

How do refugees and asylum-seekers experience Huddersfield as a ‘town of sanctuary’?

Melisa Jackson

The University of Huddersfield, Queensgate, Huddersfield HD1 3DH, England.
mylisamel@yahoo.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 07 December 19
Received in revised form 06
April 20
Accepted 20 April 20

Keywords:

Asylum-seekers
Refugees
Dispersal
Liminality
City of Sanctuary
Sanctuary
Experience
Huddersfield
Sanctuary Kirklees

ABSTRACT

This research aims to understand the experience of asylum-seekers and refugees (ASRs) within the juxtapositional climate of welcome, as promoted by the City of Sanctuary (CoS) movement, and deterrence, as per asylum policies, within a dispersal area that has signed up to support the CoS aims. The literature review highlights that ASRs face many challenges to establishing themselves in their new communities; many of which are institutionalised under the dispersal policy as they are often dispersed to areas of social deprivation. Aside from enabling relationship development between ASRs and local people through sanctuary practices, the literature offers little about the practical ways that CoS benefits ASRs and there is no consensus that the movement mitigates the challenges they face. The research used a phenomenological strategy as it aimed to build a clear picture of how things exist from the perspectives of the participants. It adopted an interpretivist paradigm using interpretative phenomenological analysis. Data was collected from three participants using semi-structured interviews. The participants identified as ASRs in line with policy definitions and were aged between 23 and 42 years. The research revealed that despite the adverse effects associated with dispersal, it is not always perceived negatively by ASRs and suggests that ASRs have some level of confidence in the Home Office’s dispersal decision. Liminality emerged as one aspect of the asylum process that adversely impacts both the present and future prospect of ASRs’ ability to settle into their community and plan for their future. It has also revealed that the participants’ ideal of sanctuary, is more than the notion of safety. It includes being understood and the perceived feeling that they can trust those around them; an ideal of sanctuary contrary to the feeling that the asylum system produces.

Introduction and Rational

The increase in asylum applicants from individuals arriving spontaneously during the 1990s resulted in the *Immigration and Asylum Act 1999*; described as arguably the most radical of its time (Zetter, Griffiths and Sigona, 2005). The act, which focused

on deterrence and control, uses measures such as detainment, dispersal, forced deportation and surveillance to restrict and deter people from seeking asylum in the UK. These measures, once seen as ‘exceptional’, are now seen as common tools employed by the Home Office as part of the asylum process (Refugee Council, 2018a); influencing public

attitude and affecting the experience of ASRs in the UK. Currently, the number of people displaced in the world is the highest on record (Sheeka, 2018), yet the rhetoric of 'deserving' and 'undeserving' (Squire and Bagelman, 2012 p. 146) persists in the debate around asylum. Recent events, such as the refugee crisis, the Brexit referendum and the United States' presidential race and mid-term election have guaranteed migrants, particularly ASRs, a recurring role in our news. Such rhetoric, along with asylum policies that portray ASRs as a 'symbol of system overload' (Koser, 2001, p. 87; Loescher, 2001, p. 16) influences the views of local people towards ASRs. Healey (2006) has identified political and public reaction towards increases in asylum applications as the structural factor that most greatly impacts the integration process, because the state's portrayal of ASRs as 'scroungers' who exploit the welfare system while offering little in return, has resulted in some sectors of the public feeling fear towards them (Healey, 2006, p. 259). Within this discourse of hostility, the CoS charitable movement, which promotes a culture of welcome and hospitality, aims to shift the traditional hostile 'cultural attitudes' of local people towards 'welcome and inclusion' (Bagelman, 2012, p. 16) in an effort to achieve its goal of making the United Kingdom a welcoming place of safety for ASRs (City of Sanctuary, 2018a). It is within this juxtaposition between the climate of welcome and deterrence that this empirical research investigates how ASRs experience Huddersfield as a 'town of sanctuary'.

The research was conducted in Huddersfield; the largest town within the metropolitan borough of Kirklees. Kirklees itself has a long tradition of accommodating people from different nationalities; with records of refugees from as early as the First World War when 300 Belgian nationals sought temporary sanctuary in Huddersfield (Huddersfield Local History Society, nd). Kirklees is a 'district of sanctuary', known as Sanctuary Kirklees; part of the national CoS movement that aims to build a culture of hospitality across the UK. Sanctuary Kirklees started in 2010 with the launch of Huddersfield Town of Sanctuary (Robin, 2010) with the goal of establishing 'a network of groups and organisations' across the borough that would be proud to identify with the movement's aim (City of Sanctuary, 2018b). This network (currently 112 local organisations) pledges to be a 'place of safety' that helps people seeking sanctuary to integrate into local communities. Through this offering of sanctuary, Sanctuary Kirklees hopes to influence the views of the local population to see the town's identity as a place of safety for ASRs. Sanctuary

Kirklees also identifies as a place where relationships between local people and sanctuary seekers are easily built. By forming relationships, it is hoped that local people will get a better understanding of the injustices that ASRs face, and as such, be 'motivated to support and defend them' (City of Sanctuary, 2018b). As at April 2018, 716 asylum-seekers were being hosted in Kirklees under the Home Office dispersal programme; of whom, 698 were being supported with accommodation (Migration Yorkshire, 2018), which, according to Hynes (2011, p. 46) meant they had 'no choice' in where they were accommodated.

ASRs often arrive in their host country with little or no legal rights, which means that as a group, they possess the least human agency (Healey, 2006) and are described by Neill (2016) as 'amongst the most vulnerable groups in society'; synonymous with social exclusion and poverty (Lewis, Craig, Adamson & Wilkinson, 2008). Restarting life in the host country is, therefore, an enormous challenge, exacerbated by stigmas and stereotypes, discrimination, liminality and powerlessness (Hynes 2011). Thus, the importance of understanding how ASRs feel within their host countries have been highlighted by Ager and Strang (2004), while Healey (2006, p. 267) notes that as a group, their personal experiences are seldom heard. Importantly, this research addresses the need to understand the experience of ASRs in terms of the local context, which Platts-Flower and Robinson (2015) acknowledge is either lacking or partially understood. While adopting a Youth and Community Work perspective that views young people as experts within their own lives (Sapin, 2013), this research is based on the notion that ASRs are experts within their own experience. It foregrounds the voices of the participants in the data analysis; giving them a small platform to voice how they experience Huddersfield as an 'area of sanctuary'. The research questions are:

1. What are ASRs' perceptions of dispersal?
2. What aspect of the asylum process impacts most negatively on ASRs, and why?
3. What constitutes sanctuary for ASRs and what impact does a 'town of sanctuary', as a local context, have on ASRs' sense of welcome and belonging?

Literature Review

Over the last fifty years, a relatively significant number of ASRs have sought refuge in Europe (Phillimore & Goodson, 2008). Until around the 1990s, most arrived in the UK via organised quota

programmes such as the Chilean's and Bosnian's projects in the 1970s and 1990s respectively. However, the number of applications from individuals spontaneously arriving increased during the 1990s, which resulted in asylum receiving high-profile political attention (Sales, 2002). Since then, laws and policies have become more restrictive, leading to an asylum system in the UK that is now described as 'extremely tough', with a shift from "regulated" sanctuary to a focus of 'outright restrictionism and deterrence' (Refugee Council, 2018a). This review discusses literature about ASRs' experience in the UK by analysing dispersal and the CoS movement; to identify how each affects the asylum experience.

