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Executive Summary

Evidence is key to informing good policy and practice. Sources of evidence can vary. It can be from evaluation of the impact of work and projects, academic research or recording of practice and experience within organisations.

This report aims to provide a base for understanding the existing evidence on refugee integration in Scotland. It identifies available evidence to help inform policy makers and people working to support refugees and asylum seekers in Scotland.

Evaluation of the quality and content of individual evidence sources was not part of this project. This project provides an overall understanding of the evidence sources identified in terms of their date of publication, geographical scope, research methods and funding.

Key Findings:
- 174 sources of evidence relating to refugee integration have been identified.
- The majority of these evidence sources use mixed research methods (42%) or qualitative research methods (29%).
- A significant amount of research was commissioned by the Refugee Council (25 sources) and the Scottish Refugee Council (19 sources).
- There are some evidence gaps in certain areas. For example, there is very little evidence on the integration of older refugees and asylum seekers (1 piece of evidence identified).
- Some of the most holistic sources of evidence come from long-running integration programmes such as The Holistic Integration Service. These also offer insight over a longer time period, rather than a snapshot at the end of a short term project or through a time-specific survey.
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Introduction

Policy Background

The UK is a signatory to the 1951 UN Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (Refugee Convention) and the supporting 1967 Protocol. The UK has international legal obligations to recognise, and offer a place of safety to, people who are in the UK and meet the definition of a refugee set out in the convention.

Under current constitutional arrangements in the UK, asylum is reserved to the UK Government and handled by the Home Office. This includes policy on asylum; the process of considering applications for asylum; the provision of asylum support and accommodation; and the operation of refugee resettlement programmes.

Many of the services which are essential to supporting refugees and asylum seekers to settle into communities are devolved and are the responsibility of the Scottish Government and Scottish local authorities. This includes health, education, legal services (including legal aid) and housing (excluding asylum accommodation).

Scotland has a clear policy of supporting integration for refugees and asylum seekers from day one of arrival. This policy was articulated in the first New Scots refugee integration strategy, which ran from 2014-17. The second New Scots strategy was published in January 2018 and runs until 2022. It is available on the Scottish Government website: http://gov.scot/newscotsstrategy

The New Scots refugee integration strategy sees integration as a long-term, two-way process, involving positive change in both individuals and host communities, which leads to cohesive, diverse communities.

The New Scots approach has been developed and led in partnership by the Scottish Government, COSLA and the Scottish Refugee Council. The development and implementation of both New Scots strategies has involved a wide range of partners from public services, charities, third sector organisations and community groups, as well as refugees and people seeking asylum.

The timeline below indicates some key UK policy changes which will have impacted refugees, asylum seekers or service providers in Scotland over the time period considered by this report. Asylum is a complex policy area, and this is not a comprehensive overview. However, it gives an indication of the changing context within which refugee integration has been taking place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td><strong>Immigration and Asylum Act 1999</strong> - commences the policy of asylum dispersal. (Glasgow has been the only asylum dispersal area in Scotland since this policy began.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Dublin II Regulation EC No 343/2003 established the criteria and mechanisms for determining the EU Member State responsible for examining an asylum application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td><strong>Gateway Protection Programme launched</strong> (the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002 provided the legal basis for this refugee resettlement programme).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Change to settlement application policy - grant of five years' limited leave rather than indefinite leave to remain (settlement) for successful asylum applicants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>UK Borders Act 2007 - Asylum seekers are eligible for in-country support while an appeal is pending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Asylum seekers whose application has been awaiting an initial decision for more than a year can apply for permission to work (in a shortage occupation role).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Commercial and Operational Managers Procuring Asylum Support Services (COMPASS) contracts commence - this replaced a previous system of 22 separate contracts for provision of asylum accommodation and support. Serco becomes the COMPASS contract holder for Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td><strong>UK Syrian Resettlement Programme</strong> - commitment to resettle 20,000 refugees to the UK by 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study Aims and Objectives**

The aim of this study was to identify sources of evidence which can inform work in Scotland to support refugee integration in the context of the New Scots refugee integration strategy.

