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While integration policies as such are not new, and in some countries date back to the 1980s and beyond, there have been important shifts in the debates on integration and in related re-configurations of integration policymaking in the past decade or so. One of the main recent trends is the linkage of integration policy with admission policy and the related focus on recent immigrants. A second trend is the increasing use of obligatory integration measures and integration conditions in admission policy, and third, integration policymaking is increasingly influenced by European developments, both through vertical (more or less binding regulations, directives etc.) and through horizontal processes (policy learning between states) of policy convergence.

An increasing number of EU Member States have, in fact, adopted integration related measures as part of their admission policy, while the impact of such measures on integration processes of immigrants is far less clear. In addition, Member States’ policies follow different, partly contradictory logics, in integration policy shifts by conceptualising (1) integration as rights based inclusion, (2) as a prerequisite for admission residence rights, with rights interpreted as conditional, and (3) integration as commitment to values and certain cultural traits of the host society.

The objective of PROSINT is to evaluate the impact of admission related integration policies on the integration of newcomers, to analyse the different logics underlying integration policymaking and to investigate the main target groups of compulsory and voluntary integration measures.

The project investigated different aspects of these questions along five distinct workpackages. These analysed (1) the European policy framework on migrant integration (WP1), (2) the different national policy frameworks for the integration of newcomers in the 9 countries covered by the research (WP2), the admission-integration nexus at the local level in studied in 13 localities across the 9 countries covered by the research (WP3), the perception and impacts of mandatory pre-arrival measures in four of the nine countries covered (WP4) and a methodologically oriented study of the impact of admission related integration measures (WP5).

The countries covered by the project were Austria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. Apart from individual cases project reports generally cover the period until end of 2010.

For more information about the project visit http://research.icmpd.org/1429.html.
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I POLITICAL DISCOURSE

The political discourse on migration and integration policy in the UK revolves around a range of sources which include transcripts of parliamentary debates, policy documents and reports referred to in parliamentary debate on immigration. This information has been used for the analysis of the current political discourse on migration and integration policies in the UK. In particular, the political analysis makes use of Hansard (record of Parliamentary debates) at the time of writing (November 2010 and backdated to July 2010), political parties programmes at the time of the electoral campaign (March 2010), and various reports of Parliamentary Committees such as the Home Affairs Committee Report on the Immigration Cap (2010), and the report Community Cohesion and Migration (2007), published by the House of Commons Community and Local Government Select Committee (Audit Commission, an independent watchdog). These sources are complemented by research and campaigning by civil society actors such as NGOs, pressure groups and other governmental agencies.

I.1 Main actors in the political debate and their arguments

The key actors for the government are the Home Office Secretary of State and the Minister for Immigration. These positions have frequently changed. Prior to the current Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition government, with Theresa May, as Secretary of State for the Home Office and Damian Green, the Minister for Immigration (both Conservatives) from 11 May 2010, it was Alan Johnson and Phil Woolas in these positions in the Labour Government.

The Coalition Programme for Government published in May 2010 stated:

“The Government believes that immigration has enriched our culture and strengthened our economy, but that it must be controlled so that people have confidence in the system. We also recognise that to ensure cohesion and protect our public services, we need to introduce a cap on immigration and reduce the number of non-EU immigrants”.

Current thinking is thus dominated by the Conservatives, whose proposals to reduce skilled non-EU immigration have drawn criticism from the Liberal Democrats within the Coalition government, especially Vince Cable, the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills and President of the Board of Trade. The latter was actually opposed to Conservative proposals at the time of the election, and was by far the most progressive of the major parties, but have had relatively little influence on immigration policy in the Coalition government.

Administration and development of policies are undertaken by the UK Border Agency in the Home Office which is responsible for securing the UK border and controlling migration in the UK. It manages border control for the UK, enforcing immigration and customs regulations. It also deals with applications for permission to enter or stay in the UK, and for citizenship and asylum.

The Mayor of London, currently Boris Johnson, though also a Conservative, has supported earned regularisation (LSE 2009). The Mayor's draft strategy for refugee integration in London (2007) – London Enriched – outlined a range of recommended
actions to tackle the disadvantage faced by London’s refugees, so that they may settle and integrate successfully in London.

A number of groups oppose restrictive immigration policies. Some of the key ones which have responded to government consultations and have good contacts with the media:

**JCWI** (Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants) is an independent national charity which exists to campaign for justice in immigration, nationality and refugee law and policy.