Dispersal

Though there were cases of 'voluntary dispersal' of refugees since the 1970s in the UK, (Boswell, 2003), a more comprehensive scheme of 'forced dispersal' was introduced under the *Immigration and Asylum Act 1999*. A key change implemented under the act is the provision of asylum support; shifting from 'mainstream benefits' provided by local authorities to support provided directly by the Home Office (Hynes, 2011, p. 43). Those who qualify, based on a destitution test, are offered subsistence and accommodation support under Section 95 of the act while their claims are being processed (House of Commons Library, 2016). The offer of accommodation is on a 'no choice basis' (Hynes, 2011, p. 46) in areas outside the South East of England. In part, this is to 'relieve housing and social pressures' (Stewart, 2011, p. n26; Hynes, 2011; Zetter et al., 2005) by 'spreading the burden' associated with asylum-seekers (Robinson, Anderson and Mustred, 2003, p. 62) to one of the 99 local authorities that has volunteered their participation in the dispersal scheme. Dispersal areas are often selected based on available accommodations which are cheaper than those in London; with a 'cluster limit' set by the Home Office of one asylum-seeker to every two hundred residing residents (House of Commons Library, 2016). As at September 2018, there were 9883 individuals in dispersal accommodation in the North West, 5240 in West Midlands and 5056 in Yorkshire and Humber (Refugee Council, 2018b), making it the third-largest dispersal region in the UK.

A small number of commentators, such as Boswell (2003), have suggested that dispersal is not compulsory, noting that asylum-seekers can refuse dispersal areas. However, as asylum-seekers are prohibited from working, they need government support in order to survive (Bagelman, 2013) and there are only a few circumstances under which 'an

asylum-seeker can establish that it is not reasonable to be dispersed outside London and the South East. Most of these circumstances are related to medical issues, such as having a doctor's note in support of being 'too ill to travel' or travelling away from their current location interfering with an established course of medical treatment. Non-medical reasons may be such matters as a 'specific risk of serious racial harassment' or a child's welfare being interfered with should they travel to the dispersal area (Shelter Legal, 2019a). Asylum-seekers can express a location preference, which is taken into consideration by the Home Office; however, there is no obligation on the part of the latter even to house siblings in the same area. An asylum-seeker may refuse to travel to a dispersal area for a number of other reasons, such as not wanting to share room with strangers and not wanting to be separated from friends and family (Hynes, 2011, p. 76). However, as only one offer is made for accommodation and travel, failure to travel to the dispersal location by single applicants usually results in termination of support and eviction from emergency accommodation. Families that fail to travel are also evicted from emergency accommodation. For both single applicants and families, the offer of support in the dispersal location is not withdrawn but left open indefinitely. As such, they are unable to appeal as the support has technically never been discontinued (Hynes, 2009) and the first-tier tribunal can 'only hear appeals relating to refusal or withdrawal of support' (Shelter Legal, 2019b). Judicial review becomes the only means of challenge, based on the 'grounds that the accommodation is not adequate' (Shelter Legal, 2019a).

Impact of Dispersal

The majority of the literature on dispersal is centred around its critique. Critics, such as Hynes (2011), Stewart (2011), and Robinson et al. (2003), argue that dispersal is covertly about deterrence rather than sharing the burden, and is an 'essential instrument' in immigration control (Bloch and Schuster, 2005, p. 491). Its element of control works by requiring asylum-seekers to attend reporting centres regularly, and accommodation providers are legally bound to report anyone missing from their accommodation (Hynes, 2009). The main impact of the asylum process, including dispersal, is asylum-seekers 'feeling of loss of control over their lives and a sense of liminality or [being in] limbo' (Hynes, 2009, p. 115) because it dictates that asylum-seekers endure a period of waiting for refugee status determination (RSD).

Asylum-seekers spend this period of waiting occupying liminal spaces, such as dispersal accommodations, which often prevents them from forming ordinary, everyday living patterns and relationships (O'Reilly, 2018; Hynes, 2011). They usually face many restrictions, such as not being allowed to work (UK Visa and Immigration, 2014) while being dispersed to areas of social deprivation (Phillimore and Goodson, 2006; Lewis et al., 2008) where large numbers of the population receive welfare support or are in low paid jobs (Travis, 2005). Travis argues that this creates 'ghettoise' areas where ASRs are at greater risk of experiencing prejudice, racial assaults and harassment. ASRs are three times more likely to experience assault and twice as likely to experience racial harassment in dispersal areas that are poor and socially deprived (Travis, 2005). Contrary to being prohibited from working, employment is classed as the "single most important' factor in securing migrant's integration into society' (Phillimore & Goodson, 2006, p. 1719-20). Bloch's (2000) research suggests that refugees who are in employment find it easier to adjust to their new society than unemployed refugees. Employment increases day-to-day encounters and opportunities to learn English and importantly, restores economic independence, thus making participation in society easier. Stewart and Mulvey (2013) recommend that dispersal areas be a good match between employment demand and asylum-seekers' skills. They suggest that the Home Office considers suitability factors such as the areas' ethnic composition, established community support networks, employment opportunities, and language support when dispersing individuals; in order for it to have a consistently positive impact on ASRs experience. The Home Office, using the Ager and Strang (2004) report, have also identified a set of high-level indicators that are integral for integration. These are achieving full potential, which includes the employment rates of refugees and level of English attainment over time; contributions to the community in terms of voluntary work, involvement with community organisations, and the extent to which refugees experience racial, cultural and religious harassment; and accessing services, including housing and satisfaction with their children's education. These are contrary to immigration rules that prohibit employment and the demographic characteristics of many dispersal areas; with unemployment being noted as the 'single most significant barrier' to refugees' integration (Feeney, 2000, p. 343).

In spite of Bagelman's (2013) and Phillimore and Goodson's (2008) empirical researches supporting

the notion that dispersal presents many disadvantages to ASRs, they acknowledge that the 'period of waiting' may be a time that asylum-seekers find valuable to recover from the shock and traumas experienced in their country of origin. Phillimore and Goodson (2008, p. 1715) also argue that the skills and qualifications that ASRs arrive with could potentially 'offer new opportunities for deprived areas,' if ASRs were supported in accessing employment appropriate to those skills and qualifications.

Dispersal also separates asylum-seekers from the established organisation and community groups in London (Stewart, 2011; Zetter et al., 2005), and from 'meaningful day-to-day encounters', which disintegrate crucial family and friendship bonds (Hynes, 2009, p. 115). The dispersal policy is therefore accused of having negative implications on integration and 'long-term resettlement' because it is 'inherently' linked to social exclusion; thus influencing individuals' 'access to services, [and affects their chances of] establishing themselves in their new communities and feeling a sense of 'belonging'" (Hynes, 2011, p. 2). A systematic literature review by Rebelo, Jose, Mercedes, and Joseba (2018), which consisted of 12 studies across five western countries including the UK, supports the claim that immigration laws, including dispersal policies, and media hostility, contribute towards a climate of mistrust, hostility and racism towards ASRs. Furthermore, these experiences are found to be positively correlated with feelings of isolation, and to negatively impact well-being. Similarly, the nature of ASRs experiences can affect their level of integration (Healey, 2006). For example, negative experiences are associated with a reduced sense of security in the UK, while positive experiences are expected to increase feelings of comfort and result in greater interaction between host and hosted. Aspinall and Watters' (2010, p. 97) research shows that in areas classed as excluding, that is, 'low-income white neighbourhoods with few immigrants', incidences of assault and racial harassment are higher; whereas, ASRs have a more positive experience in 'including areas' that have histories of immigration. Likewise, Platts-Fowler and Robinson's (2015) research, which focused on the experience of ASRs in the dispersal areas of Hull and Sheffield, shows that overall, participants in Sheffield were more satisfied with the level of support, the standard of housing and friendliness of local people than those in Hull. Participants from Sheffield reported that they are either 'fairly' or 'very satisfied' with their life, suggesting that integration was proceeding more positively. Sheffield is described as having a rich history of

immigration since 1945 (Platts-Fowler & Robinson, 2015, p. 484), with a 'long tradition of offering welcome to refugees' (Darling, 2010, p. 128). Hull, on the other hand, has a limited post-1945 history of immigration with a relatively small ethnic minority population prior to 1999. Although the research does not measure differences in these areas based on their affiliation with the CoS movement, it did highlight that Sheffield was the first CoS in the UK. It is within these contexts of forced dispersal, restrictionism over welfare, accommodation and rights, and social exclusion and liminality that the CoS movement began in Sheffield (Darling, 2010 p.129).