The study set out to consider the shape, character and format of the evidence identified. It does not undertake a systematic evaluation of the quality or content of any evidence identified. It focuses on providing an oversight of the character of evidence available based on theme, date of publication and the generators of research (funders, academia and project deliverers).
Methodology

Identifying Evidence
This report is the outcome of a 12 week project. This was primarily desk-based research (not producing its own data or evidence but reviewing the existing data or evidence).

The research has looked at academic journals, sector publications and also made use of the networks established within Scotland’s refugee and asylum support sector, particularly through the New Scots refugee integration strategy, to identify relevant sources.

There may be other evidence which has not been captured through this research. This could be due to the small scale of some projects or the means of publication and sharing of evidence, which in combination with the short time frame of this project made it more difficult to be discovered by the researcher. As a result, the evidence collected represents information which is relatively easy to access.

Evidence Identified
Evidence was considered to be anything which reports on the experience of refugees and asylum seekers, or evaluates projects, programmes and policies which support them. In this way both qualitative and quantitative evidence was considered, as well as allowing for some policy documents or briefings which use examples and evidence to explain their position and can therefore inform practice.

This project did not have the possibility to evaluate the quality of any evidence presented in the bank, thus this report cannot make any claim on the quality, reliability or trustworthiness of the evidence included.

174 sources of evidence were identified. These sources of evidence are set out as an annex to this report.

The Geographical scope
The main focus of the project was on refugee integration in Scotland, so sources which specifically look at Scotland were prioritised. As asylum policy is reserved to the UK Government, UK focused evidence which presents evidence on Scotland was also included.

A limited number of highly relevant EU research or policy documents which include reference to the UK were identified by the project. These are excluded from the findings chapter analysis but are referenced in the Annex.

The project focused on Scotland and has therefore included all evidence identified which relates to Scotland. While it also includes sources which were about integration in the UK overall, any sources which were about specific areas in the UK, and don’t present any specific evidence relating to Scotland, have been excluded. All evidence sources are included as an Annex to this report, grouped in the relevant categories referred to above and explained below.
The time period of the research
The project focused on documents published since 2000. This date was chosen because this was when asylum dispersal was introduced through the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999. It is also post-devolution, so reflects a reserved policy in a devolved context.

A group of literature reviews have been included, in relevant categories, some of which include reference to research conducted before 2000. These are included in the Annex to enable referral to previous research evidence over a longer period which was not considered directly within this project. The literature reviews themselves were published within the time period of this research.

Categories
The approach to categorising the evidence for this study began with the themes of the New Scots refugee integration strategy. One of the seven themes in the New Scots refugee integration strategy, “Needs of Asylum Seekers”, has not been used as a category because this study aligns with the New Scots approach of integration from day one, and because evidence sources often do not differentiate between refugees and asylum seekers. The remaining six themes are presented as the main focus in this report.

It was recognised that there would also be evidence which covered more than one theme. When this occurred, if it was focused predominantly on one theme, it was categorised under that theme. When it covered two themes equally or covered multiple themes, with no dominate theme, it has been categorised as “integration as a whole”.

As the process of searching for evidence progressed, more and more evidence was found which had a specific focus that did not fit closely with the existing themes and seemed better to have its own categories. This included evidence which had a specific focus on people based on a particular protected characteristic and distinct policies like family reunion. These categories are also referred to in this report and presented in the Annex. Some of the additional categories have a low number of evidence sources (under 5) which are not considered in detail in this report. This group includes: women refugees (4 records), LGBTI refugees (1 record), older refugees (1 record), disabled refugees (3 records) and media (3 records).