**ILPA** (Immigration Law Practitioners Association) was established in 1984 to promote and improve the advising and representation of migrants, provide information to members on domestic and European immigration, refugee and nationality law, and secure a non-racist, non-sexist, just and equitable system of migration, refugee and nationality law practice.

**Liberty** does not specifically focus on migration but is more broadly concerned with protection of civil liberties and human rights. It has however brought legal challenges which are one way of forcing a change in policy. The pre-entry requirement has human rights implications. On their behalf Matrix has argued that the new pre-entry language may not fulfil requirements of the European Convention on Human Rights as it risks breach of Articles 8 and 14 of the Convention and also might be capable of challenge under the Race Relations Act 1976 ([http://www.liberty-human-rights.org.uk/human-rights/asylum/pre-entry-language-req-matrix-legal-advice-sept-2010.pdf](http://www.liberty-human-rights.org.uk/human-rights/asylum/pre-entry-language-req-matrix-legal-advice-sept-2010.pdf))

**Migration Rights Network** was set up in 2008 and is a London based NGO working for a rights-based approach to migration. It seeks to give migrants a bigger voice.

**Migration Watch**, an anti-immigration group, on the other hand, says it is concerned above all else by the scale of migration and seeks to put pressure on government to substantially reduce levels. Their most recent concern is with the idea that the high levels of immigration will result in the White British finding themselves in a minority in the UK by around 2066.

### I.2 Relationship between Migration and Integration

In analysing political discourse in the UK, it emerges that the relationship between migration and integration at the time of writing (November 2010) is complex as integration (or lack thereof) is used instrumentally in the public debate in order to provide a rationale for capping migration. Capping migration has been one of the flagship policies of the Conservatives during the 2010 electoral campaign but had already been proposed by them in November 2006 (Wintour 2006). Theresa May, Home Secretary (28 Jun 2010, Hansard) stated that:

"Britain can benefit from immigration, but not uncontrolled immigration. The levels of net migration seen under the previous Government annual figure of almost a quarter of a million at its peak in 2004 were unprecedented in recent times. It is this Government's aim to reduce the level of net migration back down to the levels of the 1990s—tens of thousands each year, not hundreds of thousands... Our over-reliance on migrant labour has done nothing to help the
millions of unemployed and low-skilled British citizens who deserve the Government's help to get back to work and improve their skills.”

She announced to Parliament on 23 November 2010 the new figures to be implemented from April 2011 and which would put the brunt of the cut on Tier 1 (abolishing the general route and limiting the extraordinary talent to 1000) which does not require a work permit. She stated that “This package will serve the needs of British business. It will respond to the wishes of the British public. And it will give us the sustainable immigration system that we so badly need”. The Migration Advisory Committee was asked to consider what levels would be feasible and what would be the consequences (report published on 18 November 2010).

Political discourse in the UK focuses on the problems related to lack of integration rather than focussing on the advantages of successfully integrating migrants in the British economy. Policy makers are concerned that lack of integration, socio-spatial segregation and social exclusion of minority groups are the result of a poor acquisition of the fundamentals of the British culture i.e. its language and life style. For this reason, they advocate an urgent need for pre-entry tests to ensure better economic integration through a better knowledge of language and life in the UK. In particular, lack of integration and social exclusion has been mostly ascribed to those TCN women who join their husbands through family reunification, who usually do not speak English and hence pose economic strains on existing social services (see WP4 for fuller discussion). Migration Work made clear that “the measures are not about integration but rather about keeping people out of the country”. Integration measures will impact not just on the families which are directly affected but also on immigrant communities (Hansard Vol.721, N.53, 25 October 2010). An interview with Damian Green, the Minister for Immigration, confirmed this objective (MRN blog 4 November 2010).