City of Sanctuary

Darling, Barnett and Eldridge (2010) challenge the notion that the dispersal policy leads to an increase in social tensions and threatens community cohesion by drawing on the work of the CoS; a charitable social movement that encourages and promotes a culture of hospitality and welcome for ASRs in the UK. The CoS movement started in Sheffield in September 2005 (City of Sanctuary, 2018a), in response to the dispersal policy and the tightening restrictions imposed on asylum support (Darling, 2010, p. 129). With the vision that the UK will be a welcoming place of safety for all, CoS aims to create communities in which ASRs are valued and can contribute to their communities (Darling, Barnett and Eldridge, 2010); by shifting the traditional 'cultural attitudes' of local people from hostility towards 'welcome and inclusion' (Bagelman, 2012, p. 16).

Impact of City of Sanctuary

The literature on CoS in the UK is limited to a few key authors; the majority of whom focus on the concept of the movement itself, in terms of its characteristics, aims and achievements. Rotter (2010, p. 54) presents 'sanctuary as a tool' that enables asylum-seekers to deal with their 'groundlessness' by reprieving and alleviating the problematic waiting in limbo associated with the asylum process. CoS offers a means to address exclusionary, marginalising and alienating practices and plays a valuable role in network connections (Squire & Bagelman, 2012, p. 43). Sanctuary activities, usually in the form of cultural and educational events, centre around 'awareness-raising' that seeks to tell the truth about ASRs experiences (Bauder, 2016, p. 178; City of Sanctuary, 2018a). These activities are designed to promote relationship development between host and hosted (Squire & Darling, 2013).

When interpreted as part of a 'broader political response to state policies and practices' that restrict entry and settlement in the UK, CoS challenges the criminalising practices of policing and border control of ASRs; thus, controlling their *statist* and *pastoral* logics (Squire & Bagelman, 2012, p. 146). It disrupts the statist agenda by challenging the notions and assumptions that sanctuary is inevitably linked to unequal pastoral relationships in which there are hierarchical associations between 'protector' and 'protected', and the ideas of those deserving and undeserving of protection (Squire and Bagelman, 2012, p. 146). In promoting and providing opportunities for participation in voluntary work, it challenges the 'conventional views' of ASRs as dependent and 'passive recipients of assistance' (Bauder, 2016, p. 178); instead, presenting them as fully contributing to the life of their community (Darling, 2017). The UK's sanctuary initiatives 'thus aim to fundamentally transform the way people think about the city as a space for ASRs' (Bauder, 2016, p. 178).

On the other hand, the movement is critiqued for producing the opposite effects for which it is celebrated. It is argued that sanctuary initiatives reproduce the differences between ASRs and the residents of host communities (Bauder, 2016); normalising the 'undesirable' situation of ASRs while not offering any real solution that could bring about change (Bauder, 2016). Hospitality is usually offered via charitable and voluntary organisations; however, Darling (2017) points out that these organisations, especially those which are faith-based, do not challenge the exclusionary nature of immigration and asylum policies. According to Squire and Darling (2013, p. 194) and Squire and Bagelman (2012), sanctuary initiatives 'perpetuate' the 'pastoral logic' by encouraging ASRs to 'passively accept their situation'. Bagelman's (2012) genealogical-ethnographic study of sanctuary cities, concludes that CoS 'fixes' ASRs in suspense; feeding into and sustaining a 'powerful state of deferral' (Bagelman 2012; Bagelman, 2013 p.57-8).

Sanctuary practices are thus seen as 'a gentler form of control' that 'regularise and depoliticise' the problematic waiting (Bagelman, 2013, p. 50). It is a 'means of governing through the assertion of humanitarian intentions' and runs the risk of labelling individuals as deserving or undeserving (Darling, 2017, p. 185); and has been branded a 'governmentalizing process' that incites 'a commitment to the rules' and the resigning of oneself to the normalised waiting for the asylum process to conclude. Asylum-seekers, thus, remain at the 'political margins' of society (Bauder, 2016, p. 178). Bauder concludes that sanctuary initiatives 'do

not radically challenge the imagination of the city as a space of belonging'. Instead, the imagination of CoS aligns with urban neoliberal politics. Darling and Squire (2012, p. 196) thus argue that the CoS movement could merely be a collective of groups and individuals that do not effectively produce sanctuary, although they promote the values of hospitality.

The literature highlights many of the disadvantages that ASRs face under the institutionalised dispersal policy and there is no consensus that the CoS movement, even in part, mitigates these disadvantages. With such opposite-ends-of-the-spectrum contradictions in the literature about CoS, it is difficult to draw a conclusion regarding its impact. Aside from enabling relationship development through sanctuary activities such as community gardening and social evenings, which disrupt the notion that asylum-seekers' unresolved status, and refugees' 'otherness' disbar them from integrating into their community (Squire, 2011 p.290), the literature offers little about the practical ways that CoS benefits ASRs.

Methodology

The research used a phenomenological strategy as it aimed to build a 'clear picture' (Denscombe, 2010 p.103) of how things exist from the perspectives of ASRs as per their experience. It adopted an interpretivist paradigm using interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA); which is both descriptive and interpretative and described as a 'two-stage interpretation process' in which participants try to make sense of their world, and the researcher tries to make sense of what participants say (Taylor, 2015, p. 437). Its focus is to 'gain a deeper understanding' (Matua & Van-Der-Wal, 2014, p. 23) by uncovering meaning beyond what participants might articulate. Ethical considerations as outlined by the British Education Research Association (2018), the European Commission Directorate-General for Research and Innovation (2020) and the Economic Social Research Council (2015) were adhered to throughout the research process.

Sampling

Non-probability purposive sampling was used to select a representative studied population (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). Participants were all recruited through contact with a charitable organisation that provides a support service to ASRs. It was known from the outset that access to participants relied on trust; as ASRs are usually wary of outsiders (Hynes, 2009; Stevenson &

Willott, nd; Block, Riggs & Haslam, 2013; Hynes, 2003; Temple & Moran, 2006; Kissoon, 2006). As a result, voluntary work was undertaken at the charitable organisation. This provided direct contact with ASRs and allowed for the building of trusting relationships (Johl and Ranganathan, 2010), which, according to Leininger (1991, p. 92 cited in Brink, 1993), aids the researcher in obtaining 'accurate data' to validate findings. The intention of recruiting participants for the research was clearly explained to the Volunteering Manager, who acted as a 'gatekeeper' and gave consent for the interviews to be conducted on-site. Four participants were sought who met the fixed criteria of being either a refugee or an asylum-seeker, in line with the policy definition, and between the ages of 20 and 50 years old. However, only three participants consented; two males and one female aged between 23 and 42 years, of whom two were refugees, and the other an asylum-seeker. They resided in Huddersfield for between six months and four years. In terms of ethnicities, two were Pakistanis, and one was Malaysian; all of whom had a good command of the English language although, ethnicity and language were not criterions for selection.