The six themes in the New Scots strategy used in this report and presented in the Annex are:
- Employability and welfare rights
- Housing
- Education
- Language
- Health and wellbeing
- Communities, culture and social connection

Additional categories in the report and presented in the Annex:
- Children and family reunion
- Strategy and policy documents

- Integration as a whole (covering multiple themes)
- LGBTI refugees
- Media
- Migration statistics (Home office statistics)
- Older refugees
- Disabled refugees
- Women refugees

**Quantitative research:**
Quantitative research explains phenomena by collecting numerical data that are analysed using mathematically based methods (in particular statistics) \(^1\). This type of research usually uses a large sample of participants, records or evidence which can be quantified and counted. It is used to answer questions such as ‘how many?’ and ‘how often?’.

**Qualitative research:**
Qualitative research uses non-numerical data and refers to the meanings, concepts definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols, and description of things, and not to their counts or measures. \(^2\) This type of research tends to focus on a smaller number of participants but can provide much deeper understanding of the question or situation. Qualitative research tends to use interviews, focus groups, workshops, art-based research and other methods which cannot be directly quantified and counted. It often enables more context to be provided which offers a strong narrative and explanation of what people have experienced and factors which have impacted this. It helps to answer ‘why?’ or ‘how?’.

**Mixed methods research:**
Mixed methods research refers to that which uses both quantitative and qualitative methods. Mixed methods are often used to enable more in depth exploration of the reasons for statistical trends by capturing lived experience or service delivery perspectives alongside the quantitative research.

---

2 Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2012). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences, Boston, Pearson
Findings

In this chapter, the shape, character and format of the evidence identified is described. This is not a systematic evaluation of the content or quality of any evidence identified. The focus is on providing an oversight of the character of the evidence available based on themes, date of publication and the source.

When was the evidence recorded or produced?

174 evidence sources have been identified which were published between 2000 and 2018.

As Chart 1 and Table 1 show, evidence publishing peaked in 2010 but then fell sharply to levels similar to previous years. A clear explanation for this peak has not been identified. It may demonstrate research which had been conducted in earlier years being published in 2010. This could happen due to alignment of commissioning of research and the time taken for publication.

Despite an expectation of a significant rise in the amount of research conducted after 2015 (the peak of the humanitarian crisis), the number of research and other documents presenting evidence on refugee integration has instead been relatively steady and has only started to increase in 2018. There has been a general consistency in evidence generation since 2013. However, this does not necessarily mean that there has not been an increase in research about refugees and asylum seekers since the humanitarian crisis in 2015. For example in academia, considering the time it would take for a research project to get started, be conducted and published, there could be a number of research projects which have been initiated since the humanitarian crisis in 2015 but have not been published by the time this research was done. It may be that 2010 saw a peak for reasons of funding availability and cycles of research aligning and this may be seen again.

Chart 1: Number of Records based on the date of publication

Table 1: Number of records based on the date of being published

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Evidence sources identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown / Unclear 3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which research methods are used?

As Chart 2 shows, 42% of the evidence sources identified used mixed methods. After that qualitative methods were most common, constituting 29%. Quantitative methods accounted for 20%, 4% were Literature Reviews and the remaining evidence sources identified were policy documents.

The mixed methods evidence identified tends to have only a small scale quantitative element, this combined with the proportion of purely qualitative method research, shows that data evidencing integration in Scotland is a predominantly qualitative method area. One explanation for this could be that while in places like Glasgow the large number of refugees and asylum seekers make quantitative and statistical research possible and scientifically meaningful, in many other communities across Scotland the small number of refugees makes quantitative research, and thus shaping a representative sample, problematic.

It is worth mentioning that available quantitative statistics for refugees in the UK overall are limited. In many cases this is due to the lack of a necessity to record refugee status. Being a refugee is not a protected characteristic in itself so this is not captured or reported as part of equality data. For instance in the case of education, there is no necessity to record whether people who enroll in colleges or universities have refugee status. Schools are not obliged to record or report their pupils’ background in terms of refugee status. This information may only be captured if it is volunteered. This results in the situation that statistical information or evidence does not exist unless it is deliberately recorded in a project or programme.