The current post-credit crunch climate has brought forward the socio-economic dimension of integration and economic growth as a pathway out of recession. One of the Government’s rhetoric consists of giving reassurances that it will help promote the economic well-being of the UK by encouraging integration and protecting public services. The Government also claims that it will help ensure that spouses and civil partners are equipped to play a full part in British life from the outset (Hansard Vol721, N.53, 25 October 2010). Protecting and enhancing the labour market is therefore the absolute priority when it comes to reforms in the field of immigration policy. The socio-economic dimension to integration is complemented by the socio-cultural issues that emerge from the requirements of the tests (knowing English, knowing of lifestyle in the UK). The selective exclusion of migrants would indicate that there is a gender, ethnic and religious dimension to capping migration (Kofman et al. 2009). The announcement of the pre-entry tests and an interview with Damian Green stated that the government expects a 10% reduction which will primarily hit the rural poor, usually female, from South Asia with a high proportion of Muslims (to be more fully discussed in WP4). This targeted exclusion has obvious class related implications. In the light of 7/7 terror attacks on London public transport, integrating Muslims also raises terrorism-related concerns.

A counter argument to the migration cap is that it could damage the British economy. The Report on Immigration Cap (Home Affairs Committee) argues there are serious and widespread concerns that the proposed cap will hamper businesses, prevent top-class
international professionals from coming to the UK and damage the UK’s ability to recruit the most distinguished scientists into universities and highly talented individuals into UK companies and public services. It quotes eight Nobel prize-winners who note that the UK produces nearly 10 per cent of the world’s scientific output with only 1 per cent of its population. As the public sector shrinks, so the private sector is expected to take up the slack but its growth is partly reliant on the attraction of world-class talent to work in the UK (Hansard House of Commons 20 July 2010).

In effect the target group whose potential integration needs are emphasised within the current political discourse are new migrants. This is because newcomers represent potential permanent residents. Those who do not integrate are perceived as posing high demands on services such as translations and interpreters with additional educational and training costs for those whose first language is not English. On the other hand, permanent residents who do successfully integrate without additional costs are more likely to be skilled workers and are obviously looked at more positively. When looking at the integration needs of the host society, the main requisites that emerge from the political discourse analysis are that migrants can speak English and are economically self-sufficient. This reflects the fact that responsibility for integration is placed on the individual rather than on the host society. In this way, integration is not really framed as a two way process but as a one way process, where the individual carries responsibilities for integration and not the host society which is not expected to make any adjustments.

1.3 Framing the political discourse: multiculturalism (versus social cohesion)

Multiculturalism is at the core of the political discourse in the UK although it has been a quite contentious issue in the last decade. Despite the recent emphasis on social cohesion, multiculturalism is still alive in the political discourse and constitutes one of the key approaches to integration in the UK as opposed to other countries such as Germany where multiculturalism has been declared dead by the Chancellor Angela Merkel. (Lord) Anthony Giddens’ intervention at the House of Commons (Hansard July 2010) eloquently outlines the centrality of the multicultural approach in the UK:

"Against this [German multiculturalism] backdrop, Britain stands out as a multicultural success story, with London in the lead. Even in this country, multiculturalism seems to have become unpopular in some political circles but I stress that it is the only political philosophy which is compatible with a globalising world and an open economy such as ours".

Giddens also provides a clear definition of multiculturalism as an integration strategy which is currently being misunderstood:

"The notion of multiculturalism, however, has been tarnished by those who, more or less, completely misunderstand it. I would include-if I am allowed to say this in the context of the British Parliament-the German Chancellor in this category. Multiculturalism does not mean accepting value relativism. It means, on the contrary, promoting active dialogue between those who hold different values to produce common perspectives on the world. Multiculturalism does not mean letting different communities develop as they will. It means, on the contrary, seeking to establish contacts between communities; making sure that ghetto neighbourhoods do not develop; introducing active policies such that one
prevents those sorts of developments which one sees in so many other countries around the world. In this respect so far, as I mentioned, not only in London but in other cities we have been remarkably successful”

Cultural diversity arising from immigration is flagged as a positive value which benefits the country economically as well as enhancing its democracy:

“Multiculturalism does not mean sacrificing national identity. It is entirely compatible with, and indeed a core part of, the establishing of a national history—Britain is already an extremely diverse country from several centuries back—and it is compatible with an overall framework of democracy and an overall framework of ethics associated with democratic politics.”