Method of Data Collection

Data was collected using semi-structured interviews. An in-house pilot was carried out to test the appropriateness of the interview questions, which resulted in minor word changes. It ensured that the questions were relevant to gathering valid data (Denscombe, 2010). Power was shifted in favour of the participants by highlighting that they were the experts and had control over how the interviews proceeded. This was done to reduce the participant's likelihood of responding in ways they assumed may be pleasing to the researcher, thus enhancing data validity (Brinks, 1993). In line with Tuckman's (1972, p. 268) suggestion to 'brief participants 'about the nature or purpose of the interviews', participants were given the interview questions beforehand. The interviews lasted 27-48 minutes and were tape-recorded. Two of the three interviews were conducted on-site at the charitable organisation where participants were recruited; using a private room to ensure confidentiality in line with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (GOV.UK, 2018). One was conducted at the participant's home because they gained employment and were no longer able to attend sessions at the organisation. The interviews went well, benefiting from the relationship that had developed between the researcher and participants. It provided a relaxed atmosphere in which participants spoke extensively about their experiences in the UK.

Data Analysis

The Data was transcribed verbatim and analysed using the six-steps strategy of the IPA framework. The steps are divided into first and second-order analysis. First-order analysis is the development of a descriptive account of the experience as per the participants' perceptions (Miller, Chan & Farmer, 2018, p. 246-7). This stage of the analysis sought to understand the participants' priorities. During first-order analysis, the data was read and re-read to explore semantic content and meaning. Next, themes and patterns were identified on a case by case basis. A total of nine themes were identified at this stage. Cases were then cross-compared to highlight similarities and differences. A detailed thematic plan was made to facilitate this and which reduced the number of themes to seven. During second-stage analysis, which moves from description to interpretation, data was interpreted at a deeper level by importing theories as a viewing lens for analysis. (Miller et al., 2018, p. 247). This allowed for the amalgamation of the seven themes into three dominant ones.

Critique of Methodology

The firm focus of the research on participants' experience of Huddersfield affected the depth of information collected. A decision was made not to delve into each participant's experience in their country of origin on ethical grounds. However, it was evident during some interviews that participants avoided linking their experiences of Huddersfield with their experiences in their country of origin. It would have provided for a more in-depth discussion if participants had more freedom to discuss their experiences in their country of origin. A more rigorous sampling process, with fixed criteria for ethnicity and language, would have returned participants from a wider cross-section of the studied population. A better method would have been to choose one participant from the four most represented ethnicities within the UK's ASR population, and sampling for English and non-English speakers since the experience of these two groups may be vastly different.

Analysis and Discussion

Analysis of the raw data presented three themes suited to answering the research questions. The emergent themes are dispersal, liminality, and sanctuary as safety, trust and being understood. Using the IPA framework, both a semantic and latent level analysis is presented. This approach was chosen to in order stay true to the research's phenomenological ontology; allowing the voices of the participants to be foregrounded in the data reporting.

Dispersal

From a semantic level analysis, participants reported that dispersal was not a problem, even though they were all dispersed by the Home Office. None displayed any concern about not having a say in where they were accommodated; nor did they believe that the Home Office had made the wrong decision in dispersing them to Huddersfield. They all believed that whatever choice the Home Office had made, would have been in their best interests and that they would be dispersed to suitable areas. Emran, 38-year-old, stated:

'...if they are sending me somewhere; I totally respect that because I'm sure they are doing it for my best...'

Zee, 23-year-old also shared this view, stating:

'the first time I came here, I had no idea of what the cities are like. I didn't know where would be the best place for me, so when they dispersed, I just believed that it would be somewhere which is suitable for me... If I were sent somewhere else, I'd be a different person now cause maybe I wouldn't have gotten the chance that I got here'.

Idris, (42-year-old), too shared a similar sentiment, adding:

'Where I'm coming from, you know, I appreciate the way they [Home Office] did things'.

What participants portrayed was 'gratefulness' of being offered sanctuary and for the benefits that they received as part of the asylum-process. The participants were happy and willing to start from where they were sent; reporting no disadvantage to dispersal. Based on Zee's statement, dispersal also seemed to ease the burden associated with deciding where to settle in the UK; something that is arguably a welcome relief for asylum-seekers who do not already have friends and family here. Their responses also suggest that they have some level of trust and confidence in the Home Office's dispersal decision and the asylum system. Caution must be taken however, when engaging with participants' semantic view of dispersal. This is because they were all happy with being dispersed to Huddersfield; presenting the town as a welcoming and friendly place. Had they not been happy with the local area, their views of dispersal may have been drastically different. Generalisation is therefore difficult. As Hynes (2011, p. 94) points out, the dispersal system has a 'one-size-fits-all' approach, an approach that some might find positive, but which may be the opposite for others. Despite their mainly positive views and experience of being dispersed, the consensus from the literature is that the impact of dispersal is often negative. It is accused of being a mechanism of control linked to

social exclusion; racial harassment and isolation; all of which affect the chances for ASRs to establish themselves in their new community and feel a sense of belonging (Hynes, 2011). Some of the negative ways in which dispersal influences the participants were revealed on deeper examination of the data. For the participants, it was important that the researcher understood that once status was determined, they had the freedom to choose where to live. This was evident from Emran's statements at different points throughout the interview.

'...and then this is temporary, because what I understand, once I get leave to remain, once I get a job obviously, I will have the freedom to go and live wherever I want'.

'And I want to add one more point, as you're aware, once I get the leave to remain, I can go and live anywhere in the UK. You know that, right?'

Likewise, Zee emphasised the freedom that came with status:

'I don't think it's a big problem [dispersal] but, of course, after getting refugee status, ... we have a choice. Like now, I've got my refugee status, now if I'm not happy with Huddersfield, am allowed to go somewhere else and start my life'.

The importance that these participants attached the concept of freedom suggests that they experience some of the negative feelings associated with being dispersed and supports Hynes' (2009) observation that the asylum system, including the dispersal policy's main impact on asylum-seekers, is the feeling of loss of control over their lives. The Home Office maintains control by making it compulsory for asylum-seekers to attend reporting centres regularly; usually daily, weekly, or monthly (Bloch & Schuster, 2005). These reporting centres are in the form of police stations and UK Visa and Immigration Agency offices. Aside from creating 'exceptional anxiety' while one waits for the decision on their case, dispersal housing and reporting requirements 'fix people to knowable locations for immigration authorities' (Burrige, 2017). The feeling that they have lost control of their lives results in 'entrenched' mistrust of the police, service providers and even neighbours.

Liminality

Despite an appreciation for the system, the period of waiting for RSD during which asylum-seekers are not allowed to work, mostly impacts negatively on the experience of ASRs. Idris' explanation illuminates some of the struggles that asylum-

seekers endure before and after RSD. For him, this period of waiting for status was "not easy".

'You don't have that feeling, that you are safe and secure because you are still in thin air. You don't have a job; you don't have status; there are so many things that you cannot do what everybody else is doing. You know, because you are barred from doing it. I mean, when I came, the first six months, I couldn't work. I couldn't open a bank account. I couldn't buy anything online. So, there are so many limitations.'

Idris further explained the two concepts of security that he experienced during his time waiting for RSD.

'There are two kinds of feeling secure. One secure is your life isn't threatened. One secure is you feel you are grounded; you know that you have the rights and you can do what everybody else is doing, and you are one of everybody. But my secure, when I mentioned I didn't feel secure, it wasn't about my life being threatened... There were so many things that I couldn't do that everybody else could do. Although I was in the United Kingdom, I wasn't 100% here because I was not one of everybody. I was still in thin air, and I had this limitation. It's like a prisoner, you put him in jail, you tell him you can't go out, you can't do this as a normal free man. You are jailed. You are in prison. So, it's something like that, I wasn't in a prison, but at the same time, I had limitations, I couldn't do so many things what everybody else could do. Although I was a free man, but I wasn't a free man.'