---

3 These records are not included in chart 1

Chart 2: The frequency of research method used in sources of evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Mixed methods</th>
<th>Quantitative methods</th>
<th>Qualitative methods</th>
<th>Literature review</th>
<th>Policy Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who funded the evidence?
The evidence identified has been funded by a variety of organisations. The full record of sponsors can be found in the annex. It is also worth mentioning that a significant number of evidence records had co-sponsors which means more than one organisation funded the research.

Table 3: The main funders for the sources of evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Office</th>
<th>Scottish Government</th>
<th>Refugee Council</th>
<th>Scottish Refugee Council</th>
<th>British Red Cross</th>
<th>Academia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 3 shows, a significant part of evidence comes from academic work with 30 sources identified, including three PhD dissertations. Academic publications which have been commissioned or acknowledge funding have been excluded from this figure as they are represented in other categories; to better reflect which organisations are generating and enabling access to research.

After academic works, the Refugee Council has supported the most evidence sources with 25 identified, followed by the Scottish Refugee Council with 19. British Red Cross come next with 9 records. The Home Office commissioned or produced 7 documents (this includes migration statistics which are published each quarter). The Scottish Government commissioned or produced 8 documents, this includes two
New Scots strategies. Some of the other organisations generating evidence identified in this research include The Big Lottery Fund (4), COSLA (4) and Oxfam (7).

**Detailed Findings Relating to Main Themes**
Chart 3 illustrates the proportion of evidence identified during the project under each different category (please see the methodology section for more information about the categorisation used).

As Chart 3 shows, 30% of the evidence sources identified consider integration as an overall concept rather than focusing on a single specific theme. A contrast can be seen in the small share dedicated to a certain theme, e.g. education (4%) or housing (3%), compared to this larger share in “Integration as a Whole”. While this shows that there can be a limited number of dedicated evidence sources for some categories, they may feature as part of overall integration evidence and therefore have a broader base of potential evidence available. This is demonstrated in more detail in relation to the main themes later.

The chart demonstrates the interconnectedness of refugee integration being reflected in the evidence available. Evidence sources were more likely to consider multiple themes with few focusing on just one specific theme. The exception is communities, culture and social connections (11%), but this is a particularly broad category. This is likely to be because the needs of refugees, like anyone else, rarely occur in isolation. For example, language can be fundamental to accessing healthcare, employment or education.

**Chart 3: Evidence by Category**

4 Table percentages total 101%, this is due to rounding.

---

4 Table percentages total 101%, this is due to rounding.

**Employment**

As Table 4 and Chart 4 show, most records on employment are part of integrated research records rather than being dedicated to employment. Only 10 records are dedicated to employment, representing 6% of overall evidence. While there are a further 28 records which also present evidence on employment as part of integrated research, or a further 16% of records presenting evidence on employment. This means employment is considered in 32% of evidence identified (38 records).

**Table 4: Quantity of dedicated or integrated records evidencing employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to employment</th>
<th>Employment included in integrated research</th>
<th>Total records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 4: Share of employment evidence**

Table 5 shows the geographic focus of evidence, for both the 10 sources dedicated to employment and those where employment is integrated in broader research.

**Table 5: The number of employment records by geographical scope**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to Employment</th>
<th>Employment included in integrated records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the research method used for both dedicated employment records and those included in integrated records. Most records concerning employment were produced using mixed methods (22). Records produced by using only quantitative methods (7) have almost the same share of records produced by using qualitative methods (6). The relatively strong representation of quantitative methods may be reflective of the nature of work which supports people to access employment.
and requirements to report impact based on the number of people who accessed support and their progress or achievements.

**Table 6: The number of employment records by research method**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Dedicated</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing**

As Table 7 and Chart 5 show, 6 records are dedicated only to housing, representing 3% of overall evidence. While there are 17 integrated records which include information on housing too, representing a further 10% of overall evidence. This makes a total 13% of sources identified which have evidence on housing, but only a small proportion are dedicated to housing with the majority of housing evidence being found alongside other themes.