I.4 Connections between integration and migration control

Connections between integration and migration control are to be found in individual party programmes where these were stated clearly. The Conservatives’ programme during the election campaign advocated the extension of border policing through dedicated border police force and for introduction of e-border and exit checks and capping of immigration. For instance, Liberal Democrats suggested policy on migration during election an increased need to control the direction of migration flow and integration through their proposed Regional Point Based System to ensure that immigration is targeted on areas that are under populated and where immigration is desirable, such as Scotland. These policies have been dropped by the Liberal Democrats since entering the coalition government, as well as their proposed integration of illegal migrants already living in the country. Earned regularisation is however still supported by Boris Johnson the Mayor of London (Camilo 2010), at least when he addresses a migrant audience. In general, the political issues around migration controls and integration point towards more repressive measures at the borders. The Labour position was to retain the Points Based System but to tighten criteria as it had constantly done since the introduction of a managed migration system, the last time being in April 2010. In the absence of further pronouncements on policy in this field, this continues to be its views and is supported by centre-left think tanks, such as the ippr (Finch and Goodhart 2010; ippr 2010).

I.5 Connections between pre-entry and / or post-arrival policies programmes

While capping immigration is tackled through the introduction of pre-entry tests, post arrival policies such as the Knowledge of Life in the UK are in place to make sure the new migrants are able to integrate in the host society. Social cohesion is the latest trend in integration policies as discussed earlier in this WP. Social cohesion provides the rationale for current migration reform both for pre-entry and for post-arrival integration policies. Audit Commission, for instance, sees cohesion as a key factor in building sustainable communities and considers this in the delivery of local services assessment and inspection work. Impact of immigration on local public services is evaluated negatively by the Audit Commission: “community and service user involvement in developing cohesion priorities is inconsistent in many councils and there are only limited examples of effective working with local communities to address
community cohesion”. There is an emphasis on the need for more cohesive local communities where cohesiveness is identified with the idea of sustainable community.

The Audit Commission, which is being disbanded, includes the title “The role of English language as a tool in promoting the integration of migrants” in its report on “Community Cohesion and Migration”. Language is critical to communication and better integration and is the single greatest driver of improved cohesion in relevant areas. Immigrants with English language skills are less likely to be exploited and more able to help themselves. They have less need for interpreters and translators (which are a cost to public services) and will have a wider range of better paid job options. Nationally and locally the annual pupil census return identify a continuing increase in the percentage of children in maintained schools for whom English is a second language. Moreover, more appropriate training is still needed for teachers and scholars who are inexperienced in the most effective ways of teaching pupils from English as a second language. At a school level it is not just about language. A study by the Institute for Community and Cohesion identified rapid turnover as an important associated concern (Survey for the Local Government Association by the Institute for Community Cohesion, 2007)

I.6 Interactions between political discourse, scientific expertise and public media debate

The anti immigration debate is shaped by populist media to which governments pay attention, stating the public needs to have confidence in this policy. MAC has been called upon by both the Labour and Coalition governments to give its advice on labour migration and the Points Based System and thus to give it authority in its decisions. It is largely composed of economists. Parliamentary committees such as that on Human Rights invite experts and stakeholders with a variety of perspectives and often adopt a critical stance.

I.6.1 Contextual and process factors - The driving forces behind immigration policies

These are the factors behind the Coalition government’s policies which are strongly dominated by the Conservative anti-immigration stance.

- Fears related to sustainability of migration in economic terms
- Jobs for British people
- Recession and spending cuts impact on public services provision, feeling of insecurity
- Ideological support for anti-immigrant groups and a populist policy considered to be attractive to the electorate

I.6.2 What role does evidence play in the evolution of national discourses?

This is variable. MAC was used by the Labour government to regulate its Points Based System. Consultations have also been used, for example, on pre-entry tests and age of marriage, but research which was commissioned on the latter was rejected because it did not fit what they wanted to hear (see WP4). Projections based on current migration data of future population growth, said to possibly reach 70 million in 2029, by the anti-
immigration. Migration Watch, has been influential in the political and media discourse on the lack of sustainability of migration at the same rate. Migration Watch has used the upper limit rather than a more likely average.

I.6.3 What role does sustainability play, if any?

As for integration, sustainability plays a deterrence role rather than a positive one. 70 million people in the UK is seen as a sustainability threshold beyond which it would be unable to integrate more migrants but this is different from sustainability of integration itself.
II PUBLIC MEDIA DISCOURSE

In order to provide a frame analysis for the public media discourse in the UK we chose two newspapers- the Guardian and the Daily Mail. The time span of the media frame analysis goes from just before the electoral period in May 2010 to the time of writing (November 2010). The Guardian and The Daily Mail reflect very different political positions and are therefore relevant in reflecting differences in interpreting migration and integration issues. While the Guardian is known to inform a liberal- orientated and Labour audience, the Daily Mail addresses a predominantly a-political and Conservative audience weighting the way in which the same facts are presented to the public accordingly. Articles in the Guardian are authored and reflect the opinion of individual journalists, but in some cases the Daily Mail articles do not have an identifiable journalist and therefore are meant to reflect more widely the views of the newspaper.

