrasting examples for the same sub-sector – there is scope to investigate this issue further.
Introduction

International migration and rural economies

Over the past few years migration to the UK has risen and has become increasingly complex, with migrants\(^3\) coming in greater numbers, from a wider range of source countries, and settling and working in a variety of locations and sectors. Far from being an urban phenomenon this has also affected rural areas, with increasing numbers of migrants seeking to find employment and settle in the countryside often in areas which do not have a history of migration.

The population of England’s rural areas continues to rise at a faster rate than across the country as a whole. Most of this increase is due to internal migration by people moving out of cities, rather than different birth and death rates, yet external migration patterns are also a contributing factor.\(^4\) Foreign migrants continue to locate in England’s rural areas both on a permanent basis and seasonally, for example through the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme,\(^5\) which under current proposals for a points-based immigration policy is to be phased out by 2010.

After a further 10 nations acceded to the European Union in 2004, the number of foreign migrants arriving in rural communities increased significantly. Analysis conducted by the Commission for Rural Affairs stated that around 120,000 migrant workers registered in the rural areas of England between May 2004 and September 2006 and our own analysis shows that almost 180,000 A8 migrants applied to the Workers Registration Scheme\(^6\) between 2004 and 2007.\(^7\) This represents over 20 per cent of the total number of A8 gross inflows of migrants, as captured by Workers Registration Scheme registrations, across these two periods. Naturally some regions attract a larger number of migrant workers than others. Analysis by the Commission for Rural Communities highlights that the largest clusters of migrant workers are around Herefordshire, Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire, and to an extent, Somerset.

---

\(^3\) Throughout this report the term ‘migrant’, or ‘migrant worker’, refers to international migrants. Any references to internal migration are clearly labelled as such.


\(^5\) The Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme is designed to allow farmers and growers in the UK to recruit low-skilled overseas workers to undertake short-term agricultural work. The scheme works on a quota basis. Farmers and growers who participate in the scheme are allowed to employ a fixed number of overseas workers though the scheme each year. Since the accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the EU in 2007 the scheme has been restricted to only candidates from these two countries (the A2). In 2009 the quota is 21,250 places. The Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme has a long history. It has been in place since WWII. For more details, see: [www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/workingintheuk/eea/saws/](http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/workingintheuk/eea/saws/)

\(^6\) Coverage of the Workers Registration Scheme and all other data sources used are detailed in Appendix A.

\(^7\) Commission for Rural Communities (2007) *A8 migrant workers in rural areas Briefing Papers*, Cheltenham: CRC.
and Devon. However, following the large inflow of A8\textsuperscript{8} migrants, there are signs that numbers have been decreasing since 2007. The majority of migrant workers find employment in a small number of sectors. Workers Registration Scheme data on migrant inflows shows several economic sectors in which rural A8 migrant workers are employed, comprising manufacturing, agriculture and fishing, and distribution, hotel and retail. Evidence suggests that migrants make up a third of food manufacturing workers, a quarter of farm workers and a fifth of hotel and restaurant workers in rural England.\textsuperscript{9}

The evidence that exists highlights both the economic benefits and challenges posed by migration. Benefits include greater labour market efficiency and, potentially, increases in average wages.\textsuperscript{10} Among the challenges, the implications for the provision of public services in some areas are often quoted. For example, there are challenges posed by language barriers, which can make access to services and integration within local communities more difficult. Housing, healthcare and education could also be affected by an increase in local population when some existing local services may already be under pressure.

The current economic situation has compounded this situation. Although the worst of the recession is thought to be over, communities and businesses across rural areas continue to face business closures, job losses, reduced working, and difficulty in securing bank funds.\textsuperscript{11} Many small and peripheral rural economies have seen rapid and substantial increases in those registered for Jobseeker’s Allowance, very low numbers of unfilled vacancies and insufficient resources to offer local retraining.\textsuperscript{12}

This economic climate has in turn affected patterns of migration. Analysis conducted by the Office for National Statistics shows that the number of short-term migrants who move to the UK has dropped significantly, particularly among A8 migrants. This trend, which started in 2007, continued throughout 2009.\textsuperscript{13}

Given the changes to migration patterns in the UK over recent years, it is fundamental to identify those areas and sectors in rural economies that have a high concentration of migrant labour, their characteristics, and ultimately assess the role they place in rural economies.

\textsuperscript{8} A8 stands for ‘Accession 8’ and refers to eight Central and Eastern European countries that joined the EU in 2004. These are Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia. In addition, Cyprus and Malta were also given EU membership status in 2004.


\textsuperscript{11} Commission for Rural Communities (2009) Rural Economies Recession Intelligence January, Cheltenham: CRC.

\textsuperscript{12} Commission for Rural Communities (2009) Rural Economies Recession Intelligence February, Cheltenham: CRC.

Adding to the evidence base

In March 2009, DCLG commissioned Experian to identify those rural local areas with a high number of migrant workers and estimate their economic contribution to the rural economy. In March 2010, an update of this report was requested in order to capture new trends and reflect how the economic climate has changed.

We designed a two-stage methodology that combines literature reviews, quantitative analysis, modelling techniques and qualitative research.

**Stage 1** of the research focused on identifying vulnerable areas using quantitative analysis of the Annual Population Survey and other key sources of data on migration, such as the Workers Registration Scheme and National Insurance Number datasets. Modelling techniques have been applied to estimate the economic contribution of migrants to rural economies in Gross Value Added terms. Having identified those rural areas with higher numbers of migrant workers, we analysed their future economic performance and labour market tightness, using Experian forecasts and labour market data.

**Stage 2** of the research incorporated a further dimension to the study. Using modelling techniques we estimated the potential economic impact of future migration trends to rural areas. In addition, we drew on consultations with employers to assess their needs and how potential labour shortages could be tackled.

We provide further details on the data sources, key definitions used, and methodology in Appendix A.

This report

This report summarises the key findings from our research. It is structured around five sections:

**Section 1** provides a snapshot of international migration to rural areas, and identifies those rural areas with a high number of migrant workers.

**Section 2** examines in greater detail ‘new’ migrant profiles and the role they play in the economy including their country of origin/nationality, age and gender, industry/occupation, skills and length of stay.

**Section 3** looks at migrants’ economic contribution, including Gross Value Added estimates, and identifies those areas that would be most impacted by migrants leaving the UK or coming in smaller numbers.

**Section 4** examines future migration trends using modelling techniques and assesses employers’ future needs through qualitative research.
Section 5 concludes by setting out the key messages derived from our research.
1 Migration to rural areas

With the granting of the right to work and live in the UK to A8 nationals in 2004, rural areas witnessed a significant increase in migration flows; whereas in 2002, 6 per cent of all National Insurance Numbers allocated to overseas workers were recorded in rural local areas, by 2005 this proportion increased to 10 per cent and has remained at this level since then. In fact, the number of National Insurance Numbers allocated to overseas workers between 2004 and 2005 increased by almost 80 per cent in rural areas, reaching over 60,000 in 2005 from 35,000 in 2004. Moreover, the observed rate of increase has been even higher for rural England than England as a whole (Figure 1.1).

Data from the Workers Registration Scheme confirms this trend, with gross inflows of migrants from A8 countries working in rural localities amounting to 178,000 between 2004 and 2008. Although international migration to rural areas has increased since 2004, Workers Registration Scheme registrations to rural areas between 2004 and 2007 represent 20 per cent of overall registrations in England. In other words, international migration to rural areas is relatively small compared to urban areas. However, even if small at the national and regional level, certain rural local areas may draw on migrant workers to tackle labour shortages in specific sectors that they cannot fill with the local labour force. In addition, the fact that many of these areas do not have a history of migration poses new challenges for these local economies.

Figure 1.1: Change in National Insurance Numbers registrations for overseas nationals over time (rural areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% annual change</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Rural England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NINo 2003 - 2008

14 The number of National Insurance Numbers allocated to overseas nationals in a local authority area should provide a good indication of the number of overseas persons arriving to work. More details on data sources is included in Appendix A.

15 Introduced in May 2004, this source provides information supplied by citizens from the A8 countries when they obtain a job in the UK. A8 citizens are required to re-register for subsequent jobs until they have worked a total of 12 out of 13 months. For more details see the Box on page 7 and Appendix A.
The Annual Population Survey is the only source that provides a measure of the actual stock of migrants – neither data on Workers Registration Scheme nor National Insurance Numbers capture de-registrations or outflows. However, Annual Population Survey data needs to be interpreted with care as sample size can be limited at smaller geographies, and many have argued that it underestimates the number of A8 migrants.\textsuperscript{16}

\section*{Principal strengths and weaknesses of the data sources used}

\subsection*{Labour Force Survey and Annual Population Survey}

The Labour Force Survey is a quarterly survey of around 50,000 households per quarter, designed to provide robust national labour market and macro economic information. It is a key, regularly updated national source of data providing information on both flows and stocks of foreign nationals living and working in the UK; it is the only source that provides a measure of stock of migrants.

However, its sample size is insufficient to provide reliable data at local level. Moreover, most of the information is collected from private households, and therefore the survey could underestimate the number of migrants living in other accommodation, which includes many workers in the agricultural industry. In addition, it is better at capturing inflows than outflows of migrants and therefore it is better for analysis of long-term migration than short-term migration.

The Annual Population Survey combines results from the quarterly Labour Force Survey data. Annual Population Survey datasets are produced quarterly with each dataset containing 12 months of data. There are approximately 170,000 households and 360,000 persons per dataset. More robust local area labour market estimates are available from the Annual Population Survey than from the main Labour Force Survey.

\subsection*{Workers Registration Scheme}

The Workers Registration Scheme provides information supplied by citizens from the A8 countries when they obtain a job in the UK. It provides data on a variety of socio-demographic characteristics of migrants including age, gender, sector, occupation, and planned duration of stay. Local authority level data are available on a quarterly basis.

However, the data does not capture deregistration; only giving information on inflows of migrants. Therefore it is not possible to make assumptions about how long people stay or how many are working in an area at any one time. Moreover, self-employed workers are not required to register and an unknown number of migrant workers do not register.

\subsection*{National Insurance Number}

This source provides information on all non-UK nationals working or claiming benefits legally. Information is recorded on age, gender and nationality on an annual basis at local authority level.

However, it provides no information on deregistration (meaning that outflows cannot be captured) and the data can underestimate migration inflows because there are exemptions, such as dependents, students, migrants not of working age and not claiming benefits.

\textsuperscript{16} Green, A. E., Owen, D. and Jones, P. (2008) \textit{Migrant Workers in the South East}, Regional Economy Institute for Employment Research. Warwick: University of Warwick. For a more detailed discussion see Appendix A.
Following Green et al. and Oxford Economics,\textsuperscript{17} we have used the Annual Population Survey data to identify different groups of migrants according to their year of arrival. Whereas ‘new’ migrants include non-UK born arriving after 2004, ‘old’ migrants combines those arriving in the UK between 1992 and 2003 and prior to 1992.\textsuperscript{18}

An analysis of non-UK born workers in rural areas by their year of arrival shows that most arrived before 2004, particularly before 1992 (almost 50 per cent).\textsuperscript{19} The number of recent migrants to rural areas amounted to almost 95,000 or almost 30 per cent of the total stock of migrants in rural areas. This is particularly high taking into account that we are comparing 95,000 over a five year period (2004 to 2009) with over 85,000 over a 12 year period, showing again the scale of recent migration to rural areas.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Number of migrant workers} & \textbf{As % of total} \\
\hline
\textbf{Old migrants} & & \\
1992-2003 & 86,427 & 25 \\
Pre-1992 & 158,587 & 47 \\
Total old migrants & 245,014 & 72 \\
Total new migrants & 94,655 & 28 \\
Total & 339,669 & 100 \\
\hline
\textbf{Source: APS July 08-June 09} & & \\
\end{tabular}
\end{table}


\textsuperscript{18}See Appendix A for more details. Our definition of ‘new’ migrants includes migrants from Europe and other parts of the world. Given that migrants coming from other parts of the world represent a substantial proportion of new migrants we have decided to include them in our definition. In addition, it helped us deal with the fact that the APS suffers from small sample sizes when the data is further disaggregated to a local level.

\textsuperscript{19}Most migrants arriving before 1992 (about 62\%) came from ‘the rest of the world’ comprising all countries outside Europe. A large proportion also came from European countries, (38\%) but only a very small fraction (below 1\%) were from Eastern European countries.
1.1 The changing picture of migration to the UK

The story has changed since the increase in migration flows following A8 accession in 2004. Even prior to the recession, much had been discussed as to whether recent migration trends had started to slow down, with fewer migrants, especially from A8 and A2\textsuperscript{20} countries, coming to the UK.\textsuperscript{21} This debate has intensified since the start of the recession, with many commentators arguing that the difficult economic conditions would lead to more migrants potentially leaving the UK.