**Table 7: Quantity of dedicated or integrated records evidencing housing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to housing</th>
<th>Housing included in integrated records</th>
<th>Total records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 5: Share of housing evidence**

Table 8 shows the geographic focus of evidence, for both the 6 sources dedicated to housing and those where housing is integrated in broader research. While the quantity of records evidencing housing is small, of the dedicated sources identified, a higher proportion focus specifically on Scotland than in the integrated records. This may be because housing is so closely tied to physical geography that when it is a dedicated focus of research it is more likely to refer to specific places and that as

housing policy is devolved the most relevant dedicated evidence will be specific to Scotland.

Table 8: The number of housing records regarding the geographical scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to Housing</th>
<th>Housing included in integrated records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows that, as is the general trend across the evidence identified, the majority of records regarding housing is produced by using mixed methods (13 total). Of the dedicated records, all research is mixed methods or qualitative.

Table 9: The number of housing records regarding the research method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Dedicated</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative methods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education

As Table 10 and Chart 6 show, 7 records are dedicated only to education, representing 4% of evidence sources, while there are 19 integrated reports, or a further 11% of total records, which include information on education too. That makes a total 15% of records which include evidence on education.

Table 10: Share of dedicated or integrated records evidencing education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to education</th>
<th>Education included in integrated records</th>
<th>Total records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 shows that four of the sources dedicated to education are focused on Scotland. There is also a high proportion within the integrated records which are focused on Scotland, this may reflect the devolution of education policy to Scotland, resulting in more dedicated research. Where the records look at the UK they may not reflect the devolved context of education in Scotland.

Table 11: The number of education records regarding the geographical scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to Education</th>
<th>Education included in integrated records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows that the majority of evidence on education has been produced by using mixed methods (11) and qualitative methods (7). Evidence produced by quantitative methods accounts for only 5 records.

Table 12: The number of records in education regarding the research method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Dedicated</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative methods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language
As Table 13 and Chart 7 show, 6 records are dedicated only to language, representing 3% of overall evidence. While there are a further 24 integrated records which include information on language too, or a further 14% of records presenting evidence on language. That makes a total 17% of records which include evidence on language (30 records). This indicates that language is most likely to be considered alongside other themes when researched and highlights the important role of language in relation to accessing support services, like healthcare, or pursuing ambitions through education or employment.

Table 13: Share of dedicated or integrated records evidencing language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to language</th>
<th>Language in integrated records</th>
<th>Total records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 7: Share of language evidence

Table 14 shows that the number of evidence sources dedicated to asylum seekers and refugees' language learning in Scotland is not very substantial (3 records) but there are 3 further sources which present evidence on asylum seekers and refugees' language learning within the UK. The fundamental importance of language for integration can be seen in the 24 sources where language is a feature alongside other themes like employment and community. Fifteen of these additional evidence sources are Scotland-specific, indicating strong recognition of the role of language in supporting integration.

Table 14: The number of language records regarding the geographical scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to language</th>
<th>Language included in integrated records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 shows that just over half of evidence relating to language has been produced by using mixed methods (16) while the number of records using qualitative methods (9) and quantitative methods (5) is not substantially different. However, all five of the quantitative sources are in integrated records, while there are five language dedicated qualitative records.

Table 15 The number of language records regarding the research method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Dedicated</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative methods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health and Wellbeing

As Table 16 and Chart 8 show, 15 records are dedicated only to health and wellbeing, representing 9% of overall evidence. There are also 20 integrated reports which include information on health and wellbeing alongside other themes, or a further 11% of overall evidence. This includes evidence relating to refugee and asylum seeker health and wellbeing in relation to poverty and employability. That makes a total of 35 evidence sources, or 20% of total sources identified which include evidence on health and wellbeing.

Table 16: Share of dedicated or integrated records evidencing health and wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to health and wellbeing</th>
<th>Health and wellbeing included in integrated records</th>
<th>Total records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 8: Share of health and wellbeing evidence

As Table 17 shows, among the total number of 35 evidence sources identified concerning the health and wellbeing of refugees, nine of the 15 records dedicated to
health and wellbeing focus on Scotland, compared to just six of the integrated records.