The main actors in the media discourse engaged in actively debating migration are the political parties, the Conservative/Liberal Democratic Coalition Government, and organisations such as the anti-immigration Migration Watch and pro-immigration groups such as the Institute for Public Policy Research, Joint Council for Welfare of Immigrants and Liberty which commissioned the Matrix lawyers court case on the illegality of pre-entry tests.

Similarly to what has already been observed in the parliamentary analysis, integration during this period was mainly framed by the public media discourse on the migration cap and English Language pre-entry tests. The test was introduced on 29 November 2010 and has created media debate with regards to the threat it poses to human rights (“Human rights lawyers condemn English test for spouses coming to UK. Lawyers advising Liberty say that making spouses pass English test to enter the UK could be discriminatory” Alan Travis, The Guardian, 27 September 2010).

The media analysis exposes the fact that immigration cap and pre-entry tests are measures which are explicitly directed to newcomers. While admission policies are specifically targeted to newcomers, and are therefore at the centre of the media debate, integration strategies are for those migrants who have already entered the country and have acquired leave to remain. The second set of issues about integration for long stayers are not currently addressed by media debate as they were not specifically targeted by the Conservative agenda. Another strand in the media discourse concerning migration and integration issues is the sustainability threshold, identified with the population hitting 70m by 2030. This is closely related to need for immigration cap and has been discussed in the parliamentary analysis section of this Work Package.

The rising concern about population size is expressed by The Guardian in terms of the percentage of ethnic minorities compared to the overall British population: “Ethnic minorities to make up 20% of UK population by 2051” (Mark Tran 13 July 2010) and also “UK population nears 62m” (Haroon Siddique 24 June 2010). Interestingly, the Daily Mail explicitly relates upper end of population forecasts with need for immigration cap, in a way which is deliberately misconstructed as if it was the most likely: “Home secretary rejects cap on immigration amid forecasts population will hit 70m by 2030”. Another reason for capping migration is identified in the media by the current economic recession (The Guardian “Recession puts government on course to reduce immigration” Alan Travis, 28 June 2010).
The Daily Mail provides a relevant policy analysis published before the elections hence during the Labour Government in 2008 in the article “An immigration cap is firm but fair - and vital for Britain’s future” (James Slack, 8th September 2008). This article clearly sets a sustainability limit to the access of new migrants to the UK and accuses the previous Home Secretary and the Prime Minister of being “hopelessly out of touch with the mood of the nation on this [migration] issue”. The article states that “This is not just about a "cap" on immigration. It is about the future of our country” and draws on Migration Watch projections on population growth. ‘Failure to cut immigration back to the level of the early Nineties will result in our population going to 70, then 80 million and beyond as immigration is the main driver of population growth. The Home Office's own research, released separately to the Migration Watch poll, found that 64 per cent of adults believe ‘laws on immigration should be much tougher’, while another 9 per cent said immigration should be halted completely. The Home Secretary made it very clear that he did not favour a cap on immigration because it is a crude measure which could harm the economy and is not as effective as the points-based system the Government introduced in 2008. This last statement largely reflects the view of Labour and its support for the PBS as opposed to migration cap, which had been discussed in the media long before the recent election campaign. The picture below represents visually the impossibility of admitting more people in an already overcrowded country.

![Image of overcrowded city](image.jpg)

The Daily Mail

The cap claims to be flexible and to allow the entrance of at least half of those who apply among skilled workers (“Immigration cap exclusions turn policy into gesture, say critics” Alan Trevis, The Guardian, 28 June 2010). When looking at the perceived integration necessities for newcomers within the media discourse, these clearly are being a skilled migrant and being able to speak English. While the Guardian has offered critical takes on the English test (“Expecting immigrants to speak English is hypocritical”, Daniel Trilling 10 June 2010), the Daily Mail has hardly mentioned the English test incoming legislation.
In the Guardian article “Immigration: the test case” (Nick Saville, 12 December 2009) the English test is defined as a gate keeping device. The article advocates linguistic diversity as a resource and suggests a shift from gate keeping device to a way to measure progress. The media discourse depicts the perceived integration necessities for long-stayers as need to know about life in the UK as a citizenship requirement. This is post-admission test leads to indefinite leave to remain in the host society whose integration needs are mainly defined by availability of space for new migrants and available resources. Integration needs for the host society are that it is not too overcrowded and that citizens can speak English in order not to have too many added costs in translation and in training staff to deal with migrant for whom English is not the first language.