Indeed, evidence suggests that there has been a slowdown in workers migrating to the UK. Data on National Insurance Numbers issued to foreign workers shows that these have declined significantly (Figure 1.1). By 2006, the number of National Insurance Numbers registrations had already stabilised, and from 2007 onwards it has experienced a downward trend both in rural areas and England as a whole. Between 2007 and 2008 the number of National Insurance Numbers allocated to overseas workers decreased by 16 per cent for England and 21 per cent for rural areas. And the latest Office for National Statistics release suggests there has been a similar decrease – of 14 per cent – in the UK as whole between September 2008 and September 2009.

Data on migrant inflows from the Workers Registration Scheme confirms that with worsening economic conditions fewer migrants from A8 countries are attracted to the UK and rural areas are no exception. Gross inflows of migrants from A8 countries working in rural localities in 2009 amounted to 22,000, a 26 per cent fall compared to 2008, slightly higher than the 22 per cent fall experienced in the UK as a whole for the same period. Figure 1.2 shows that a fall in Workers Registration Scheme applications for workers registered in rural areas began at the end of 2007, continued in 2008, particularly during Q3 and Q4, and throughout 2009.

\textsuperscript{20} A2 states, which joined in 2007, comprise Bulgaria and Romania.

According to Office for National Statistics projections of international migration, net migration in England is likely to fall from 209,000 in 2008 to 170,000 by 2016 and from 12,900 to 7,600 in rural England. However, current Office for National Statistics projections are based on the average net migration rate of the last few years, an assumption that may now be subject to challenge. Research by Oxford Economics (2009) for the Department suggests a much sharper decline with total figures for the UK reaching 100,000 by 2009 and 90,000 thereafter.

There are a number of reasons that help explain these recent changes in migration trends, often referred to in the literature as ‘push and pull factors’. Among ‘push’ factors are the economic conditions of the ‘sending’ country; some authors have argued that during 2008 unemployment has declined and wages improved in countries such as Poland giving migrants incentives to go back or remain in their home country. ‘Pull’ factors include the strength of the UK economy relative to that of migrant workers’ home countries, particularly with respect to job opportunities and the exchange rate.

In the context of the current recession, with a weaker pound and increased unemployment, the number of non-British workers in employment in the UK is estimated to have fallen by 2.6 per cent or 99,035 between Q4 2008 and Q4 2009. A weaker pound relative to other currencies means that the gap between potential earnings in the home country against the UK narrows providing fewer incentives to migrate. However, it is important to note that

---

22 Rural England projections were calculated by summing the net difference between inflow and outflow of migrants in all local authorities that are defined as R50 or R80 by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. It is important to highlight that outflows also consider UK born going to leave abroad.


given the global nature of the recession, economic conditions in migrants’ home countries have also worsened and therefore the impact on migration trends to the UK could be overstated. For example, Schneider et al (2009)\textsuperscript{25} find that deteriorating economic conditions have not necessarily shortened intended length of stay.

1.2 Migrant labour in rural areas

So far we have established that rural areas have seen an increase in inflows of migrants since 2004, that ‘new’ migrants make up a significant share of the total stock of migrants in rural areas, and that net migration to the UK is starting to decline, particularly among A8 migrants. Gross inflows of A8 migrants as measured by the Workers Registration Scheme data, have also recorded falls of over 20 per cent between 2008 and 2009. In this context, it is important to identify the rural areas where migrant workers comprise a significant share of the local workforce.

According to data from the Annual Population Survey, non-UK born workers in rural England are highly concentrated in a few regions\textsuperscript{26}, with just over 70 per cent or 239,000 living in the South East, East of England and South West alone.

Using the Annual Population Survey we have estimated the numbers of ‘new’ and ‘old’ migrants in rural areas for each region. The East of England, South West, South East, and East Midlands (in that order) appeared to have the highest numbers of ‘new’ migrants. In this respect, trends for ‘new’ migrants in rural areas are similar to those found for the country as a whole (see Oxford Economics 2009).\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{25} Schneider, C. and Holman, D. (2009) Longitudinal study of migrant workers in the East of England Interim Report. Cambridge: PPCG and Anglia Ruskin University. In addition, they also find that it is not only economic conditions that drive migrant decisions. Other consideration not least personal and family reasons are often cited as a key driver of migrant decisions to leave the country.

\textsuperscript{26} It is worth noting that Greater London as an urban area (and the area with most migrants in the UK) is excluded from this analysis, which focuses on rural areas only.

Figures from the Workers Registration Scheme, only including migrants from A8 countries, show a similar distribution of ‘new’ migrant workers in rural areas across regions with the East of England, South West, East Midlands, South East, and West Midlands recording the highest number of A8 migrants.

In terms of ‘old’ migrants, again it is mostly rural areas in the South East, South West and the East of England that recorded the highest numbers, showing that these regions have been utilising migrant work for some time now, even before the accession of A8 countries in 2004. Figure 1.3 shows that while the South East had a higher influx of migrants prior to 2004, the East of England remains the region with the highest numbers of recent migrants.
Map 1.1: Total stock of migrants per thousand workers, July 08 – June 09

Source: Annual Population Survey
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Using the Annual Population Survey we have identified those local areas that rely more heavily on migrant labour. In particular, places such as Forest Heath, East Cambridgeshire, Tandridge and Test Valley make up the top five local rural areas in terms of total stock of non-UK born workers as a percentage of total employment.

Table 1.2: Top 20 Rural local authorities by number of non-UK born workers (total stock)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Rural local authorities/unitary authorities</th>
<th>Non-UK born workers 2008/0928</th>
<th>As % of total employment 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Forest Heath</td>
<td>8,354</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>East Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>6,128</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>5,806</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Test Valley</td>
<td>7,644</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</td>
<td>Richmondshire</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Aylesbury Vale</td>
<td>10,377</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>South Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>9,597</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>South Oxfordshire</td>
<td>7,423</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Caradon</td>
<td>3,313</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>South Kesteven</td>
<td>7,171</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Wychavon</td>
<td>6,848</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>6,789</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Mid Sussex</td>
<td>6,917</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>North Cornwall</td>
<td>4,251</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Horsham</td>
<td>5,935</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>North Norfolk</td>
<td>3,452</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>Daventry</td>
<td>4,268</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Rother</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>West Wiltshire</td>
<td>5,318</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>South Shropshire</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Population Survey July 08 – June 09 and Annual Business Inquiry 2008 for total employment

28 Please note that this refers to migrants in employment. It is also important to emphasise that at local level the Annual Population Survey suffers from small sample size and therefore these numbers should be interpreted with caution.
In addition, using Workers Registration Scheme data, we have identified those local areas with the highest inflows of 'new' migrants from A8 countries. Overall, as illustrated by Map 1.2, there are similarities between local areas which experienced a high influx of recent migrants in 2008 and those identified as generally having a large stock of migrants. In particular, the local authorities of East Cambridgeshire, Forest Heath, Wychavon, South Oxfordshire and North Cornwall appear in the top 20 in terms of both stock and recent inflows (Table 1.2 and 1.3 respectively).

However, as expected, there are also differences given that the datasets used capture different groups of migrants.
Map 1.2: A8 migrants per thousand workers, 2009

Source: Workers Registration Scheme
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### Table 1.3: Top 20 rural local authorities by number of Workers Registration Scheme registrations, 2009\(^{29}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Rural local authorities/unitary authorities</th>
<th>Number of registrations in 2009</th>
<th>As % of total employment 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Fenland</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>King’s Lynn and West Norfolk</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Penwith</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>East Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Herefordshire, County of</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>West Somerset</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Wychavon</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>Newark and Sherwood</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>North Kesteven</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Breckland</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Forest Heath</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>Ryedale</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>West Lancashire</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>North Cornwall</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>South Oxfordshire</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Stratford-on-Avon</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>East Lindsey</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Kerrier</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Workers Registration Scheme 2009 and Annual Business Inquiry 2008 for total employment

---

\(^{29}\) The Annual Population Survey’s sample size is too small to report data for new migrants at the local level and therefore we have presented figures for the Workers Registration Scheme.
Summary

- Rural areas have witnessed a significant increase in migration flows since the integration of Eastern European countries to the EU in 2004. Far from being an urban phenomenon, recent migrants have increasingly chosen to settle in the countryside, in many cases in areas without a history of migration.

- Whereas most migrants to rural areas arrived before 2004 (over 70 per cent of the total stock according to Annual Population Survey data), almost 30 per cent or 95,000 arrived after 2004. This number is particularly high given that it only refers to a five-year period.

- However, both flows of migrant applications from Workers Registration Scheme data and National Insurance Numbers registrations data suggest that recent trends in migration have slowed down, even prior to the downturn, at the end of 2007. In fact, between 2008 and 2009 gross inflows of migrants as measured by Workers Registration Scheme data in rural areas fell by more than 20 per cent.

- Over 70 per cent of rural migrants are concentrated in the South East, South West, and East of England alone. In particular, local areas, such as East Cambridgeshire, Forest Heath, Wychavon, South Oxfordshire and North Cornwall registered a high number of migrants (as a proportion of their workforce) both in terms of stocks and recent inflows.
2 Migrants’ profiles

As stated in the previous section, migrant labour is an important component of rural areas’ workforce. This section considers the characteristics of migrants and the role they play in the labour market of rural economies.

In particular, we present data on ‘new’ migrants’ socio-demographic characteristics, such as their country of origin and nationality, gender and age, industry and occupation, skills and length of stay. We use the latest available Annual Population Survey data, and complement it with data from the Worker Registration Scheme to present information at the local level. Given that recent migrants are more likely to leave the UK than those that have been in the country longer – as explained in section 1 – this analysis focuses on ‘new’ migrants, i.e. those that arrived after 2004.

2.1 Country of origin and nationality

According to Annual Population Survey data, the majority of ‘new’ migrants in rural areas come from the accession countries with half coming from A8 countries, a small proportion from A2 countries (3% per cent), and a significant proportion of migrants from the rest of the world (42 per cent). Relative to the whole of England, the proportion of A8 migrants in rural areas is higher (it is 34 per cent of all new migrants in England against 50 per cent for rural England) and the share of migrants from the rest of the world is lower (51 per cent for the whole country against 42 per cent in rural England).

---

30 Due to sample size, data for migrants’ characteristics at the local level cannot be sourced from the Annual Population Survey, see appendix A for more details.
31 Evidence from a study by the National Institute for Economic and Social Research (NIESR) for the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) suggests that the number of migrants from the A8 countries is the most likely to decline further owing to decreasing wage differentials and a less attractive exchange rate. See DCLG (2009) Managing the impacts of migration: Improvements and innovation. London: DCLG.
32 Interestingly, a comparison with last year’s Annual Population Survey figures shows that the proportion of A8 migrants in rural areas has gone down (from 54% in 2007/08 to 49% in 2008/09) and that of the rest of the world has gone up (from 36% in 2007/08 to 42% in 2008/09) reinforcing the fact that the number of A8 migrants has declined over the last year.
Table 2.1: ‘New’ migrants by country of origin in rural England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Rural England %</th>
<th>Total England %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of EEA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the world</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Population Survey July 08 – June 09

A detailed look at the volumes of ‘new’ migrants arriving from A8 and A2 countries and the wider European Economic Area<sup>34</sup> compared to arrivals from the rest of the world, shows that in the majority of regions a far higher number arrive from these countries. The exceptions are the East of England, North East, and South East which had a higher number of ‘rest of the world’ arrivals.

Figure 2.1: Rural migrant workers by regions and country of origin

A more detailed look at the make-up of migrants’ country of origin by region (figure 2.2) shows that while migrants from A10 countries are spread across rural areas within the different regions, pockets of migrants originating from other countries of the European Economic Area can be found in the East of England, South East, and North East – with many working in agriculture and food-processing (for example, there is a high concentration of Portuguese workers in the food-processing sector in the East of England). Finally, Annual Population Survey data suggests that many ‘new’ migrants come from the rest

<sup>33</sup> See footnotes 14 and 21 for a definition of A8 and A2.

<sup>34</sup> The European Economic Area was established in 1994 following an agreement between European Free Trade Association (EFTA), the European Community (EC), and EU member states. It allows EFTA countries to participate in the European single market without joining the EU. For more information see European Economic Area, European Commission External Relations [Online] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/eea/
of the world. This is the case in many regions, particularly in the rural areas within the East of England and South East.