Table 17: The number of health and wellbeing records regarding the geographical scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dedicated to health and wellbeing</th>
<th>Health and wellbeing included in integrated records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 shows that the majority of the evidence relating to health and wellbeing are produced by using mixed methods (17) and qualitative methods (8). Six records out of 35 have used quantitative methods to evidence asylum seekers and refugees’ health and wellbeing.

Table 18: The number of health and wellbeing records regarding the research method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Dedicated</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative methods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communities, Culture and Social Connections**

This is a very broad theme, concerning the relationship between communities and asylum seekers and refugees, as well as opportunities for people to express and share culture and interests. Evidence was included in this category where it was in any way concerned with:

- interaction and connection between asylum seekers and refugees and communities;
- the impact of asylum seekers and refugees on local communities, society and the economy;
- the approaches and views of local communities on asylum seekers and refugees.

The evidence sources in this section include surveys and polling on people’s attitudes on asylum seekers and refugees, as well as reports on activities, events and projects which aim to bring asylum seekers and refugees together with communities. Finally, quantitative or qualitative evaluations on the effects asylum seekers and refugees have on local communities in both the long and short term are also included.

As Table 19 and Chart 9 show, 19 sources are dedicated to community, culture and social connections, representing 11% of overall records. There are an additional 30 integrated reports which include information relating to this theme, or a further 17% of records presenting evidence on communities, culture and social connections. This means that communities, culture and social connections is considered in 28% of sources identified overall (49 records).
Table 19: Share of dedicated or integrated records evidencing community, culture and connection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to community, culture and social connection</th>
<th>Community, culture and social connection in integrated records</th>
<th>Total records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 9: Share of communities, culture and social connections evidence

As Table 20 shows, among the 19 records dedicated to communities, culture and social connection, 16 specifically relate to Scotland, showing a strong recognition of the importance of community, culture and social connections for refugee and asylum seeker integration. In the integrated records there are a similar number of sources focusing on Scotland and looking at the UK overall.

Table 20: The number of records in communities, culture and social connection regarding the geographical scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to communities, culture and social connection</th>
<th>Communities, culture and social connection included in integrated records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 21 shows the majority of evidence relating to communities, culture and social connection has been produced by using mixed methods or qualitative methods. This is a pattern seen in other themes in the report. However, there are also a significant number of quantitative sources.

Table 21: The number of communities, culture and social connection records regarding the research method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Dedicated</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative methods</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integration as a whole

In this section the evidence sources which consider integration as an overall concept are presented. This includes evidence which considers a number of the main themes already reviewed in relation to integration.

Table 22 and Chart 10 show that 53, out of the 174 evidence sources identified in total, relate to integration as a whole. That constitutes 30% of the total sources of evidence identified in this research. This represents evidence sources where there is not one distinct main theme, including sources presenting evidence on two or more themes, where there is not a dominant theme. It illustrates the interconnectedness of integration, as even when looking at a specific theme there are times when these cannot be fully separated from each other if integration is to be understood.

Table 22: The number records in integration as a whole compared to all records found

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration as a whole</th>
<th>Other records</th>
<th>Total records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 10: Integration as a whole share of evidence
Table 23 shows that 22 sources evidencing integration as a whole have been identified which are dedicated to Scotland, while there are 26 sources relating to the UK and four considering the UK as part of the EU. There is also one source which is international in scope.

Table 23: The number of records in integration as a whole regarding the geographical scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration as a whole</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 24 shows, like most themes, the majority of records are produced by using mixed methods (27) and qualitative methods (14). There are only nine quantitative sources and three literature reviews.