What Idris has portrayed is the state of liminality; described by Hynes (2011, p. 2) as 'a particular state experienced by people as they pass over the threshold of one phase of their life to another'. Liminality usually refers to the period between entering the asylum system and the time when status is granted and is described as an inherent part of the asylum experience. Liminal spaces, which include not just dispersal accommodation but detention centres and refugee camps, keep asylum-seekers 'outside' of their communities (O'Reilly, 2018, p. 822); as the exclusionary nature of the asylum process restricts asylum-seekers from forming ordinary, everyday living patterns (Hynes, 2011, p. 31). Findings from O'Reilly's research found that asylum-seekers often experience feelings of being 'trapped, controlled and imprisoned' (O'Reilly, 2018, p. 828). Idris's account of his experience supports O'Reilly's findings. Even though he was here in the UK, he felt he was not

“100% here” because he felt imprisoned by the system and needed validation via RSD.

The temporary nature of asylum accommodation adds to the sense of being in limbo. Emran’s experience supports the notion that the liminal spaces associated with dispersal impact on integration by disrupting relationship formation (Hynes, 2009, p. 115).

‘interaction is limited because we are in a temporary place. Once we move to a permanent place, then we will interact with the neighbours more. We were friends with the neighbours, but they moved out because this is like temporary, people come and go’ (Emran).

Asylum-seekers are usually relocated on more than one occasion, which separates them from the relationships that they had started to form and compounds their prospect of being socially excluded. It affects their chances of feeling a sense of belonging in their communities, because the time spent in liminal spaces affects ASRs’ chances of establishing roots (Hynes, 2011). The data further suggests that the limitations imposed by asylum policies infiltrate every aspect of life for ASRs, bringing with it a sense of ‘powerlessness’ (O’Reilly, 2018, p. 827) and reliance which affects the ease at which asylum-seekers can get things done. Without a bank account, Idris struggled to book a National Express bus ticket to London, as this is usually done online. He had to rely on the kindness of strangers to sign-post him to a travel agent, where he was able to book.

Liminality also impacts on access to training and employment. Zee’s encounter with the education system demonstrates some of these difficulties:

‘...when I was an asylum-seeker, there were few free courses available at *****. I tried, but I wasn’t able to get a space. So, at that time, [for] a few months, I felt like I couldn’t really integrate with the students because I felt like I’m missing out and I’m not like, relating to them. So, I kept away from young people, from like the students who are going to university and everything.’

It is strongly implied that Zee avoided young people in education because they symbolise the liminality that she experienced; being denied the opportunity to participate in an activity that is normal for a young person her age. Idris, the only participant to have secured a job, encountered similar limitations when searching for employment. Idris was highly motivated to find work and is representative of findings from Phillimore and Goodson’s (2006)

research, which showed that ‘the majority of ASRs are motivated to locate employment.

‘I went interviews, like; I went everywhere in Leeds. I didn’t leave anywhere. I travelled by train and coach just to do interviews to get a job’ (Idris).

Although Idris spoke English well, other factors hindered his prospect of obtaining employment.

‘Some people did appreciate my skills, but they were hesitant to take a risk that how real is that in CV that they’re seeing. So, because I haven’t worked in the UK, they can’t investigate what’s real and what’s not, you know, the referencing....’

Idris’ difficulties illustrate the argument that liminality persists even after RSD. Bagelman (2013) notes that, after RSD, refugees soon discover that ‘waiting’ remains an aspect of everyday life. Asylum-seekers are not allowed to work, which results in a lack of UK work experience when status is granted. They usually arrive in the UK without documentation regarding their qualifications and work experience, such as an employer’s reference. This makes it difficult for employers to assess their suitability for the roles they apply for (Phillimore and Goodson, 2006) as per Idris’ experience, which lowers their prospect of gaining employment, especially employment that suits their skills and qualifications.

In contrast to the majority of the literature, that period of waiting was presented by Emran as invaluable. Despite experiencing some aspects of liminality as mentioned above, he did not view the period waiting for RSD as limiting. For him, it was an opportunity that should be utilised to find one’s bearings, recover from traumatic experiences, spend time with family, and restore the sense of feeling like a human being. He states:

‘I think it’s better not to work in this period till you get approval... So, I have this time, utilise this time to upgrade my skills, maybe get more education, maybe relax, spend more time with the family. Because if you think about it, most of the people coming to this part of the world, asylum-seekers, are not coming from a stress-free environment. They coming from a very tough place. It doesn’t have to be money or lifestyle, not maybe like me, I was having a great lifestyle in *****, but my mind was just gonna blow up of not seeing humanity and equality. So, a lot of people come here because they feel they are not human anymore.... So, this time, till I get the approval, I think I should utilise it, again, getting to know the people, getting to know the culture, getting some basic courses and

training because obviously the work, the system will be a little bit different than where I come from or where the persons come from. So, if you are asking me if it's ok not to work until I get my approval? I say it's brilliant, it's good. It's good for me, my health, my family. I spend more time with my family, doing what I really like; maybe study because you know and everybody in this world knows, the moment you start your life, which is getting a job, you not gonna get time for education, you hardly ever get time to do something you like.'

Of the few theorists that offer waiting in a less negative light, Emran's perspective of his time spent waiting supports Bagelman's acknowledgement that 'waiting is not a static experience of being held still; supposedly, it can be productive, active; and infused with value' (Bagelman 2013, p. 55). Findings from Phillimore and Goodson's (2006, p. 1729) research also found that the period of waiting gave participants time to cope with the culture shock and traumas of losing both loved ones and material goods in their country of origin.

Sanctuary as Safety, Trust and Being Understood.

The idea of sanctuary was presented as a place or space of togetherness in which the participants are comfortable and felt safe. It includes having people from diverse backgrounds with opportunities for integration; and importantly, consisting of people they can trust. Aside from meeting basic needs, it is somewhere from which adequate guidance is offered to offset the feeling of being "lost" (Idris); and where language barriers are easily overcome so that people are understood. The participants' notion of sanctuary is akin to Rotter's depiction of sanctuary spaces as 'a setting within which social ties could be reconstituted', where 'trust' and 'acceptance' are 're-established', and concrete protection secured" (Rotter, 2010, p. 42).

It is not surprising that trust is a criterion of sanctuary from the perspectives of participants as it often appears as a central theme within refugee studies (Hynes, 2009). Mistrust may have stemmed from the circumstances under which they flee their country of origin and it is reasonable to assume that trust is an aspect of 'concrete protection and security' for the participants, in accordance with Rotter's (2010) depiction. Findings by Hynes shows that, regardless of nationality, ASRs experienced feelings of being mistrusted or disbelieved during the asylum process. So, from the point of arrival, asylum-seekers were unsure of who they could trust. The public's fear and mistrust of these groups

also increases levels of discrimination and prejudice. Trust within migrants' communities, from the perspective of Colson (2003) relies on 'reciprocity' between ASRs and their host country, based around a shared future, and according to Carey-wood et al. (1995), refugees need 'stable accommodation and gainful employment' within which to rebuild their lives, and ultimately, trust. However, within the process of dispersal, there is little or no space to re-establish trusting relationships within political, institutional or social realms; this in turn negatively affects the resettlement process once status is determined (Hynes, 2009).

Guidance during the asylum process and after RSD featured as a fundamental aspect of sanctuary; of which, language is a prominent feature. When asked what constitutes sanctuary, Emran states:

'the language thing, it's a big barrier, you know. That's the most important thing. If I understand what you need, that's it; then I can find a solution. [So], enough people who talk different languages because you need to understand the language.'

This is important because newly arriving asylum-seekers typically have no geographical knowledge of the areas they are dispersed to, nor of the services available. Being understood ensures that ASRs get "all the correct information, [and importantly] that they understand the information" and can proceed while feeling "happy [and] satisfied" (Emran). The onus on learning the language is usually placed on ASRs as a means by which they can integrate into society. This, however, takes time. Emran points out that the need to be understood is crucial as a newly arrived asylum-seeker. He suggests that service providers take some responsibility for overcoming the language barrier by having people who can understand the native languages of asylum-seeker:

'there should be people who know the language... because sometimes I feel, people are not misguided, but because they don't understand the language" some people "give up" without getting the information that they needed. So, having people who can understand. I don't know how easy it's gonna be but if you see the nationalities of asylum-seekers in the UK, I mean, it's not like every other day there is.... a new nationality. It's the same you know.'