Figure 2.2: Rural migrant workers by regions and country of origin

2.2 Age and gender

Migrants to rural areas tend to be largely from younger age groups, which is also the case for migrants to England as a whole. Annual Population Survey data on age shows that most ‘new’ migrants (about 70 per cent) in rural areas are between 18 and 34 years old. More precisely, 49 per cent are between 25 and 34; 20 per cent between 18 and 24; and 20 per cent between 35 and 44. These trends are reflected in rural areas within regions as shown in figure 2.3 below.

Figure 2.3: Rural workers by region and age group
Workers Registration Scheme data for A8 migrants shows similar trends with migrants concentrated among younger groups, with results skewed towards workers between 18 and 24.

In terms of gender, 55 per cent of migrants in rural England are male compared to 45 per cent female. Data from the Workers Registration Scheme shows a similar breakdown with 56 per cent of male and 44 per cent female – a trend apparent for England as a whole.

### 2.3 Industry and occupation

Agriculture, hospitality and manufacturing are among those sectors employing a large number of migrants in rural areas. Data for A8 migrants shows that the sector that attracts the greatest number of successful Workers Registration Scheme applicants in rural areas is administration, business and managerial: 9,500 or almost 45 per cent of migrant workers fall into this category. However, the majority of workers in this sector, and in the Sector Based Scheme sectors are employed by recruitment agencies and so could work in any industry. The agriculture sector was the second largest in terms of Workers Registration Scheme applicants: just over 5,000 successful Workers Registration Scheme applicants intended to work in this sector. Hospitality and catering, utilities and manufacturing also recorded a large number of migrant workers in rural areas.

---


36 The Sector Based Scheme is a scheme that allows people from 18-30 from outside the European Economic to come to the United Kingdom to take temporary work.


38 For 2009 Q4 Workers Registration Scheme the Sector Based Scheme was disaggregated further identifying applications related to other sectors (hospitality, food processing, among others). To ensure comparability with the other quarters we used a Sector Based Scheme sector total aggregating the new categories.

39 It is important to note that the latest run of Annual Population Survey data (July 08 – June 09) has a significant number of missing cases for sectoral breakdowns and therefore we have not included information on sectoral employment from this source.
2.3.1 The agriculture sector

As shown in figure 2.5, in the agriculture sector the rural areas within the East of England employ the greatest number of migrants; 40 29 per cent of the total number of Workers Registration Scheme applicants working in this sector registered in this region in 2009. The South West and South East also had a notably high volume of agricultural workers in 2009, with 27 per cent and 14 per cent of applicants in the sector working in these regions respectively.

40 This reflects the fact that the East of England is one of the leading regions in agricultural production. According to Experian’s Regional Planning Service Spring 2010 forecast, the East of England’s agricultural output is the third highest in the UK only behind that of Scotland and the South West.
Migration location quotients (comparing the share of migrants in the sector in a region to the share of migrants in the same sector for rural England) show that the highest concentration of workers in this sector is in the West Midlands with a location quotient of 2.\textsuperscript{41} The East of England is the only other region to have a higher concentration than the average for rural England.

Turning to the local picture, Table 2.2 shows the 10 local authorities in which there was the highest number of successful Workers Registration Scheme applications in 2008 as a percentage of employment in the sector. It shows that in places such as Penwith and Fenland A8 workers made over 30 per cent and 20 per cent of the workforce respectively.\textsuperscript{42} As detailed below, and as expected, migrant labour plays a greater role within local rural areas with a large agriculture sector. It is worth noting that besides A8 migrants there is a sizeable number of migrants from other countries of the European Economic Area and the rest of the world working in this sector, with the composition of migrants by country of origin varying by locality (as stated in section 2.2). Unfortunately, Workers Registration Scheme data, which only covers A8 migrants, is the most reliable source of data at the local level that provides sectoral breakdowns, and as a consequence this analysis only focuses on this group of migrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Rural local authorities/unitary authorities</th>
<th>Number of Workers in Sector</th>
<th>As % of employment in agriculture 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Herefordshire, County of</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>King’s Lynn and West Norfolk</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Fenland</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Wychavon</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>East Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Penwith</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>West Lancashire</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</td>
<td>East Riding of Yorkshire</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Workers Registration Scheme 2009 and Annual Business Inquiry 2008

\textsuperscript{41} Should the value be more than 1, this denotes a higher concentration than the English average.

Analysis of the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme\textsuperscript{43} data suggests that generally the regions that utilise the most workers on this scheme are also those regions that attract the most Workers Registration Scheme migrants in agriculture.

In total, over the period shown in Table 2.3 the West Midlands is the region with the highest number of Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme migrants. Within this region, the County of Herefordshire is again the local authority that utilises the largest amount of Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme workers (87 per cent of the regional total). Of these, the majority are employed in specialist fruit (83 per cent) and general cropping (15 per cent).\textsuperscript{44} Significant amounts of workers employed in the five local authorities that record the highest number of Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme workers in this region are employed in other horticulture and specialist glass. A breakdown of the sub-sectors in which Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme workers are employed in the three regions that employ the highest numbers of Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme migrants can be found in Appendix A.

Table 2.3: Regional distribution of Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme migrants in rural areas\textsuperscript{45}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Q1 2007</th>
<th>Q2 2007</th>
<th>Q3 2007</th>
<th>Q4 2007</th>
<th>Q1 2008</th>
<th>Q2 2008</th>
<th>Q3 2008</th>
<th>Q4 2008</th>
<th>Q1 2009</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>3,995</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>9,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>3,770</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>9,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>5,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>2,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humber</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>11,305</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>10,395</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>30,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>12,980</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>12,235</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>34,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme 2007-2009

Clearly it is important to consider whether this represents a dependence on migrant labour and the alternative sources that could meet employer demand. Assessing the tightness of the labour market, by considering the claimant count rate of unemployment, provides an indication of the degree to which

\textsuperscript{43} The Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme is designed to allow farmers and growers in the UK to recruit low-skilled overseas workers to undertake short-term agricultural work. The scheme works on a quota basis. Farmers and growers who participate in the scheme are allowed to employ a fixed number of overseas workers though the scheme each year. Since the accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the EU in 2007 the scheme has been restricted to only candidates from these two countries (the A2). In 2009 the quota is 21,250 places. See: www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/workingintheuk/eea/saws/

\textsuperscript{44} While our research focuses upon R50 and R80 areas (see Appendix A for more details), it is important to note the importance of South Eastern ‘Significant Rural’ local authorities and the amount of seasonal workers that they attract. In this region, the local authorities of Swale and Maidstone attract the greatest number of Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme workers.

\textsuperscript{45} † means 1 or 2.
there is a local workforce in these areas that could potentially fill the gaps left by migrant workers, should migration to rural parts of England decline.

As the aftershocks of the recession continue to work their way through the labour market, the number of people claiming Jobseeker’s Allowance has risen dramatically both nationally and in rural local authorities. This is also the case in those areas where there are large numbers of migrant workers working in the agriculture sector and many of these local authorities have higher than the rural average claimant count rates. Across the 10 local authorities with the most migrant workers in agriculture (Table 2.2), the level of people claiming for less than six months has risen. The largest increase has been in South Holland (a change in rate from 1.1 in 2008 to 2.6 in 2010). There has also been a rise in the rate of long term claimants. In fact, in all authorities long term claimant rates have increased albeit to a lesser extent than short term rises. As an example, in Fenland the rate of those claiming for over six months increased from 0.6 in 2008 to 1.6 in 2010.

In terms of age, most short-term claimants tend to be concentrated around young groups, particularly between 18 and 24. While this may suggest that there could be a supply of local labour available to the agriculture sector, a variety of factors – wages, working conditions etc – will influence whether these individuals will look to the agriculture sector for employment (these issues are discussed in more detail in subsequent sections).

Figure 2.6: Claimant counts rate increases for the top 10 local authorities for migrant workers in the agriculture sector

Source: Claimant counts 2008 - 2010

46 All claimant counts data refers to January 2008, 2009 and 2010.
2.3.2 The hospitality and catering sector

The hospitality and catering sector is also a significant employer of migrant workers. According to Workers Registration Scheme data on migrant inflows, 2,530 or over 10 per cent of total A8 migrants arriving in the UK in 2009 sought employment in the sector, and rural areas within the South West and the South East had the highest numbers (Figure 2.7).

Figure 2.7: Distribution of hospitality and catering rural migrant workers across the regions in 2009\textsuperscript{47}

![Bar chart showing the distribution of hospitality and catering migrant workers across regions in 2009.](image)

Source: WRS 2009

Migrant location quotients confirm this trend with the South West and South East both having a higher concentration of migrants in this sector than the average for rural England. Other regions such as the North West also feature a high concentration of migrants in this sector.

At the local level, South Lakeland, North Somerset and South Oxfordshire appeared as having a larger number of applications in the hospitality sector. However, it represents a small proportion of the total workforce when compared to the agriculture. The latter reflects the decline in Workers Registration Scheme migrants during 2009. As expected, many rural areas within the South East and South West appear in the top 10. Analysis of Workers Registration Scheme occupation data supports the evidence that hospitality and catering is the largest employment sector in these local authorities. Kitchen/catering assistant, maid/room attendant, bar staff and cleaners were common occupations in each of the local authorities below.

\textsuperscript{47} This graph refers to rural areas within each region (R50 and R80 districts according to the Department for Environment, Foods and Rural Affairs definition, see section A1 in Appendix A for more details).
Table 2.4: Top 10 local authorities for migrant workers in the hospitality and catering sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Number of Workers in Sector</th>
<th>As % of employment in H and C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>South Lakeland</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>North Somerset</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>South Oxfordshire</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>East Lindsey</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Stratford-on-Avon</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>South Bucks</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>West Somerset</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Cotswold</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Workers Registration Scheme 2009 and Annual Business Inquiry 2008

Again, the claimant count rate in these authorities has undoubtedly risen dramatically between 2008 and 2009. In East Lindsey and Isle of Wight the claimant count rates for 2009 are above the rural average. In terms of age, most recent claimants tend to be young, particularly between 18 and 24 years old. Local authorities, such as North Somerset and East Lindsey, show a particularly large share of claimants in this age group.
2.3.3 The manufacturing sector

According to Workers Registration Scheme data, 940 migrant workers (or 4 per cent of total Workers Registration Scheme applications) sought employment in the manufacturing sector in rural areas in 2009. Over 20 per cent of all workers in this sector that work in rural areas registered in Yorkshire and Humber. High numbers also registered in the South West, (18 per cent) South East (16 per cent) and East (14 per cent).

Figure 2.9: Distribution of manufacturing rural migrant workers across the regions in 2009⁴⁸

---

⁴⁸ This graph only includes rural areas within each region (see footnote 30 for more details).
Location quotients show that rural areas within Yorkshire and Humber, West Midlands and the South East have a higher concentration of migrants in this sector than the average for rural England.

Table 2.5 shows those local authorities with the highest Workers Registration Scheme applications in the manufacturing sector – with Herefordshire, North Lincolnshire and Hambleton having the most. As in the case of hospitality, migrant workers make up a small fraction of the total workforce in many of these areas. Many of those local authorities with the highest numbers of migrant workers operating in the manufacturing sector are centres for food-processing, and analysis of the Workers Registration Scheme occupation data suggests process operatives was a more common profession in the majority of the authorities listed below.

**Table 2.5: Top 10 local authorities for migrant workers in the manufacturing sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Number of Workers in Sector</th>
<th>As % of employment in manufacturing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</td>
<td>North Lincolnshire</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Herefordshire, County of</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</td>
<td>Hambleton</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>King's Lynn and West Norfolk</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Aylesbury Vale</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Kerrier</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Wychavon</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>Newark and Sherwood</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Workers Registration Scheme 2009 and Annual Business Inquiry 2008*

The claimant count rate of these local authorities has risen dramatically over the past two years (between 2008 and 2010). In North Lincolnshire, Kings Lynn and West Norfolk, and South Holland the claimant count rates for 2010 are above the rural average. Across all 10 local authorities the level of people claiming for less than six months has risen significantly. In North Lincolnshire the claimant rate for short term claimants has increased by 1.6 from 1.8 in 2008 to 3.4 in 2010. In all local authorities the rate of long term claimants has also increased between 2008 and 2010. In terms of age, it is worth emphasising the large number of short-term claimants between 18 and 24 years old, particularly in areas such as North Lincolnshire. Again, while there may be significant numbers of local workers looking for employment in these areas, other factors will influence whether these represent a genuine labour pool for manufacturers in rural areas.
2.4 Skills

Given the differences in education systems across different countries, capturing the skills levels of migrants is particularly challenging. In fact, using Annual Population Survey data we find that a high number of non-UK born (over 60 per cent) reported to hold ‘Other qualifications’, reflecting the difficulties they find in matching their skills levels to the UK system.