However, there is a general acknowledgment that migrants are positive for the British Economy and this is reflected in the debate in the Guardian:

- The Guardian “Government reconsidering plans to impose immigration cap. Business to be consulted over proposals amid fears they could prove damaging to City”, Haroon Siddique, 25 June 2010)
- The Guardian “Theresa May: immigration cap will not harm UK economy” Haroon Siddique 28 June 2010
- The Guardian “Immigration cap will lead to skills shortages, say employers “ Alan Trevis 26 August 2010-11-22

From a media perspective the integration and migration nexus is addressed in terms of limiting access to TCN newcomers. However there are tensions in the media debate that highlight an economic concern related to limiting migration, i.e. in times of economic recession it is risky to limit important contribution of migrants to the UK economy. The argument against migration is that the presence of migrants exerts too much pressure on public services and that social exclusion is negative for local communities. Concerns over social exclusion are specifically expressed when addressing Muslim minorities in the UK and this relates to security turn in immigration control and the social cohesion agenda as mentioned earlier in this Work Package.

The media discourse at the moment is not really orientated to integration policies strictly speaking but around capping migration. Integration is used more as a rationale for limiting the influx of migrants than as a real policy concern. With regards to the frame analysis question “Who is good and who is a bad migrant and why?” the Daily Mail in the article “Immigration? Given a choice between a skilled Indian and an unskilled Bulgarian, I know who I’d prefer” (Stephen Glower, 29th July 2010) constructs a neat hierarchy where the good migrant is identified with the skilled (and possibly European) migrant and the bad migrant with the unskilled TCNs who are generally Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Thai women, that is the principal nationalities in family reunification currently targeted by the pre-entry tests. Given the choice between skilled and unskilled migrant, the fact of being skilled would have the priority over ethnicity as the title of the article suggests. This positioning of the Daily Mail on the European and extra-European question is at odds with the Euro-sceptical approach of the Tories and the new Right in general. Integration requisites therefore range from employment (for both newcomers and long stayers) to knowledge of the English language (both
newcomers and long stayers) and include the citizenship test for long stayers which however is not addressed in current media debate.

The Guardian picked up the issue of illegality of the pre-entry test in breach of the right to family life under human rights law: “Human rights lawyers condemn English tests for spouses coming to UK. Lawyers advising Liberty say that making spouses pass English language tests to enter the UK could be discriminatory” (Alan Travis, Monday 27 September 2010). The Matrix’ legal opinion argues that those coming from non-English-speaking countries will be put at a disadvantage compared with those who cannot speak English but come from the US or other majority English-speaking countries. Lawyers pointed out that it is likely to be discriminatory to require someone with a degree in English from India to take the test but not someone from California who speaks only Spanish. The pre-entry test could lead to the break-up of families in cases where spouses cannot pass the test because of the lack of available English courses, or their inability to fit lessons around work or family commitments, age, illness or disabilities. The UK Border Agency said that exceptions will be made in cases where migrants have physical or mental impairment, but added that these will be rare. On the other hand, the Daily Mail supports the views of the Government on the need to introduce pre-entry tests and also portrays migrants’ inability to speak English as life threatening: “Revealed: Hospital has staff from 70 countries as nurses who don’t even understand ‘nil by mouth’ forced to take English lessons (Sophie Borland, 6th April 2010).

In conclusion, both parliamentary and media debate have depicted migration and integration as contested issues which are particularly heartfelt as they concern the present and the future of the UK and are intrinsically connected with the current perception of shortage of available resources. For this reason, the parliamentary and the media discourse in general, and the selected newspapers in particular, seem to suggest that a regulation of migration is legitimate as long as it doesn’t breach human rights. Integration is seen as a one-way process, in which society doesn’t hold any responsibility for the integration of new and already established migrants. The
responsibility for integration rests upon the individual migrant and depends on her or his ability to speak English and their capability to contribute to the British economy.
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