Emran's explanation suggests that some ASRs get frustrated with their inability to communicate, particularly with service providers. Language then is essential as both a feature of ASRs experiences and as a coping strategy. Aside from being a practical skill, it is a mode of expression that makes contact between local people and ASRs easier and

which is viewed as both a structural and agency factor within the resettlement process. It is considered to be structural on the basis that ASRs are expected to learn the language ‘just because’ the host society requests it; with English language attainment being one of the Home Office’s high-level integration indicators, which Phillimore and Goodson (2008) argue, emphasise assimilation into the host community. On the other hand, learning the language because it fulfils a purpose as identified by ASRs makes it an act of agency (Healey, 2006, p. 263-264) and Stewart (2011), suggest that language support should be one of the suitability factors that the Home Office considers as part of the dispersal process. Language is also a barrier to employment and social interaction which contributes to social isolation and adds to the experience of being in limbo (Healey, 2006). Healey further argues that ‘language is crucial to ‘fitting in’ and that it adds to the feeling of being accepted in the new environment (Healey, 2006, p. 269). As all participants spoke good English, this may be one of the reasons why they feel such a sense of belonging as they are able to fit into the local community through their ability to effectively communicate in the local language.

Local context

All the participants found Huddersfield to be a welcoming and friendly town. The local people were described as “friendly and helpful” with welcoming smiles. Huddersfield is a space within which they feel safe, comfortable and relaxed; and it is appreciated for its diversity and multiculturalism. It provides a sense of being “home” (Emran) and the overall perception is that there is scope to achieve a more fulfilled life than in their country of origin. Emran states,

‘All the people I’ve met, especially people from my own community, who have been here from, like after their asylum is approved, I can see literally all are having jobs they wanted, they’re all living a good life... So, when I see people I [believe] I can do much better [than in country of origin] because where I come from its suddenly different... seeing this very comfortable, the simplicity of people, the honesty; it makes me feel welcomed and definitely makes me feel that I can move on and live a better life.’

Huddersfield also provides amenities such as shops and places of worship that meet the needs of the participants. However, they report that information around available support is usually not forthcoming. What they have identified as lacking is: ‘Someone to give info and to guide. That’s really important... [and] something which is missing’ (Idris). This

supports the literature which observes that areas such as London, where asylum-seekers are dispersed from, have established organisations and community groups to better facilitate and support ASRs (Zetter et al., 2005; Stewart, 2011). Although Idris acknowledged that some support was available, he felt that there was lack of guidance in accessing the available support.

However, what the literature sparsely mentions are the positives that many of these smaller areas contribute to the experience of ASRs. Two recurring features of Huddersfield that add to the participants’ sense of welcome are its lack of “rush” and participants not having experienced any incidents of racism. Zee states:

‘Four years living here, and I never experienced any sort of racism or anything in Huddersfield. But I’ve been to Liverpool, and I went to Manchester, just for a few hours, and I’ve already faced like, a few incidents that happened... So, in that sense, I think Huddersfield is really great for not doing those kinds of things.’

Emran further added:

‘If you talk about good or bad or racism, all this is all over the world, but I haven’t faced anything yet, [in] all my experience in the UK.’

Despite these positive experiences, Huddersfield does not escape from incidences of racial discrimination. The high-profile case that made national news of a Syrian schoolboy being ‘bullied’, (Parveen, 2018) can somewhat attest to this. However, the participants did not feel that they had experienced any racism. This may be because, based on its history of migration and of offering refuge, Huddersfield is possibly an ‘including area’ as per Aspinall and Watters’ (2010) typology of ‘including’ and ‘excluding’ areas as discussed in the literature review.

Huddersfield as an un-hurried environment occurred across all three interviews, with all participants stating that the possible reason why Huddersfield feels so welcoming is because it does not have the ‘rush’ that is often associated with life in the bigger cities.

‘I’ve been to London, Manchester, Leeds. I feel that in Huddersfield you are more welcomed. Maybe it’s a less busy place, you know. Like in London, you feel people are more busy, and everybody is just busy in their own lives, and everybody is in a hurry. But here, you feel home. You feel people are relaxed. When you get into a bus, you ask the driver, I’m going to this place? You will spend time with the driver and ask him

questions, and he's gonna answer. Everybody is cool and relaxed; nobody is in a hurry' (Emran).

'it's not too much rush'(Zee).

'I don't wanna be in London, in between this crowd and all that rush, you know, instead of being in a small town where it is more quieter and you have more calmer people' (Idris).

The 'lack of rush' seems to symbolise that local people have more time for daily interactions, which possibly heightens ASRs feelings of being welcome and adds to their sense of belonging.

City of Sanctuary

Despite providing such a clear description of sanctuary, the participants had little to no knowledge of the CoS movement. As such, the impact of the movement as perceived by the participants could not be explored. The participant's perception is that there is a lack of understanding in general by local people towards the struggles that they may have faced, both in their country of origin and here in the UK. They expressed that this lack of understanding was due to a lack of knowledge on the part of local people, which arguably challenges the effectiveness of Sanctuary Kirklees in raising awareness and telling the truth about ASRs experiences in an attempt to influence the views of local people to see the town's identity as a place of safety for ASRs.

'I think people in Huddersfield not really know the circumstances of refugees because me and my family have been engaging in this fund raising-project with *****, of course, the clients are not people who are involved with refugees. So, whenever we go to them, when we tell them about ourselves and our situation, about the process, I think they are shocked. Like, they didn't know these things happening to refugees. Everyone is the same, there is no one person who says, yeah, I know that. Oh Yes, I know this happening. They are like, oh, really? Is this what's happening? Is this how it goes? So, I think people are not aware...' (Zee).

Idris also explained that:

'...nobody understands. Only few who deals, who met someone who is going through this route, they might, but not everyone...'

Alternatively, this lack of understanding may be argued to be a good thing, as despite not having knowledge of ASRs' traumatic experiences and the disadvantages that they often face, the experience of the interviewees suggests that local people simply treat them as they would

anyone else, therefore contributing to the good experience that they have so far enjoyed.

The participants' lack of knowledge about the CoS movement also raises questions about Sanctuary Kirklees effectiveness in establishing a network of organisations that are proud to identify with the movement aims, especially because the organisation where the participants were recruited is indeed a member of their network. What this brings to mind is a hypothesis by Darling and Squire, that the CoS 'represents little more than a collective of organisations and individuals who promote the values of hospitality but who do not effectively practice sanctuary' (Darling and Squire, 2012, p. 196). If this is the case within Huddersfield, an area described as welcoming and friendly where ASRs feels safe, comfortable and relaxed, the importance of practicing the sanctuary code is also brought into question. Nonetheless, without concrete supporting data, it is not reasonable to assume that Sanctuary Kirklees does not directly or indirectly affect local peoples' attitudes towards ASRs despite the former's lack of knowledge and understanding about the traumatic experiences that ASRs may have experienced. So, although this finding is not enough to adequately support Darling and Squire's suggestion about the CoS movement, it adds to the existing literature and edges closer the prospect of drawing a conclusion about the CoS' impact and effectiveness.