For the purposes of this study, we have excluded those reporting ‘Other qualifications’ and based our analysis on those that specified their skills levels (Figure 2.11). Other possible methods to deal with ‘Other qualifications’ include apportioning these to different skills levels using the Labour Force Survey standard split - see Office for National Statistics (2006) Labour Force Survey User Guide, Vol. 5. London: ONS. However, this may not be entirely accurate since it is based on the whole population (UK born and non-UK born) and therefore could underestimate the number of those stating ‘Other’ with a degree level as suggested by Simm, C. (2006) Improving the Collection of Qualifications Data. London: MORI. Another way of estimating the skills levels of migrants would be to use the age they left full-time education as a proxy for their skills levels (see for example Chappell, L., Latorre, M. and Rutter, J. (2009) Migration and Rural Economies: Assessing and addressing risks. London: IPPR). However, given the differences in school systems across countries and the fact that leaving school at a specific age does not necessarily mean that a qualification has been gained, it is an imperfect proxy. For this reason, for the purposes of this analysis we simply chose to exclude those reporting to hold ‘Other qualifications’ from the analysis. We recognise that this is not an ideal solution.
greater detail in section 4 and as widely documented in the literature\textsuperscript{50} this suggests that migrants often find employment in the UK in roles below their skills levels.

Data for all ‘new’ migrants in England (not only those settling in rural areas) sourced from the Annual Population Survey reveals a similar skills profile. In addition, when compared to UK born, we find that the local workforce is characterised by a less polarised profile, partly explained by slightly lower proportions of people with qualifications equivalent to NVQ4 and above, higher proportions of workers having NVQ3, NVQ2 and below and fewer having no qualifications at all.

**Figure 2.11: ‘New’ migrants’ skills in rural areas**

![Bar chart showing skills distribution](chart.png)

Source: APS July 08 - June 09

2.5 Length of stay

Workers Registration Scheme application data gauges the proposed length of stay of successful applicants. Whilst migrants’ situations are likely to change, this data gives an indication of the length of time migrants intend to stay at the time of their application.

Figure 2.12 suggests the majority of successful Workers Registration Scheme applicants intended to stay in England and work for a period of three months or less – 17,940 migrant workers, or 58 per cent, felt that they would remain in England for this period. A significant amount (16 per cent) stated that they did not know how long they would stay. Although there is a high degree of individual variability around intended length of stay and how this compares to actual length of stay, there is a tendency for migrants to stay for longer

periods of time than initially intended.\textsuperscript{51} Many studies found that migrants continually re-assess and readjust their expectations with regards to the duration of their stay based on their work situation and the socio-economic conditions at home.\textsuperscript{52}

Figure 2.12: Intended length of stay of rural A8 migrant workers 2009

![Bar chart showing the intended length of stay for rural A8 migrant workers in 2009.](source: WRS 2009)

Rural parts of the East of England attract the greatest number of short term migrants – 4,120 or 31 per cent intended to stay for less than three months. This is most likely because of agricultural jobs in the region that require short term seasonal work. It is also, as illustrated in the next section, one of the regions where migrants contribute the most to the economy (see Map 1.3) and therefore could be vulnerable to changing migration patterns.

Figure 2.13: Region of registration for migrants proposing to stay for three months in 2009

![Bar chart showing the region of registration for migrants proposing to stay for three months in 2009.](source: WRS 2009)

\textsuperscript{51} See for example Spencer et al. (2007) Migrants' lives beyond the workplace: the experiences of Central and Eastern Europeans in the UK. York: JRF.

This is supported by our analysis of rural local authorities, which show that four of the five local authorities with the highest number of migrants intending to stay for three months are in the East of England – Fenland, South Holland, East Cambridgeshire and King’s Lynn and West Norfolk.

Summary

- Whereas the majority of new migrants come from A10 countries and the European Economic Area (58%) a significant proportion (42%) come from other parts of the world (Annual Population Survey data).

- Migrants tend to be young – 70 per cent of new migrants are aged between 18 and 34 (Annual Population Survey data). Migrants are more mobile, with fewer ties and can therefore look for job opportunities outside their home country.

- Agriculture, manufacturing and hospitality and catering are the three sectors that employ the highest numbers of rural migrants arriving post 2004. This is consistent with findings from other studies.

- Although skills data is difficult to assess given the differences in education systems across countries, evidence suggests that the skills profile of new migrants is highly polarised, with many migrants reporting NVQ level 4 qualifications or above and a high percentage stating they had low or no qualifications; (although many migrants are young and may not have completed their education).

- A high proportion of new migrants (almost 60%) intend to stay for less than three months, in part reflecting the seasonal nature of work, particularly in sectors such as agriculture and food-processing.
3 Migrants’ economic contribution

Having examined migrants’ socio-demographic characteristics, this section focuses on the economic impact of migration to rural areas. It first provides estimates of their economic contribution in Gross Value Added terms; drawing on the literature, it then goes on to provide an overview of migrants’ wider impact on the economy; and concludes by examining local areas’ vulnerability.

3.1 The Gross Value Added contribution of rural migrants

Following Green et al. and Oxford Economics\(^53\) we have developed estimates of contributions to regional Gross Value Added for different groups of migrants – ‘new’ and ‘old’ – according to their year of arrival. As determined in section 1, while ‘new’ migrants comprise those arriving from 2004 onwards, we have split ‘old’ migrants into two separate groups: those arriving before 1992 and those arriving between 1992 and 2003.

This split enables us to understand the difference in contribution of migrants based upon their duration of stay. Moreover, it allows us to understand which regions have the highest proportions of those migrant workers that have arrived in England over the past few years. This is significant as it is this group of migrants who are most likely to return to their countries of origin and, potentially, leave gaps in the labour markets of those rural areas they leave behind.

We have taken base estimates and wage adjusted estimates to assess Gross Value Added contribution.\(^54\) The advantage of this second measure is that it adjusts for differences in local and migrant productivity, assuming that wages make a good proxy for productivity. If differences in earnings are due to variations in occupational distribution, then the wage adjusted measure will reflect the differing occupational mix of local workers and migrants.\(^55\)

3.1.1 Base estimates

As shown in the table below, the highest overall contribution in Gross Value Added terms comes from migrants who have been in England for the longest period of time (2.9 per cent). Estimates for migrants arriving after 2004 suggest their contribution has been larger than those arriving between 1992


\(^{54}\) See Appendix A for details.

and 2003, especially given that we are comparing a 12 year period (1992-2003) to a five year one (2004 onwards).

Table 3.1: ‘New’ and ‘old’ migrants in rural England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural total</th>
<th>Gross Value Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1992</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-2003</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since 2004</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Experian

As it comprises all migrants that settled before 1992 and is therefore a larger group than migrants post 2004\(^{56}\) it is unsurprising that the pre-1992 group contributes the most in Gross Value Added terms. Furthermore, assuming that most would have more than 10 years of work experience in the UK, it is reasonable to presume that for many wages would have increased in line with career progression. Experian estimates based on Annual Population Survey figures show that the Gross Value Added share for migrants arriving before 1992 is slightly higher than their employment share – an indication of high productivity. There was no difference in the Gross Value Added/employment share split for migrants arriving after 2004. Furthermore, the occupational profile of these different cohorts of migrants sourced from the Annual Population Survey shows that a higher proportion of ‘old’ migrants work in high skilled occupations, whereas a higher percentage of ‘new’ migrants are employed in lower skilled jobs. Data on wages confirms this trend: on average wages appear to be higher among ‘old’ migrants compared to ‘new’ migrants.

Figure 3.1 below shows the extent to which different groups of migrants in rural areas have contributed to the rural economy across regions. The region with the highest overall contribution of migrants to Gross Value Added is the South East (8.3 per cent). This is followed by the East of England (6.9 per cent) and the South West (5.9 per cent). The main factor behind this is that the South East, East of England and South West are the regions with the highest absolute number of migrants in rural areas.

In the case of the South East, the Gross Value Added share for migrants in rural areas arriving before 1992 is particularly high (4.9 per cent). This is partly due to the fact that more migrants within this group are concentrated in the region. However, the Gross Value Added share for rural migrants arriving before 1992 is greater than the corresponding employment share (together a proxy for productivity)\(^{57}\) suggesting these migrants are employed in industry

\(^{56}\) See Table 1.1 page 5.

\(^{57}\) Productivity refers to output or Gross Value Added produced per worker. A larger difference in the share of Gross Value Added compared to the share of employment could indicate higher productivity – meaning that a smaller share of workers would be needed to produce that share of output.
sectors with higher productivity levels when compared to UK workers.\textsuperscript{58} This is also true for rural areas across the whole of England for migrants arriving before 1992 and, to a lesser extent, those arriving between 1992 and 2003.

Another key finding from the Gross Value Added estimates is that ‘new’ migrants, that is those arriving after 2004, have contributed the most in the East of England (over 3 per cent), followed by the East Midlands and the North West. Again, this is highly influenced by the fact that there are more ‘new’ migrants in these areas. A look at productivity, measured as the difference between the share of employment and the share of Gross Value Added, for each region provides further insight. Whereas this difference is negative for the East of England, suggesting that migrants may be concentrated in low productivity jobs, this difference is positive for both the East Midlands and the South West.

**Figure 3.1: Migrants’ Gross Value Added contribution to rural areas across regions\textsuperscript{59}**

![GVA Share](image)

Source: Experian estimates based on APS June07-July08

Most importantly, the fact that ‘new’ migrants in these rural areas, particularly within the East of England, contribute to a larger share of Gross Value Added than other groups of migrants, suggests that these areas would be most affected by outflows or lower inflows of ‘new’ migrants. Map 3.1 below illustrates ‘new’ migrants’ estimated Gross Value Added contribution\textsuperscript{60} at county level, emphasising the fact that migrants play a key role in local economies, especially within the East of England and East Midlands.

\textsuperscript{58} Whereas the difference between pre-1992 migrants’ share of Gross Value Added and their share of employment is 0.5%, it is 0.3% for UK workers.

\textsuperscript{59} Please note that this refers to analysis undertaken for a previous piece of work which used an earlier version of the Annual Population Survey (June 07 – July 08). The same applies to Map 3.1 and Table 3.2.

\textsuperscript{60} Caveats are needed in relation to Gross Value Added estimates at county level, given that the Annual Population Survey suffers from small sample sizes when the data is disaggregated to a local level.
Map 3.1: ‘New’ migrants’ estimated Gross Value Added contribution to local areas
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3.1.2 Wage-adjusted measures

Wage-adjusted estimates, which control for differences between migrants’ and UK workers’ wages, show similar results to our base estimates. Generally, the longer migrants have been in the UK, the higher their wages. Subsequently, the wage adjustment scenario pushes up the Gross Value Added share for rural migrants arriving pre-1992 and rural migrants arriving between 1992 and 2003; with only a minor negative effect for the most recent migrant cohort.

Table 3.2: Difference between base and wage-adjusted estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gross Value Added Base estimates</th>
<th>Gross Value Added Wage-adjusted</th>
<th>Difference between estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1992</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-2003</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since 2004</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>-0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Experian based on Annual Population Survey July 07 – June 08

3.2 The wider impact of migrants in rural areas

Building on our analysis of those areas most dependent on migrant labour, and more specifically, their economic contribution to rural areas, this section draws on the literature to provide an overview of the wider impact of migrant workers to rural areas.

Migration is certainly not a new phenomenon but increased European integration and the inflow of migrants from A8 countries since 2004 have brought migration to public attention. Public discourse has often expressed concern over the economic and social effects of increased levels of migrant workers, in both urban and rural areas. Many perceive that increased migration could lead to a reduction in the availability of employment for British nationals and furthermore, put a strain upon public service provision.

With the sharp rise in unemployment as a result of the recession, there is the risk that the claim that migrants ‘take’ jobs from local people or drive down wages may take a stronger hold. However, despite mounting public concern, national studies have not found evidence of a causal link between the increase in migration and displacement of British workers.61

---

3.2.1 The impact of migrants on the labour market

The impact of rural migration on the labour market is well documented. The majority of migrant workers find employment in a small number of sectors, generally those job roles that have remained as the rural working class has declined, and which UK workers have been reluctant to take on – in particular arduous, low paid, outdoor employment. Migrant workers are therefore often seen as plugging key labour market gaps, particularly in sectors such as manufacturing, agriculture and fishing, and hospitality and catering (see section 2).

Evidence that immigration leads to significant negative employment effects or depresses the wages of local workers is at best mixed. Manacorda et al. (2007) found that regions with the biggest increases in Eastern European migrants have actually seen the smallest rises in their unemployment rates. The Institute for Public Policy Research found that migrants provide clear benefits at the micro level, with a number of UK studies suggesting that for firms in many local areas, migrants are important in filling skills gaps at all levels in the labour market.