Table 24: The number of records in Integration as a whole regarding the research method used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative methods</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Themes
In addition to evidence which reflected six of the main New Scots refugee integration strategy themes, or multiple themes across integration as a whole, evidence has been found which had a specific focus that did not fit with these themes and seemed distinct enough to need to be classified as something other than ‘integration as a whole’. This included evidence which had a specific focus on people based on a shared protected characteristic and distinct policies like family reunion. Another reason for having additional categories is to keep the focus of some evidence, for example, evidence which were solely focused on women or older refugees and asylum seekers.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, given the focus of these evidence sources, there are only a small number of sources dedicated to specific topics which are outside the main themes or integration as a whole. However, the fact that evidence sources targeting some of these areas exist highlights that there can be specific issues which refugees and asylum seekers may face because of their protected characteristics, the way they are portrayed in the media, or the way policy affects them.

Two themes were identified as a particularly strong focus which was beyond the six main themes considered. These two themes are children and family reunion, and poverty and destitution. These themes are specific enough to be considered distinct from integration as a whole. They relate closely to policy and the impact that this can have on people when they need support.

Children and family reunion
In this section evidence concerning asylum seeking and refugee children is presented. This includes sources with some consideration of other themes, like education or health and wellbeing, as well as distinct issues like violence against children and young people. A number of sources of evidence concerning children and family reunion has been found which are included in this section too. There were no sources in integrated records which considered integration of asylum seeking and refugee children specifically or made significant reference to their experience. This means that children and young people have not been easily identified as a consideration in evidence sources which consider refugees and asylum seekers’ integration as an overall concept.

As Table 25 shows, the number of records only about Scotland (6) is roughly half of the number of records which evidence asylum seeking and refugee children in the UK (13). This may be because any evidence focusing on children and young people specifically is likely to be considering the UK level policy in relation to Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) or children at risk as a focus of UK refugee resettlement vulnerability criteria and the reserved policy of family reunion.

Table 25: The number of children and family reunion records regarding the geographical scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to children and family reunion</th>
<th>In Scotland</th>
<th>In the UK</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Scotland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The research method used for producing evidence about children and young people is mostly either mixed method (8 records) or qualitative method (7 records). Only 3 records using quantitative methods have been identified.

Table 26: The number of children and family reunion records regarding the research method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed method</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative method</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poverty and destitution

Poverty and destitution is not one of the seven themes in the New Scots refugee integration strategy, but in the course of searching for evidence on asylum seeker and refugee integration, 17 sources of evidence dedicated to poverty and destitution have been found, or 10% of total sources. This makes it clear that poverty and destitution are significant issues affecting refugees and asylum seekers in the UK.

As Table 27 and Chart 11 show, a further 6 records relating to integration as a whole were found which contain evidence relating to poverty and destitution experienced by refugees and asylum seekers, accounting for 3% of overall records. This means that 13% of evidence sources found included consideration of poverty and destitution among refugees and asylum seekers.

Table 27: Share of dedicated or integrated records evidencing poverty and destitution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated poverty and destitution</th>
<th>Poverty and destitution in integrated records</th>
<th>Total records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 28 shows, eight records are dedicated to refugees and asylum seeker’s poverty and destitution only in Scotland while nine other sources dedicated to refugees and asylum seekers’ poverty and destitution provide evidence on Scotland as part of the UK. Of the six integrated records providing evidence relating to poverty and destitution, only one is entirely focused on Scotland.

Table 28: The number of poverty and destitution records regarding the geographical scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to poverty and destitution</th>
<th>Poverty and destitution in integrated records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29 shows that poverty and destitution is a distinct area where most of the sources used quantitative or mixed methods rather than qualitative and mixed. This indicates that quantifiable data is gathered in this area, for example, the number of people seeking support because of the effects of poverty and destitution.

Table 29: The number of poverty and destitution records regarding the research method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Dedicated</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative methods</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

This research aimed to gather together evidence relating to asylum and refugee integration which could be used to inform the work of the New Scots refugee integration strategy.

A total of 174 evidence sources have been identified by theme and consideration has been given to some of the key characteristics of this evidence, including: geographical scope; research method; and the organisations supporting the generation of evidence by funding and commissioning research.