Conclusion

The research revealed that despite the adverse effects associated with dispersal, it is not always perceived negatively by ASRs. The participants, who did not view dispersal as disadvantageous, believed that the Home Office's decision to disperse, and the area chosen, were aligned with their best interests. They were therefore willing to start from wherever they were sent. That they held this belief prior to dispersal suggests that they also have some level of confidence in the Home Office's dispersal decision and asylum system. Despite some of the negatives they face due to the culture of hostility created by asylum policies and media portrayal, ASRs are grateful for refuge in the UK and the support they receive as part of the asylum process. As smaller dispersal areas hold the potential for positive integration experiences for ASRs, the Home Office needs stricter adherence to the suitability factors recommended by Stewart and Mulvey (2013), when dispersal decisions are made, to increase the potential for a positive integration experience.

Liminality emerged as one aspect of the asylum process that adversely impacts both the present and future prospects of ASRs' ability to settle into their community and plan for their future. There is evidence to suggest that the period of waiting offers some asylum-seekers the opportunity to recover from the traumatic events experienced in their country of origin and that it provides space to familiarise themselves with the culture and custom of their new country. However, the data, backed by literature, provides a strong argument that the liminality associated with the period of waiting for RSD has a mostly negative impact on the experience of ASRs. It infiltrates every aspect of life for ASRs; impacting the ease of which they can get things done. It also affects relationship development, educational attainment and adds to the difficulties in securing employment once status is granted. There is a perceived lack of guidance throughout and beyond the asylum process, and frustration and misunderstandings can arise due to the language barriers. This suggests that more professionally provided guidance and support during the asylum process, and allowing for a greater understanding of "what's next" after RSD, is needed in small dispersal areas with less organised support systems than in London and the South East.

The participants ideal of sanctuary is profound, comprising not just the mere feeling of safety. It includes the sense of being understood and the feeling of being in the company of trustworthy individuals, which is hypothesised to represent the notion of concrete protection and security; an ideal of sanctuary contrary to the feeling that the asylum system produces. The demographic characteristics of the local area also matters to ASRs. Although it does not shield them from experiencing the negatives of the asylum system, areas that are multicultural, relaxed and 'simple', with 'less rush' compared to bigger cities such as London, offer opportunities to build relationships and may enhance the ASRs feelings of being welcome and belonging. The research was unable to ascertain whether or not ASRs believe Huddersfield, as a 'town of sanctuary', added to their mostly positive experience as they had little to no knowledge of the movement. However, their belief that local people do not understand their plights challenges the effectiveness of Sanctuary Kirklees in educating local people to understand the injustices ASRs face and in motivating them to support and defend them. Questions are also raised around the importance of practising the sanctuary codes in areas such as Huddersfield where the experiences of the participants suggest that local peoples' behaviour and attitudes are somewhat subconsciously in alignment with the CoS principles. However, if

Sanctuary Kirklees is to achieve its aims, then it needs to be more visible, both to ASRs and the local community, as it is very difficult to support an initiative if you do not have knowledge of its existence. With that said, as the CoS targets are local people, who were not sampled in this research, future studies examining their knowledge and understanding of the movement, both here in Huddersfield and across the UK, would shed more light on the effectiveness of the CoS movement in achieving its aims. A particular area of focus might be in altering the views of local people across the UK, and in ascertaining the practical ways in which the movement impacts the experiences and daily life of ASRs. More research is also recommended which foregrounds the voices of ASRs, to build on this research in understanding ASR's experiences, in terms of the local context.

References

- Ager, A., & Strang, A. (2004). *Indicators of integration: Final report*. Retrieved from <https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110218141321/http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/04/dpr28.pdf>
- Aspinall, P., & Watters, C. (2010). *Refugees and asylum seekers: A review from an equality and human rights perspective*. Retrieved from <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/research-report-52-refugees-and-asylum-seeker-research.pdf>.
- Bagelman, J. (2012). *City of sanctuary: A state of deferral* (PhD Thesis). The Open University: Milton Keynes.
- Bagelman, J. (2013). Sanctuary: A politics of ease?. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 38(1), pp. 49-62. doi:10.1177/0304375412469314
- Bauder, H. (2016). Sanctuary cities: Policies and practices in international perspective. *International Migration*, 55 (2), pp. 174-187. doi:10.1111/imig.12308
- Bloch, A., & Schuster, L. (2005). At the extremes of exclusion: Deportation, detention, and dispersal. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28 (3), pp. 491-512. doi:10.1080/0141987042000337858
- Bloch, A. (2000). Refugee settlement in Britain: The impact of policy on participation. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 26 (1), pp. 75-88. doi:10.1080/136918300115651
- Block, K., Riggs, E., & Haslam, N. (2013). Ethics in research with refugees and asylum seekers:

- Processes, power and politics. In K. Block, E. Riggs, & N. Haslam (Eds.) *Values and vulnerabilities: The ethics of research with refugees and asylum seekers* (pp. 3-19). Australia: Australia Academic Press.
- Boswell, C. (2003). Burden-sharing in the European Union: Lessons from the German and UK experience. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 16 (3), 316-335. Retrieved from <https://doi-org.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/10.1093/jrs/16.3.316>.
- Brink, H.I.L. (1993). Validity and reliability in qualitative research. *Curationis*, 16 (2), 35-38. doi:10.4102/curationis. v16i2.1396.
- British Educational Research Association (BERA). (2018). *Ethical guidelines for educational research*. (4th ed.) Retrieved from https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/BERA-Ethical-Guidelines-for-Educational-Research_4thEdn_2018.pdf?noredirect=1
- Burrige, A. (2017). *Reporting to the Home Office: exploring connections to detention and solidarity*. Retrieved from <https://righttoremain.org.uk/reporting-to-the-home-office-exploring-connections-to-detention-and-solidarity/>
- Carey-Wood, J., Duke, K., Karn, V., & Marshall, T. (1995). *The settlement of refugees in Britain* (Home Office Research and Planning Unit report). London: HMSO.
- City of Sanctuary. (2018a). *About*. Retrieved from <https://cityofsanctuary.org/>
- City of Sanctuary. (2018b). *Sanctuary Kirklees*. Retrieved from <https://kirklees.cityofsanctuary.org/>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Colson, E. (2003). Forced migration and the anthropological response. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 16 (1), 1-18. doi:10.1093/jrs/16.1.1.
- Darling, J., & Squire, V. (2012). Everyday enactments of sanctuary: the UK City of Sanctuary movement. In R. K. Lippert & S. Rehaag (Eds.) *Sanctuary practices in international perspectives: Migration, citizenship and social movement* (pp. 191-204). London: Routledge.
- Darling, J. (2010). A city of sanctuary: The relational re-imagining of Sheffield's asylum politics. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* New Series, 35(1), pp. 125-140. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/stable/40647292>
- Darling, J. (2017). Forced migration and the city: Irregularity, informality, and the politics of presence. *Progress in Human Geography*, 41 (2), pp. 178-198. doi:10.1177/0309132516629004
- Darling, J., Barnett, C., & Eldridge, S. (2010). City of Sanctuary - a UK initiative for hospitality. *Forced Migration Review*, 46 (34). Retrieved from <https://www.fmreview.org/urban-displacement/darling-barnet-eldridge>
- Denscombe, M. (2010). *The good research guide* (4th ed.). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Economic and Social Research Council. (2015). *ESRC Framework for research ethics*. Retrieved from <https://esrc.ukri.org/files/funding/guidance-for-applicants/esrc-framework-for-research-ethics-2015/>.
- European Commission Directorate-General for Research and Innovation. (2020). *Guidance note — Research on refugees, asylum seekers & migrants*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/other/hi/guide_research-refugees-migrants_en.pdf.
- Feeney, A. (2000). Refugee employment. *Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Unit*, 15 (4), pp. 343-349. doi:10.1080/026909400750068086.
- GOV.UK (2018). *Guide to the General Data Protection Regulation*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guide-to-the-general-data-protection-regulation>
- Healey, R. (2006). Asylum-Seekers and refugees: A structuration theory analysis of their experiences in the UK. *Population, Space and Place*, 12 (4), pp. 257-271. doi:10.1002/psp.412.
- House of Commons Library (2016). *Policy on the dispersal of asylum seekers*. Retrieved from <https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/Research/Briefing/Summary/CDP-2016-0095>
- Huddersfield Local History Society. (nd). *Migrations*. Retrieved from

<http://www.huddersfieldhistory.org.uk/huddersfields-history/migrations/>

Hynes, P. (2009). Contemporary compulsory dispersal and the absence of space for the restoration of trust. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 22 (1), pp. 97-122. doi:10.1093/jrs/fen049.