Green et al. found that in general, far from saturating a number of job types, migrant workers fill gaps in low paid jobs and many work long hours. While some migrant workers have indicated that they are keen to maximise their hours of work for financial gains, it is also the case that migrant workers are potentially vulnerable to exploitation. While typically the majority of migrants work in these unskilled sectors, many migrant workers underutilise their skills. A key reason for this is lack of proficiency in the English language, but many also display a readiness to work in lower skilled jobs – at least in the short-term.

While the increasing competition for jobs in some sectors has the potential to limit the number of employment opportunities, many have focused upon the impact on wages. For example, Blanchflower et al. (2008) contend that by increasing supply more than demand, migration has reduced inflationary pressure on wages and the natural rate of unemployment. In essence, migration may reduce wage inflation among low skilled workers in the short-term, and increase wage inequality among the bottom half of earners.

There is evidence that migrants are predominantly competing with each other rather than with UK nationals. Indeed, it seems it would take a very deep economic downturn for British workers to take on certain jobs, such as

---

seasonal agricultural work. Despite this, increased competition for popular roles may exist as migrant workers are reportedly perceived in a more positive light than UK nationals with employers citing a range of non skills-related attributes as a positive feature of migrant workers. Migrant workers are often highly valued for their flexible attitudes and strong work ethic by employers, with many becoming increasingly utilised by employers and seen as a reliable source of labour – particularly in rural economies. The Institute of Directors surveyed its members in 2007 and found that 61 per cent recruited migrant workers because these individuals had skills not readily available in the local workforce. Thirty-eight per cent said migrant workers had a better work ethic than UK workers and 16 per cent stated that migrant workers were cheaper to employ than UK workers.

At the level of the UK as a whole, evidence so far suggests that it is unlikely that migration has had a significant impact on the wages or employment prospects of local workers. However, there is some evidence that suggests immigration has had a significant but small impact on wages of previous waves of lower-skilled migrant workers and that when the occupational structure of the UK workforce is taken into account, there is a negative impact on the wages of UK workers at the bottom of the occupational distribution.

3.2.2 Migrant work and long-term competitiveness

Besides the impact on the labour market, relying on low-cost labour could have longer term consequences on a sector’s competitiveness. This is an important question that has not received as much attention as the impact on the labour market.

If migration makes available a ready supply of low-cost labour, firms may continue to use low-capital productivity models of production which would otherwise be abandoned – the so-called ‘low-skill equilibrium’. However, whilst the influx of foreign migrants into rural areas has naturally had an effect on investment in the rural labour market, it has not been proven to impede investment opportunities.

This issue is particularly relevant to the agriculture sector. With the industry relying on low-skilled seasonal immigration, there are questions as to whether this is a sustainable solution to the profitability problems, and continued restructuring occurring in UK agriculture and other rural sectors. It certainly has not been a long-term solution in the past for other struggling industries.

---

Drawing on consultations with employers, section 4.2 provides further insights into this key question.

3.2.3 Public services provision

The increase in migrant workers creates both opportunities and challenges for the provision of public services. While some argue that migrant workers have a negative impact on public service provision by putting additional strain upon services, migrants make a significant contribution to this sector. It is important to note that the public sector, especially the health sector, is a large employer of non-UK workers for occupations where labour shortages have been identified. As shown in Table 3.3, 15 per cent of total workers arriving since 2004 have found employment in the public administration, education and health sector and 20 per cent of total workers in rural areas. The highest concentration of workers in this sector can be found in rural areas within Yorkshire and Humber and the East of England.

Table 3.3: Workers arriving since 2004 working in public administration, education and health services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Workers in England</th>
<th>% of Workers (All Sectors)</th>
<th>Workers in Rural England</th>
<th>% of Rural Workers (All Sectors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y&amp;H</td>
<td>9,583</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>20,798</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8,787</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>22,617</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>6,468</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>7,994</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3,506</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>9,773</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>5,913</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East 74</td>
<td>3,444</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>123,629</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18,590</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Population Survey July 07 – June 08

Despite the role that migrant workers play in these sectors, most of the literature regarding public service provision and migrants focuses on the challenges posed to public services provision rather than acknowledging migrants’ contributions. Housing, healthcare and education can all be impacted by an increase in local population especially when some existing local services may already be under pressure. For example, an influx of migrant workers can put pressure on localised housing markets (especially the private rented sector). In addition, a number of migrant workers are not

---

74 Please note that Annual Population Survey data available indicates no ‘new’ migrants working in this sector in rural England, however caution needs to be exerted since sample size for rural areas within the North East is small for this particular region.
75 Please note that given the large number of missing data for country of birth when broken down by sectors for rural areas in the July 08 – June 09 run, we have not updated this data.
76 The majority of migrant workers are housed in the private rented sector, although the impacts of migrant workers may be felt more broadly throughout the housing market. Green, A. E., Owen, D. and Jones, P. (2008) Migrant Workers in the South East Regional Economy. Warwick: Institute for Employment Research, University of Warwick.
registered with a GP which can put additional pressure on local Accident and Emergency departments. Migrants may also have different needs that public services often do not address, such as language barriers.

With regard to healthcare, Spencer et al. (2008) reported a very low take-up of health entitlements, and no obvious displacement of the local population. The age profile of migrant workers is such that they may be expected to make relatively few demands on the health service. However, changes in the profile of migrant workers may mean that demands for certain services (e.g. maternity services and childcare) may increase in the future.

In addition, evidence suggests that migrants make fewer demands on the welfare system than the local population. The most recent Accession Monitoring report 79 found that the majority of benefit applications submitted by A8 nationals remains low in relation to the total number of claimants in the UK. In fact, studies have shown that migrants are net contributors to the UK economy (Sriskandarajah et al., 2005) with migrants contributing more in tax receipts than receiving in benefits.

Although there is increasing evidence on the positive contributions made to the economy, especially to regional and local development, the economic contribution of migrants remains a subject of heated debate, particularly in the context of an economic downturn.

3.3 Understanding the role of migrant workers

So far we have identified those local areas with higher numbers of migrant labour, estimated the economic contribution of migrants to rural areas, and discussed the wider impact of migrant workers on the economy.

We found that local rural areas within the East of England, South East, South West and East and West Midlands have both a high stock of migrants (Annual Population Survey, 2008/09) as well as ‘new’ migrants especially, although not only, from A8 countries. In particular, those areas employing a high proportion of ‘new’ migrants are more likely to be affected if outflows were to increase, as this group of migrants is generally more likely to leave the country.

Our analysis of the Annual Population Survey and Workers Registration Scheme data showed that the agriculture sector employs a particularly high proportion of migrant labour. More specifically, some areas within the East of England appear to be employing a large proportion of ‘new’ migrant workers.

Our estimates of migrant contributions to the economy also highlighted the fact that ‘new’ migrants in the East of England contribute to a greater extent to regional Gross Value Added relative to other regions. This suggests that local areas with a high number of migrant workers particularly within the East of England, but also within the other regions, could be impacted by any decline in net migration to the UK in the near future.

While the extent to which local labour markets utilise migrant labour gives an indication of their ability to function without it (as examined in section 1 of this paper), other factors also need to be taken into account. In the context of the economic downturn, firms are likely to lower their demand for workers anyway, and therefore the impact of a smaller migrant workforce could be relatively minor. Therefore, the areas that will be most impacted if migration numbers drop back are not only those that draw more heavily on migrant workers, but also those likely to see smaller reductions in their future demand for labour.

Finally, there is another element of the employment make-up of local areas that needs to be taken into account. Even if firms did not employ large proportions of migrant workers given changing trends in migration patterns, it could be argued that they could draw on local workers. However, in certain areas labour markets can be tight, especially for low-paid occupations that local workers often do not value. As a proxy for labour tightness we use the claimant count rate.

Figure 3.2 below shows the top 20 local rural areas for recent A8 migrants and includes forecasts for job losses between 2008 and 2010 (we have used Experian regional and local forecast and calculated change as a percentage of total employment in 2008). It shows that many areas, such as Ryedale Herefordshire, Penwith and East Cambridgeshire, among others, feature lower than expected job losses compared to the average for rural England of -2.5 per cent, as well as higher than average Workers Registration Scheme registrations.
In section 2.3 we identified some of these areas, such as Herefordshire, Penwith, and East Cambridgeshire, as having a high number of migrants working in the agriculture sector. We also found that local areas with high number of migrants in the agriculture sector employ more migrant workers than other areas. But the agriculture sector is a small sector and can be subject to volatile changes over short periods of time. Despite this volatility, Experian’s most recent forecasts indicate that the sector has generally proved relatively resilient with some areas showing positive change in employment over the last two years, unlike the hospitality and catering sector, which has been hit hard and is expected to witness job shedding that will continue throughout 2010.

Indeed, figure 3.3 shows that areas such as Herefordshire, Chichester, West Lancashire, Penwith, East Riding of Yorkshire and Wychavon are all forecast to gain rather than lose jobs in the next couple of years. This implies that these areas may be particularly susceptible to change both if migrant inflows decrease and outflows increase.

In addition, most of these areas have relatively low claimant count rates (as a proportion of working age population) indicating a fairly tight labour market (see Figure 2.6 in section 2). Data for January 2010 shows only Fenland (4.4 per cent) and West Lancashire (4.5 per cent) reported a claimant count rate slightly higher than the English average of 4.3 per cent. All other areas recorded low values, particularly Herefordshire (2.9 per cent), and Chichester.
(2.8 per cent). As expected, most areas have seen a recent increase in their rates as a result of the recession when compared to previous months, and short-term claimants tend to be concentrated around young age groups, particularly between 18 and 24.

Finally, despite the economic downturn, unfilled vacancies for most of these areas have increased between January 2009 and 2010 (with the exception of West Lancashire, Herefordshire and South Holland). This, again, could be an indicator of the tightness of the labour market, and emphasises that these areas may be more impacted by changing migration patterns.

Figure 3.3: Expected job losses 2008-2010 for areas with a high proportion of A8 migrants employed in agriculture

---

81 Data sourced from NOMIS, January 2010.
82 Data sourced from NOMIS, including January 2007-2010.
Summary

- Migrants make a significant contribution to rural economies, estimated to be 6 per cent of rural areas’ Gross Value Added. Those migrants arriving before 1992 contribute the most in Gross Value Added terms, which is hardly surprising given that they have settled in the country for longer with implications on career progression and wages.

- ‘New’ migrants (those arriving post-2004) have contributed the most to the East of England meaning that this area could be particularly affected should migration patterns change significantly.

- Whilst some argue that migrants have a negative effect on public service provision, many studies have found that migrants make few demands on public services given their age profile. In addition, the public sector – particularly the health sector – is a large employer of migrant work.

- Some areas, such as Herefordshire, Chichester, Penwith, among others, with a high concentration of migrant workers in the agriculture sector, are more susceptible to changing patterns of migration. This is due to the fact that the sector has proven relatively resilient to the downturn and many of these areas have relatively tight labour markets (with a low proportion of claimants).
4 Future trends

The report so far has focused on the current economic contribution of migrants to rural areas, but has not considered the implications of changing patterns of migration on rural areas. Using quantitative and qualitative research methods, this section analyses the impact of different assumptions on migration trends on rural economies and assesses employers’ future needs.

4.1 Migration forecasts

In order to understand future trends in migration inflows and employment in the current economic climate we have undertaken a three-step approach. With each step we have adjusted the underlying assumptions to examine their different effects on rural economies.

Scenario 1: Given the widespread nature of the recession migrant inflows remain relatively stable

As a first step we analysed the official migration projections (Office for National Statistics 2006-based population projections). As these are based on 2006 demographic patterns, many believe these projections overestimate migration inflows and outflows, given that they do not take into consideration the fact that with the economic downturn fewer migrants may be coming to the UK, and more may decide to leave.

Given the difficulties associated with estimating the number of non-UK born people leaving the country, we took Office for National Statistics inflows and combined these with Annual Population Survey stock numbers to capture outflows of non-UK born.83

We then adjusted these stock projections to reflect the proportion of migrants that are currently in employment (again we used the Annual Population Survey – more details on the methodology can be found in Appendix A, section A3). According to these estimates, the change in the stock of migrants in employment between 2007 and 2008 was approximately 180,000 for England and approximately 25,000 for rural areas as a whole, representing around 6 per cent of England’s total stock of migrant workers and 8 per cent of total stock of migrant workers in rural areas.

Under this hypothetical scenario we assume that given the widespread nature of the recession, migrants would not have enough incentives to leave the UK

83 Office for National Statistics outflows capture both UK and non-UK born leaving the UK. Therefore, this methodology allows us to find the change in stock of non-UK born only as well as capture the most recent trends in stock. Even if imperfect, given that it underestimates short-term migration, it is the only source of data on migration stocks. Please note that this section is based on a previous piece of work which used an earlier version of the Annual Population Survey June 07/July 08.
for their home country or other countries in the EU, and therefore we would not expect significant changes in flows. Under these assumptions, even with mounting unemployment and Sterling’s loss of value against other currencies such as the euro due to the effects of the recession, migrants would still be relatively better off in the UK than in other countries. In line with these assumptions, Schneider and Holman (2009)\textsuperscript{84} found that the deteriorating economic conditions had not as yet had a “shortening effect” on migrants’ length of stay, with both quantitative and qualitative research showing that migrants had a “wait and see” attitude.

In fact, it is now becoming evident that some countries within the EU have been hit harder than initially thought. There has been a slowdown in growth globally and in the euro zone there is subdued domestic demand due to the austerity measures implemented in many countries.\textsuperscript{85} As a consequence, the contribution of migrants to rural economies remains relatively constant – around 6 per cent of Gross Value Added for rural England (see section 3.1).

**Scenario 2: Deteriorating economic conditions drive inflows down but impact is still moderate**

As a second step we revised the inflows considered in Scenario 1 to reflect that with the economic downturn fewer migrants may decide to come to the UK to work. We built on the work commissioned by the Department for Communities and Local Government\textsuperscript{86} which combines the Mitchell and Pain model on the drivers of international migration with the National Institute of Economic and Social Research’s global econometric model to account for the impact of the downturn on international migration flows. The projections assume that both with the current economic climate and with the longer-term trend of countries catching up with development, economic prospects in the UK will decline relative to prospects in other countries in the longer term. Using this model, inflows are at least 10 per cent lower than the Office for National Statistics estimates for the period covering 2008-2016.

Therefore the change in stock of migrant workers between 2007 and 2008 would be approximately 145,000 for England and 20,000 for rural areas, 5 per cent and 6 per cent of total migrant employment in these areas respectively. Even if economic conditions affect employment prospects in the UK, driving the number of inflows down, with the change only slight and the workforce as a whole contracting at the same time, it does not significantly alter the contribution of migrants to rural areas. Moreover, the change in total stock of migrants (that is not only those in employment but also those of school age and retired) anticipated by this model only drives the total stock of migrants in 2015 down by 360,000, or approximately 4 per cent compared to the previous forecasts in July 2008 and the Office for National Statistics projection. Given the modest changes to the expected stock of migrants over the years,


\textsuperscript{85} RBS, Purchasing Managers Index, May 2010.

\textsuperscript{86} DCLG (2009) Projections of migration inflows under alternative scenarios for the UK and world economies. London: DCLG.
changes to the Gross Value Added share of migrants in rural economies would be expected to be moderate.  

Scenario 3: With fewer employment opportunities, inflows go down and outflows go up

As a third step we adjusted migrants’ employment rates assuming that these have been adversely affected by the recent downturn. Using our forecasts for change in total employment we estimated the impact on the employment of the non-UK born. We assumed that migrant workers are more sensitive to changes in total employment with employment contracting at a faster rate as employment levels decline.

Unlike the other scenarios, using these assumptions we find that trends in migrant employment decline significantly in the short term – by 3 per cent in 2008 and by 7 per cent in 2009 for England and by less than 1 per cent and 5 per cent in rural England. In other words, given fewer opportunities in the labour market, some migrants would return home or go elsewhere and fewer would decide to migrate to the UK. This scenario is more in line with current trends evidenced by National Insurance Number data and Workers Registration Scheme data in section 2.

Figure 4.1: Migrant employment in rural areas

This, in turn, has consequences on migrants’ Gross Value Added contribution, with shares falling slightly between 2008 and 2011 and recovering to their previous levels from 2013 onwards (see figure 4.2 below). This pattern can be seen across the different regions with those having a higher share of Gross Value Added (South East, East and South West) presenting a slightly more pronounced fall and recovery.

87 The National Institute of Economic and Social Research July 2008 forecasts and Office for National Statistics projections anticipated a total stock of approximately 8 million by 2015. Given that the January 2009 forecasts revise down the stock by 360,000, this represents less than 4 per cent of 8 million.

88 It is important to note that the total stock of migrants sourced from the Annual Population Survey did not experience significant changes between 2008 and 2009. This difference with the other sources could be explained by the fact that the Annual Population Survey fails to capture short-term migration.
4.2 Understanding employers’ future needs

In addition to conducting desk-based analysis on changing assumptions about migration patterns and their likely impact on rural economies, we also asked employers about their views on migration trends and whether they were likely to face labour shortages.

We undertook 20 consultations with employers in those sectors that employ the highest numbers of migrants: agriculture, hospitality and manufacturing, particularly food-processing. We chose local areas that have a large number of migrants in these sectors. In the case of agriculture these included East Cambridgeshire, Fenland, Herefordshire, King’s Lynn and Norfolk; for hospitality South Somerset, West Somerset, South Oxfordshire and South Lakeland, and for manufacturing Herefordshire, South Holland, Breckland and North Lincolnshire. In choosing our sample, we tried to keep a mixture of regions as well as different business sizes. In addition, we conducted five consultations with recruitment agencies in these areas.

The interviews provide a more in-depth understanding of employers’ needs and how recent economic events have affected their labour requirements. However, it is important to note that they are only indicative and as such are not fully representative of the sectors or areas in question.

The objective of our qualitative research was to gauge employers’ views on three key themes: (a) whether they are seeing fewer numbers of migrant workers and therefore whether they are likely to face challenges in recruiting sufficient workers in the future; (b) whether they are finding an increasing availability of local labour given the current economic climate; and (c) whether the availability of migrant labour has in some way affected businesses’ production modes, replacing capital investment with labour. In addition to
these key themes we asked employers more general questions about the characteristics of their non-UK born employees. We have included a summary box for each sector in Appendix A, section A4.

4.2.1 Future labour shortages

When asked whether they were currently suffering labour shortages or were likely to face labour shortages in the short-term most employers in all three sectors answered in the negative. However, when asked more generally whether they thought that migrants were leaving the UK or coming in fewer numbers given the current situation, some employers recognised that in the last year they saw fewer numbers of migrants in their local areas. In addition, some reported that they knew of a few cases where migrants, particularly from A8 countries, were returning home, rather than looking for jobs in other countries. But these trends were generally not seen as widespread or particularly affecting any of the businesses we interviewed.

In this respect, it is also important to draw a distinction between different sectors. In particular, firms within the agriculture sector reported that even though currently they have a sufficient supply of migrant labour, they would suffer significantly should migrants decide to leave in the future. In addition, one interviewee raised the issue of whether the supply of labour would be enough once the economic climate picked up.

In the case of hospitality, by contrast, some employers, particularly those working in sub-sectors related to holidays and leisure, stated they had been hard hit by the recession and therefore had to cut back their staff. Thus, irrespective of whether migrant labour availability has decreased, they reported that they were not facing labour shortages since their recruitment needs had gone down anyway.89

These findings are generally consistent with our analysis in section 3.3. According to our employment forecasts and other studies on this subject,90 the hospitality sector is one of the sectors suffering significant job losses, whereas agriculture was found to be a relatively resilient sector with lower expected job losses. Therefore, it is not surprising that employers, particularly within the hospitality sector, reported to have a larger number of applicants for fewer vacancies.

89 This is an interesting finding given that some argue that a weaker pound would attract more domestic and foreign visitors to the UK, which would in turn have a positive effect on the hospitality sector (related to tourism). However, these interviews are not fully representative of the sector, and the interviews were carried out before the holiday period.
4.2.2 The local and migrant workforce

Most interviewees in the different key sectors thought that migrants were filling labour gaps, that is, carrying out jobs that the local labour force is not willing to take on and therefore believed there was no displacement of the local workforce. This, again, is in line with the findings of other studies on this subject (see section 3.2.1).

Among the reasons quoted by employers for hiring migrant labour, the following were quoted: the seasonal/temporal nature of the work; the low wages/low skills and often limited career progression\(^{91}\) offered by many of these roles; and migrants’ attitude towards work (often referred to as “hard working and very good at their work”). Again, these findings are consistent with the literature in this area (see section 3.2.2).

An interesting point that deserves further attention is that employers, particularly within the hospitality sector, mentioned they had seen a rising interest within the local workforce on low-skilled vacancies such as waitering. In other words, with mounting unemployment some people could now be more likely to take on jobs they had not considered in the past.

4.2.3 Production modes: labour and capital investment

Through the consultations with employers we also asked whether the availability of labour had affected their production modes, for example, substituting investment in equipment and machinery for cheaper, more labour-intensive processes. This is particularly applicable to the case of agriculture.\(^{92}\)

It has been widely documented in the literature that the sector is undergoing structural transformation, suffering a significant contraction over the last decades, and struggling to remain competitive.\(^{93}\) In the consultations, some employers stated that they had tried to mechanise some of their processes with mixed results.

“We tried investing in different types of harvesting equipment but it wasn’t altogether useful – and is very expensive. For example, raspberry picking machines do not work for the types of raspberries people like to eat, since they squash them.”

Another interviewee stated that “where it works it is very good – for example mechanical pruning has saved a lot of time and money – but when it comes to fruit picking there really aren’t machines that can do the same jobs as people.” Thus, even if some firms have reported to be willing to invest in capital they suggest that there are certain processes, such as fruit-picking, that are more inherently dependent on labour.

---

\(^{91}\) For example, in the case of hospitality it was argued by employers that even if there is career progression in place, it is not uncommon for both UK born and non-UK born workers to move to different firms after a short period of time to advance in their careers.

\(^{92}\) In the case of hospitality, the sector is highly dependent on labour for many customer-facing roles that cannot be replaced by investment in capital.

In the case of food-processing a few interviewees stated that had it not been for the availability of migrant labour, they would have probably invested more in machinery. Identifying the impact of migration and the availability of ‘cheap’ labour on firms’ production modes is not without challenges and is a topic that deserves further study.

Summary

- Three different scenarios were presented in order to understand the impact of future trends in migration inflows and employment on rural economies. Whereas under Scenarios 1 and 2 (using Office for National Statistics official projections and the revised National Institute of Economic and Social Research projections respectively) we found a moderate impact on rural economies, under Scenario 3 (with more migrants leaving given fewer opportunities in the labour market, and more in line with recent trends), migrants’ Gross Value Added contribution would see a slight decrease that would only pick up after 2013.

- Evidence from consultations with employers suggests that they are not facing labour shortages at present, with lower demand due to the recession mitigating any losses of migrant workers. However, employers within the agriculture sector highlighted their need for migrant labour and raised concerns should migration patterns change significantly in the future.

- A few employers, particularly within the hospitality sector, reported that given the downturn they saw a slight rise in interest among the local workforce in low-skilled roles that was not observed in the past.

- With regards to the impact of migration on production modes and whether potential labour shortages could be addressed by more investment in capital, some employers in the agriculture sector stated that there are processes, such as fruit-picking and harvesting, that cannot be mechanised. In addition, a few respondents within the food-processing industry suggested that had they not been able to rely on migrant workers over the past few years they would have further invested in capital. This is an area that deserves further study.
5 Key messages

This report examined the economic role played by migrant workers in rural economies, identifying those areas with a high proportion of migrant workers, examining migrants’ profiles, and their contribution to the economy. This final section sets out the key messages derived from our research.

International migrants play an important role in some local rural economies

Based on data sourced from the Annual Population Survey and Workers Registration Scheme we identified those rural local authorities with a high proportion of migrant workers. In particular, places such as Herefordshire and East Cambridgeshire among others were found to have a high percentage of migrants as part of the workforce according to both total stock data from the Annual Population Survey and more recent inflows data from the Workers Registration Scheme.

Our estimates show that migrants contribute to approximately 6 per cent of rural areas’ Gross Value Added. In particular, we found the contribution of recent migration (post-2004) to have been particularly high in the East of England.

Using Workers Registration Scheme data we also identified key sectors – agriculture, hospitality and manufacturing – that are highly represented in different local areas. It is worth emphasising that areas with a high concentration of migrants in agriculture (particularly in the East of England region) employ a larger share of migrants relative to other areas.

The gross inflow of migrants, particularly ‘new’ migrants to rural areas, as captured by Workers Registration Scheme data, has declined by over 20 per cent between 2008 and 2009

The number of migrants to rural areas has declined over recent years, particularly in the last two (gross inflows of migrants as measured by Workers Registration Scheme data indicated declines of 20 per cent both between 2007 and 2008, and 2008 and 2009). This is consistent with trends at national level.