Hynes, P. (2011). *The dispersal and social exclusion of asylum seekers: Between liminality and belonging*. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/HUD/detail.action?docID=688531>

Hynes, T. (2003). *The issue of 'trust' or 'mistrust' in research with refugees: Choices, caveats and considerations for researchers*. Retrieved from <https://www.unhcr.org/3fcb5cee1.pdf>

Johl, S. K., & Renganathan, S. (2010). Strategies for gaining access in doing fieldwork: Reflection of two researchers. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 8(1), pp. 42-50. Retrieved from <https://search-proquest-com.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/docview/856419413?accountid=11526>

Kissoon, P. (2006). Home/lessness as an indicator of integration: interviewing refugees about the meaning of home and accommodation. In B. Temple & R. Moran (Eds.) *Doing research with refugees* (pp. 75-96). Bristol: The Policy Press.

Koser, K. (2001). New approaches to asylum?. *International Migration*, 39 (6), pp. 85-102. doi: 10.1111/1468-2435.00180

Lewis, H., Craig, G., Adamson, S., & Wilkinson, M. (2008). *Refugees, asylum seekers and migrants in Yorkshire and Humber, 1999 - 2008: A review of literature for Yorkshire Futures*. Leeds: Yorkshire Futures.

Migration Yorkshire. (2018). *Kirklees: Local Migration Profile, June 2018*. Retrieved from <https://www.migrationyorkshire.org.uk/userfiles/attachments/pages/664/kirkleesImp-summary-jun2018.pdf>

Miller, M., Chan, C.D., & Farmer, L.B. (2018). Interpretative phenomenological analysis: A contemporary qualitative approach. *Counsellor Education and Supervision*, 57 (4), doi:10.1002/ceas.12114.

Neill, K. (2016). *Refugees and asylum seekers*. Retrieved from <https://www.calderdale.gov.uk/v2/residents/health-and-social-care/joint-strategic-needs-assessment/inequalities/refugees-and-asylum>.

th-and-social-care/joint-strategic-needs-assessment/inequalities/refugees-and-asylum.

O'Reilly, Z. (2018). Living liminality': Everyday experiences of asylum seekers in the 'Direct Provision' system in Ireland. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 25 (6), pp. 821-842. doi: 10.1080/0966369X.2018.1473345.

Parveen, N. (2018, December 5). Syrian schoolboy 'suffered years of abuse' in Huddersfield school. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2018/dec/05/syrian-schoolboy-allegedly-suffered-years-of-abuse-in-huddersfield-school>.

Phillimore, J. & Goodson, L. (2006). Problem or opportunity? Asylum seekers, refugees, employment and social exclusion in deprived urban areas. *Urban Studies*, 43 (10), pp. 1715-1736. doi: 10.1080=00420980600838606.

Phillimore, J., & Goodson, L. (2008). Making a place in the global city: The relevance of indicators of integration. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21 (3), pp. 305-325. doi:10.1093/jrs/fen025.

Platts-Fowler, D., & Robinson, D. (2015). A place for integration: refugee experience in two English Cities. *Population, Space and Place*, 21 (5), pp. 476-491. doi:10.1002/psp.1928.

Rebelo, D.S., Jose, M., Mercedes, F., & Joseba, A. (2018). Mistrust, anger, and hostility in refugees, asylum seekers, and immigrants: A systematic review. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, 59 (3), pp. 239-251. doi:10.1037/cap0000131

Refugee Council. (2018a). *Top 20 facts about refugees and people seeking asylum*. Retrieved from <https://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/topfacts>

Refugee Council. (2018b). *Asylum support*. Retrieved from https://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/assets/0004/4618/Asylum_Support_Nov_2018.pdf.

Robin. (2010). *Huddersfield Town of Sanctuary launch*. Retrieved from <https://kirklees.cityofsanctuary.org/2010/07/13/huddersfield-town-of-sanctuary-launch>

Robinson, V., Anderson, R., & Mustred, S. (Eds.) (2003). *Spreading the Burden? European Policies to Disperse Asylum Seekers*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Rotter, R. (2010). *'Hanging in-between': Experiences of waiting among asylum seekers living in Glasgow*.

Retrieved from
<https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1842/5839/Rotter2010.pdf?seque>.

Sales, R. (2002). The deserving and the undeserving? Refugees, asylum seekers and welfare in Britain. *Critical Social Policy*, 22 (3), pp. 456–478. Retrieved from
<https://doi.org/10.1177/026101830202200305>

Sapin, K. (2013). *Essential skills for youth work practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Sheeka, F. (2018). *World Refugee Day 2018: How does the British public feel about refugees?*. Retrieved from
<https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/articles-reports/2018/06/20/world-refugee-day-2018-how-does-british-public-fee>.

Shelter Legal. (2019). *Dispersal*. Retrieved from
https://england.shelter.org.uk/legal/housing_options/asylum_seekers/UK_border_agency/dispersal

Shelter Legal. (2019b). *Challenging UKVI decisions*. Retrieved from
https://england.shelter.org.uk/legal/housing_options/asylum_seekers/challenging_UK_border_agency_decisions

Squire, V. & Begelman, J. (2012). Taking not waiting: space, temporality and politics in the City of Sanctuary movement. In P. Nyers & K. Rygiel (Eds.) *Citizenship, Migrant Activism and the Politics of Movement* (pp. 146-164). London: Routledge.

Squire, V. & Darling, J. (2013). The "minor" politics of rightful presence: Justice and relationality in City of Sanctuary. *International Political Sociology*, 7 (1), pp. 59-74.
 doi:10.1111/ips.12009

Squire, V. (2011). From community cohesion to mobile solidarities: The City of Sanctuary Network and the Strangers into Citizens campaign. *Political Studies*, 59 (2), 290-307. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9248.2010.00865.x.

Stevenson, J. & Willott, J. (nd). *Standing on the threshold: negotiating insider and outsider status in cross-cultural research*. Retrieved from
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/163943.doc>.

Stewart, E. & Mulvey, G. (2013). Seeking safety beyond refuge: The impact of immigration and citizenship policy upon refugees in the uk. *Journal*

of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 40 (7), pp. 1023-1039. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2013.836960.

Stewart, E. (2011). UK dispersal policy and onward migration: Mapping the current state of knowledge. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 25 (1), 25-49. doi:10.1093/jrs/fer039.

Taylor, A. (2015). Using interpretative phenomenological analysis in a mixed methods research design to explore music in the lives of mature amateur keyboard players. *Music Education Research*, 17 (4), pp. 437-452.
 doi:10.1080/14613808.2014.906397.

Temple, B. & Moran, R. (Eds.) (2006). *Doing research with refugees: Issues and guidelines*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Travis, A. (2005, December 23). Dispersal of asylum seekers creating ghettos in deprived areas, says Home Office report. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from
<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2005/dec/23/asylum.immigrationasylumandrefugees>

Tuckman, B. W. (1972). *Conducting educational research*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Zetter, R., Griffiths, D., & Sigona, N. (2005). Social capital or social exclusion? The impact of asylum-seeker dispersal on UK refugee community organisations. *Community Development Journal*, 40 (2), pp. 169-181. doi: 10.1093/cdj/bsi025.