Through scenario analysis (based on Experian employment forecasts) we estimated that if migrants were to leave and arrive in fewer numbers following fewer employment opportunities rural areas would see a slight decrease in the Gross Value Added contribution of migrants to their local areas which would only pick up after 2013.
Should migration numbers continue to decline, the agriculture sector, and parts of the UK where the labour market remains tight are likely to be most affected

Job losses within the agriculture sector are forecast to be somewhat lower than in other sectors of the economy (in some cases there is job creation rather than losses) and in some areas with high numbers of migrants employed in the agriculture sector, such as Herefordshire or Chichester, the claimant unemployment rate is quite low, a sign of a tight labour market. This suggests it may be difficult to replace the migrant workforce with local labour in these areas.

However, qualitative research suggests that employers will not be facing labour shortages in the near future, particularly in the hospitality industry which has been hit hard by the downturn and has been subject to substantial job shedding.

There are, however, some signs that with mounting unemployment some local workers are more willing to accept employment opportunities they would not have considered in the past

This is particularly the case within the hospitality sector, where employers mentioned they had seen a rising interest among the local workforce for low-skilled, low paid vacancies such as waitering.

There are signs that in some sub-sectors changing production models may mitigate any impact, but further research is required to fully investigate the scope for changing production models

One area that we touched on in this report but deserves further study is that of the impact of migration on firm’s production modes, particularly in the case of agriculture, a sector that has been long undergoing structural change.

Through our qualitative research we found that there are processes within agriculture that are more difficult to replace with investment in machinery, such as harvesting and fruit-picking. Through case study work on businesses’ production models – particularly using contrasting examples for the same sub-sector – there is scope to investigate this issue further.
Appendix A: Method notes

A1. Key definitions and sources

This section describes key definitions and main sources of data used throughout this report.

Key definitions

*Rural areas*
This report uses the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs’ district level classification of rural areas: *Rural 80* – districts with at least 80 per cent of the population in rural settlements or larger market towns; *Rural 50* – districts with at least 50 per cent, but less than 80 per cent of the population in rural settlements or larger market towns. Following Rural Evidence Research Centre (2009),94 we have recoded districts into three categories rural (Rural 50 and Rural 80), urban (Major and large urban) and mixed (other urban and significant rural).

*‘New’ migrants*
‘New’ migrants include both migrants from Europe and the rest of the world arriving in the UK after 2004. According to Annual Population Survey data the split between these two groups was 65 per cent for European Economic Area and 35 per cent for rest of the world. National Insurance Numbers data suggests a slightly lower ratio of 75/35. Given that they represent a substantial proportion of ‘new’ migrants we have decided to include them in our definition of ‘new’ migrants.95 A more detailed analysis of migrants’ country of origin is undertaken in section 2.

*‘Old’ migrants*
We have defined ‘old’ migrants as those arriving before 2004. Following Green et al. and Oxford Economics (2009) we have further split this group by different years of arrival:

- 1992-2003

95 Note that in this respect our definition differs slightly with that used by Oxford Economics (2009). Furthermore, looking at total non-UK born allows us to increase the sample size when examining migrants’ socio-demographic characteristics.
For a complete list of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs’ classification, see: www.defra.gov.uk/rural/ruralstats/rural-definition.htm
Data sources

**Annual Population Survey**
The Annual Population Survey datasets used throughout this report are an aggregation of the quarterly Labour Force Survey datasets for 2008 Q3, 2008 Q4, 2009 Q1 and 2009 Q2 so therefore covers the period from July 2008 to June 2009.

The Labour Force Survey is a key source of information on labour supply, that is, on individuals who supply their labour. The Labour Force Survey is a quarterly survey of some 50,000 households per quarter. It is designed to provide robust national labour market and macro economic information, but its sample size is insufficient to provide reliable data at local level. Therefore, for local area analysis, the Annual Population Survey datasets are produced, originally from the quarterly datasets and then with additional boost surveys. These are based approximately on 170,000 households and 360,000 persons per dataset and therefore provide more robust local area labour market estimates than from the main Labour Force Survey.

The Annual Population Survey is one of the key regularly updated national sources of data providing information on both flows and stocks of foreign nationals living and working in the UK (we used country of birth to identify non-UK born in employment and their year of arrival to identify ‘new’ and ‘old’ migrants).

The main limitation of the Annual Population Survey is its sample size which limits the amount of detailed breakdown available. Most of the information is collected from private households; and therefore the survey could underestimate the number of migrants living in other accommodation, which includes many workers in the agricultural industry. In addition, it is better at capturing inflows than outflows of migrants and therefore it is better for analysis of long-term migration than short-term migration. However, the Annual Population Survey is the only source that provides a measure of stock of migrants and therefore much of our analysis – where the sample size is large enough – relies on this source.

**Workers Registration Scheme**
Introduced in May 2004, this source provides information supplied by citizens from the A8 countries when they obtain a job in the UK. A8 citizens are required to re-register for subsequent jobs until they have worked a total of 12 out of 13 months. Unfortunately, the data does not capture deregistration; only giving information on inflows of migrants. Therefore it is not possible to make assumptions about how long people stay or how many are working in an area at any one time.

Self-employed workers are not required to register and an unknown number of migrant workers do not register. The Workers Registration Scheme provides data on a variety of socio-demographic characteristics of migrants including age, gender, sector, occupation, and planned duration of stay. Local authority level data is available on a quarterly basis. Local authority level data is derived from the postcode of the employer (or the business address of the
agency which employs them); hence the Workers Registration Scheme provides data on migrants (largely, but not exclusively) on a workplace basis. Although only covering recent migrants from A8 migrants this study uses Workers Registration Scheme data to examine the characteristics of ‘new’ migrant workers and complement Annual Population Survey data when the sample size at local level does not allow us to provide data at local level.

**National Insurance Number**
This source provides information on all non-UK nationals working or claiming benefits legally. Information is recorded on age, gender and nationality on an annual basis at local authority level (predominantly on a residence basis). The number of National Insurance Numbers allocated to overseas nationals in a local authority area should provide a good indication of the number of overseas persons arriving to work. Further, it includes information on the self-employed. However, it provides no information on out-migration. Data is available for the latest financial year 2008/09 and for previous calendar years.

National Insurance Numbers registration data can underestimate migration inflows because there are exemptions, such as dependents, students, migrants of not working age and not claiming benefits. In addition, there is no account of deregistrations meaning that outflows cannot be captured. Finally, some authors argue that registering migrant workers by their area of residence rather than area of employment means that the data cannot account for those migrants who frequently move between jobs.96

**Office for National Statistics population projections**
These are trend based sub-national population projections, which means assumptions for future levels of births, deaths and migration are based on observed levels. The 2006-based projections, released in June 2008, include a migration assumption of 190,000 net international migration into the UK each year. These are based on 2006 mid-year population estimates and are therefore likely to over-estimate net international migration. The latest 2008-based population projections were released in October 2009 and included a migration assumption of 180,000 net international migration into the UK each year.

A2. **Gross Value Added estimates: Methodology**

Local authority/unitary authority data on employment of migrants and non-migrants has been sourced from the Annual Population Survey. Please note that Gross Value Added estimates are based on July 2007 – June 2008 Annual Population Survey data.

The Annual Population Survey provides an up to date and consistent dataset on the level of migrant labour at a local, regional and national level. The Annual Population Survey also provides information on the characteristics of

the migrant and non-migrant labour force. Additional characteristic variables used to generate the Gross Value Added estimates include the migrant date of entry into the UK, industry sector of employment and gross weekly earnings. Baseline Gross Value Added estimates by local authority/unitary authority and broad industry sector have been taken from Experian’s Local Market Database and have been aggregated to cover the same time period as the Annual Population Survey. This study defines migrants as those born outside the UK, due to sample size restrictions; no further breakdown by country of origin has been used in this part of the project.

The Annual Population Survey suffers from small sample sizes when the data is disaggregated to a local level. Therefore we have kept the industry split as broad as possible using the nine industry sector breakdown as outlined below.

Table A.1: Industrial structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-B</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C,E</td>
<td>Energy &amp; water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-H</td>
<td>Distribution, hotels &amp; restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Transport &amp; communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J-K</td>
<td>Banking, finance &amp; insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-N</td>
<td>Public administration, education &amp; health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Q</td>
<td>Other services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office for National Statistics

Likewise a bespoke date of arrival variable has been derived in order to maximise local sample sizes. We have developed local authority/unitary authority estimates of contributions to Gross Value Added for migrants arriving before 1992, arriving between 1992 and 2003 and arriving from 2004 onwards. There is an additional arrival variable to capture migrants where no date of arrival has been specified.

Further, to provide the migrant contribution to rural areas as required, one of three definitions (rural, urban or mixed) is appended to each local authority/unitary authority based on the following classification.
Table A.2: Rural classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Model definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>Major Urban</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Large Urban</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>Other Urban</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Significant Rural</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R50</td>
<td>Rural – 50</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R80</td>
<td>Rural – 80</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

The baseline migrant contribution to rural Gross Value Added is estimated using a four step process:

1. Annual Gross Value Added by industry and local authority/unitary authority is aggregated across the four quarters from July 2007 to June 2008.

2. A rural, urban, mixed classification is appended to each local authority/unitary authority.

3. Baseline rural Gross Value Added is estimated by multiplying the percentage of migrants working in different industries (split by date of arrival) by the Gross Value Added produced by that industry/local authority/unitary authority.

4. The local authority/unitary authority results from step 3 are then aggregated to produce a regional and national migrant estimate of rural, urban and mixed classified Gross Value Added.

The baseline estimates assumes the productivity of migrants is equal to the productivity of the local workforce. We have also produced wage adjusted estimates which tests this assumption. The addition of wages to the baseline methodology examines if migrants are concentrated in lower paying occupations within the broad industry structure. If migrant wages are found to be lower than the non migrant equivalent, then the migrant contribution to Gross Value Added is assumed to be lower than the base estimates for the local workforce.

The wage adjusted estimates therefore require further data on average gross weekly earnings for migrants and non migrants. Migrant to non migrant earnings ratios, split by local authority/unitary authority, industry sector and date of arrival have been used to adjust Gross Value Added with earnings used as a proxy for productivity differentials.

97 Rural Definition and Local Authority Classification, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs: www.defra.gov.uk/rural/ruralstats/rural-definition.htm
A3. Forecast methodology

Forecasts for Scenario 1 of migrant contribution to rural Gross Value Added have been derived using an eight stage process:

1. Firstly we have utilised the Office for National Statistics 2006 based sub-national population projections, specifically the natural change and migration component summaries at a local level to obtain forecasts of flows of international migration into each local authority/unitary authority in England.

2. The projections from stage 1 have been multiplied by a ratio of in migrants to changes in migrant stock. The ratio uses recent Labour Force Survey data to estimate the differences between recent in migration and the changes in the stock of migrants to capture the extent of the level of migrants leaving the UK each year.

3. The Annual Population Survey has been used to produce regional estimates of employment rates for migrants and non-migrants.

4. Stage 4 combines the changes in local authority/unitary authority migrant stock derived from stage two with employment rates from stage 3 to derive the local level change in employment levels of migrants.

5. Our 2007/08 base of migrants in employment are pushed forward using the change in migrant employment from stage 4 to derive a forecast of migrant employment to 2016.

6. Total employment (migrant plus non-migrant) forecasts have been derived by combining Annual Population Survey base year estimates with local authority/unitary authority level forecasts of total employment sourced from Experian’s Local Market Database.

7. The outputs from stage 5 and stage 6 have been combined to produce a forecast of the migrant share of total employment.

8. The shares from stage 7 have been combined with the Local Market Database sourced Gross Value Added forecasts at the local level to derive a forecast of the trend based migrant contribution of Gross Value Added for each local authority/unitary authority. The rural/urban/mixed classification is appended to each local authority/unitary authority and the rural contribution is derived by simply summing across those local authority/unitary authority defined as rural.

The trend based forecast of migrant contribution to Gross Value Added requires assumptions concerning the extent of migration into England, the extent of migrants returning to their country of birth and migrant employment rates. In effect we assume that recent employment rates and Office for National Statistics migration projections are realised in the future.
Two additional steps have been taken to test the implications of changing the input assumptions. First, we use an alternative source of migrant inflows, taken from ‘Projections of migration inflows under alternative scenarios for the UK and world economies’.98 This study investigates the impact of economic fluctuations on the migrant stocks and flows in the UK. The paper suggests a downward revision to migrant projections of around 360,000 by 2015 as a result of the downturn (Scenario 2: moderate impact).

Finally, we test the impact of changing the employment rates. Given the recent downturn in the economy, our short term employment forecasts see a reduction in total employment levels followed by modest growth. We therefore adjust migrant employment levels by assuming that migrants are adversely affected by the recent downturn and contraction in total employment expected in the period 2007/08 to 2010/11. Conversely as total employment returns to positive growth from 2010/11 onwards, we expect migrant employment rates to increase at a faster rate than employment rates for UK workers (Scenario 3: significant impact).

A4. Consultations

We undertook 20 consultations with employers in those sectors that employ the highest numbers of migrants: agriculture, hospitality and manufacturing, particularly food-processing. We chose local areas that have a large number of migrants in these sectors. The interviews provide a more in-depth understanding of employers’ needs and how recent economic events have affected their labour requirements. To this end we also undertook five consultations with recruitment agencies in rural areas in order to gauge the effect of the downturn on migrant inflows and outflows. It is important to emphasise that the findings from these interviews are indicative and as such are not fully representative of the sectors or areas in question.

The agriculture sector

Dependency on migrant labour: the firms we interviewed in the agriculture sector are highly
dependent on migrant labour. It constitutes at least half of the total workforce and, in some
cases, up to three-quarters of it.

Past trends: most companies interviewed reported that the numbers of migrant workers they
employ have remained stable in the last few years, reflecting the fact that this sector has been
dependent on migrant labour for some time now, even before A8 accession was granted. In
fact, some firms have been employing migrant workers for more than 20 years. One firm did
report that the number of migrants has increased significantly, that is, at a faster rate than
overall employment growth in the business.

Future trends: interviewees are not expecting the number of migrant workers in their
businesses to change substantially in the next few years. “It seems there is no shortage in
agencies offering workers. At Christmas there were four or five buses a day and even now
agencies bring two or three more people than are required”. However, when asked more
generally whether they thought that the number of migrant workers would decrease with the
current economic climate many stated this would be the case. In fact, some stated that they
noted the number of migrants from Eastern European countries has been going down
recently in their local areas, with many returning home rather than leaving to other countries.
In addition, one employer mentioned concerns about the future availability of labour once
trade picked up. In short, although generally employers suggested they are not currently
facing labour shortages, they did highlight the fact that they rely on migrant workers and as
such the sector would be significantly affected if they were to leave.

Sub-sectors and occupations: when asked whether there are specific sub-sectors more
dependent on migrant labour some businesses highlighted the fact that seasonal work,
particularly harvesting and picking fruits, is particularly dependent on migrant labour.

Characteristics of migrants:

- **Length of stay:** as expected given the seasonal nature of the work, average length of stay
  for migrants in the sector is quite short – three to six months, with many migrants
  returning for different rounds. The seasonal nature of the work and the lack of career
  prospects are factors that help explain a relatively short length of stay in the sector.
- **Nationality:** some interviewees reported that the numbers of Eastern European workers,
  particularly Polish, was decreasing with many returning home, but the number of workers
  from other countries particularly Iraq, Lithuania and Latvia has seen an increase.
- **Gender and Age:** workers tend to be young, and gender is mixed, although within the
  firms interviewed many men were reportedly harvesting whilst a more even gender split
  was seen in fruit picking.
- **Occupation:** workers tend to concentrate on fruit picking and harvesting.
- **Skills:** these tend to be mixed, with some employers reporting low skill level of their
  workers and others stating that some of their workers are over-qualified.
- **Training:** training and on-site accommodation and entertainment is often provided by
  many employers given the remoteness of some of the areas.
**Migrant and local labour force:** most employers stated that they employ seasonal workers because local workers are not willing to undertake this type of work which involves hard outdoor work. The fact that migrants are more prepared to work seasonally, for an often lower pay, and that they are hard working, have been quoted as important reasons why employers hire them. Most employers believe there hasn’t been any displacement of native workers, since very few are willing to live in a remote area and undertake seasonal work.

**Capital/labour investment:** many employers in the sector highlighted that they have invested in technology – for example harvesting equipment or raspberry picking – but many emphasised that machinery is often not a substitute for labour when it comes to fruit picking. “We’ve looked at investing in other technology. Where it works it is very good (mechanical pruning has saved a lot of time and money) but when it comes to fruit picking there really aren’t machines that can do the same jobs as people. But certainly we consider new technologies and are open-minded to them.”

**Public sector involvement:** many employers emphasised the importance of Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme. “If this scheme were to be abolished these workers could no longer come to the UK and it would have a significant negative impact on our business and many other businesses like it.”
The hospitality sector (restaurants, hotels, and catering)

Dependency on migrant labour: the firms we interviewed in this sector had a lower proportion of migrants than other sectors. This may be related to the structure of the sector, which generally has a higher number of medium-sized and smaller businesses than the other two sectors.

Past trends: after the rise in migrant numbers due to the integration of Eastern European countries to the EU, many employers reported that most recently the number of migrant workers they employ has either decreased or stayed the same. Many reported to have been hard hit by the recession and therefore had to lay people off. So even if some noticed lower numbers of migrants applying for jobs this matches demand as firms struggle in the current economic climate.

Future trends: many employers expect the number of future workers to either stay the same or decrease. Some thought that migrants were returning home, rather than migrating to other countries, or would increasingly do so with the current economic climate.

Sub-sectors and occupations: interviewees reported that migrants work in a variety of roles, particularly within low-skilled occupations – from ‘behind the scenes’ housekeeping, cleaning and kitchen roles, to more customer-facing occupations.

Characteristics of migrants:

- **Length of stay**: length of stay reported by interviewees varied from six months to two years. In some cases, particularly with large employers, there is a need for seasonal short-term work during the holiday period. It was suggested that length of stay is related to the structure of the sector and career progression. One employer reported that once migrant workers improved their language skills they tend to move on to better paid jobs. Another employer reported that average retention of employers (UK/non-UK born) is two years with workers moving to a different business within the industry to progress in their careers.
- **Nationality**: countries within the EEA, and particularly Poland were quoted.
- **Gender and Age**: migrants tend to be young and gender is generally mixed.
- **Occupation**: most interviewees reported that migrant workers were working in low-skilled roles, particularly kitchen staff, cleaning and waitering.
- **Skills**: generally employers suggested that the level of skills of their workers was low. A few employers reported that they sometimes employ students, who work over the summer to support their studies. There were also a few examples of employees that were over-qualified (they had their own business in their country of origin).
- **Training**: most firms reported to provide training as part of the job.

Migrant and local labour force: most employers reported that they hired migrants to fill labour gaps. Most of them thought that there is not a displacement of the local workforce given that few locals apply for waitering and kitchen roles. However, there were mixed views between those interviewed as to whether the local workforce was increasingly willing to take these jobs given the current climate. Whereas one employer reported she was expecting a much higher response to a recent advert she had placed, others reported they were increasingly seeing more interest from the local workforce in these jobs. One of the employers suggested it was much more difficult to get experienced workers and another referred to the particular shortage of experienced chefs.
**Capital/labour investment:** as an industry that is highly dependent on labour, employers generally thought they could not replace labour with higher investment in capital.

**Public sector involvement:** a few employers referred to the role played by Jobcentre Plus during the economic downturn. Whereas one interviewee thought this agency helped them to find suitable candidates for their most recent vacancies, another interviewee thought it needed a better understanding of employers’ needs.
The manufacturing sector (food-processing)

Dependency on migrant labour: it varies widely for the different firms interviewed from 10 per cent to 90 per cent of their workforce. Those most dependent are often ‘less desirable’ factory based companies. Most suggested that migrants were taken on mainly due to an urgent need for labour and the unwillingness of the local population to take on these jobs.

Past trends: most interviewees reported a rise in the number of migrants employed over recent years. Some employers suggested that the employment growth rate was higher for migrant than local labour, particularly for some of the firms that have seasonal needs.

Future trends: most employers did not know or thought the number of migrants in their firms would remain the same. Several reported a few cases of migrants returning home rather than looking for work in other countries.

Sub-sectors and occupations: mainly low-skilled elementary occupations, factory work and transport.

Characteristics of migrants:

- *Length of stay:* This varies but most suggested that migrants employed were longer term migrants that had worked in their roles for a considerable period of time and had settled in the locality.
- *Nationality:* countries within the European Economic Area, and particularly Poland, Latvia, Lithuania and Portugal were quoted most frequently.
- *Gender and Age:* migrants tend to be young (20-30) yet more than one respondent suggested that they employ migrants of all ages. Gender is generally mixed although with slightly more male workers.
- *Occupation:* most interviewees reported migrant workers were working in low-skilled roles, particularly kitchen staff, cleaning, factory work and processing. One respondent noted having several migrant workers as supervisors.
- *Skills:* interviewees suggested workers had a mixed level of skills – with some having university degrees yet far more having low skills.
- *Training:* most firms reported providing training as part of the job, including in one case language courses which were often well received. In a few cases training was linked to promotion potential.

Migrant and local labour force: most employers reported that they hired migrants to fill in labour force gaps and due to the fact that they “work well, work hard and turn up”. Most of them thought there is little displacement of the local workforce given that few locals apply for these jobs. Even if they do not appear to be facing labour shortages at present employers suggested that if they were to suffer labour shortages in the current climate they thought they could find workers to fill these gaps given high redundancy levels. In addition, retention was mentioned as a problem in the industry and getting short-term, flexible migrant work though agencies has often been the way of addressing this.

Capital/labour investment: most employers suggested that had they not been able to draw upon migrant labour then investment in machinery would have been the alternative course of action.

Public sector involvement: most suggested there was little the public sector could do. One respondent emphasised the risks posed by foreign competition in the food-processing sector, with some businesses abroad following low costs models based on cheap labour.
Recruitment agencies

Dependency on migrant labour: some sectors and occupational roles were seen as more dependent than others on migrant workers, particularly within the agriculture sector.

Past trends: an increase in migrant workers was noted by most respondents over the past few years. Most did not want to speculate about future trends.

Sub-sectors and occupations: seasonal work, land work, ‘unpopular’ factory work were the most cited occupations.

Characteristics of migrants:
- Nationality: mixed. Polish communities were commonly cited as were Lithuanian and Latvian workers.
- Gender and age: mixed ages and gender, but a high proportion of males in their 20s.

Migrant and local labour force: respondents suggested that agencies were asked for migrant workers because these individuals were more willing to do menial roles than native workers. It was suggested that were it not for the high levels of redundancies, local labour pools may not be able to support migrant dependent companies.

Public sector involvement: most interviewees thought there was little scope for public sector intervention. One respondent suggested that improving access to remote rural areas was a major issue that needed to be addressed. In particular, it was suggested that enhancing transport schemes would make travel to work to these areas more accessible, potentially increasing the pool of workers willing to work in these areas.
### Additional tables

**Table A.3: Top five local authorities for Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme workers in the West Midlands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Farm Type</th>
<th>Q1 2007</th>
<th>Q2 2007</th>
<th>Q3 2007</th>
<th>Q4 2007</th>
<th>Q1 2008</th>
<th>Q2 2008</th>
<th>Q3 2008</th>
<th>Q4 2008</th>
<th>Q1 2009</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Herefordshire</strong></td>
<td>Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2360</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>5460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Cropping</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Horticulture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-classifiable -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2790</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>6600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lichfield</strong></td>
<td>Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Cropping</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Shropshire</strong></td>
<td>Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Horticulture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stratford-on-Avon</strong></td>
<td>General Cropping</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Horticulture</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wychavon</strong></td>
<td>2. General Cropping</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Other Horticulture</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Specialist Glass</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme 2009*
### Table A.4: Top five local authorities for Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme workers in the South East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Farm Type</th>
<th>Q1 2007</th>
<th>Q2 2007</th>
<th>Q3 2007</th>
<th>Q4 2007</th>
<th>Q1 2008</th>
<th>Q2 2008</th>
<th>Q3 2008</th>
<th>Q4 2008</th>
<th>Q1 2009</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chichester</strong></td>
<td>Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Horticulture</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maidstone</strong></td>
<td>Specialist Glass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Cropping</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Horticulture</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swale</strong></td>
<td>Other Horticulture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Cropping</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>395</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tonbridge and Malling</strong></td>
<td>General Cropping</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tunbridge Wells</strong></td>
<td>Other Horticulture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Cropping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme 2009

### Table A.5: Top five local authorities for Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme workers in the East of England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Farm Type</th>
<th>Q1 2007</th>
<th>Q2 2007</th>
<th>Q3 2007</th>
<th>Q4 2007</th>
<th>Q1 2008</th>
<th>Q2 2008</th>
<th>Q3 2008</th>
<th>Q4 2008</th>
<th>Q1 2009</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Cambridgeshire</strong></td>
<td>General Cropping</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fenland</strong></td>
<td>General Cropping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>King’s Lynn and West Norfolk</strong></td>
<td>Specialist Glass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Horticulture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Cropping</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Norfolk</strong></td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Cambridgeshire</strong></td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Fruit</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Cropping</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Seasonal Agricultural Workers Scheme 2009