Available evidence is not evenly distributed across the themes identified. A significant proportion of evidence considers multiple themes, highlighting how interconnected integration work is.

There are gaps in the available evidence. This is sometimes because refugee status is not a category for data collection and this population is therefore not distinguishable from the general population. The question of whether a person’s status should be recorded is complex and requires understanding of people’s identity as well as consideration of the appropriateness of gathering information which is not required to deliver services appropriately.

The majority of evidence sources have used mixed or qualitative methods. This is likely to be because of gaps in quantitative data available and the challenge for researchers of recruiting enough participants to constitute a reasonable data set. This also says something about the nature of integration itself, it is about ‘how’ support can be provided and ‘why’ things did or didn’t work. Integration is complex and it affects individuals in different ways, finding out the ‘how’ and ‘why’ is likely to be more useful than just measuring the number of people affected.

Some of the most systematic evidence identified in this research came from evaluation of multi-year integration programmes (such as the Holistic Integration System). These evidence sources often used mixed methods to measure progress as people settle and integrate into communities rather than a snapshot of a single short term project. Integration is a long term process and evidence sources which reflect this and consider the long term impact of work may be most useful for informing good practice. This is not something this research was able to consider in detail.

Since 2000, the number of sources of evidence produced each year has varied. This research did not consider the timescales of the research itself but looked at the date of publication when known. It also didn’t investigate whether previous research had informed these publications or if they had referred to previously published data. This could be a useful consideration for future research, to be able to create indicative measures for the impact of integration work.

This research helps to form a picture of the type of evidence available to support refugee and asylum seeker integration in Scotland. It is hoped that it can inform the planning of future research and the delivery of the New Scots refugee integration strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sponsor(s)</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Date published</th>
<th>Geographic scope</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugees’ Opportunities and Barriers in Employment and Training</td>
<td>The Department for Work and Pensions</td>
<td>Alice Bloch</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees, Recent Migrants and Employment: Challenging Barriers and Exploring Pathways</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>Sonia McKay</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Market Integration of Refugees: Strategies and good practices</td>
<td>European Parliament</td>
<td>Regina Konle-Seidl and Georg Bolits</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing the face of the Scottish teaching profession? The experiences of refugee teachers</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>Henry Kum, Ian Menter and Geri Smyth</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘When They don’t Use it They will Lose it’: Professionals, Deprofessionalization and Reprofessionalization: the Case of Refugee Teachers in Scotland</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>Geri Smyth and Henry Kum</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization/Researcher(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The forbidden workforce: Asylum seekers, the employment concession</td>
<td>ASSET UK Development Partnership Board, Deng Yai, Aghileh Djafari Marbini and Razia Balimoria</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and access to the UK labour market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Study on Support Mechanisms for the Recognition of the Skills,</td>
<td>Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) Partnership, Paul Guest and Michela Vecchia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Qualifications of Migrant Workers and Refugees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and integration of refugee doctors in Scotland</td>
<td>Global Commission on International Migration, Emma Stewart</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I Want to Do Anything which Is Decent and Relates to My Profession’</td>
<td>Academic work, Emilia Piętka-Nykaza</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Date published</td>
<td>Geographic scope</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Towards Integration: The Housing of Asylum Seekers and Refugees in Britain</td>
<td>Academic paper</td>
<td>Deborah Phillips</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Extent and Impact of Asylum Accommodation Problems in Scotland</td>
<td>Scottish Refugee Council</td>
<td>Vicky Glen and Kate Lindsay</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum Seekers in Scotland: The Accommodation of Diversity</td>
<td>Academic paper</td>
<td>Duncan Sim and Alison Bowes</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Long Term Integration of Gateway Protection Programme: Refugees in Motherwell, North Lanarkshire</td>
<td>University of the West of Scotland and Oxfam Partnership</td>
<td>Duncan Sim and Kait Laughlin</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Lanarkshire</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating the Maze: Refugees Routes to Housing, Support and Settlement in Scotland</td>
<td>Scottish Refugee Council &amp; Access Apna Ghar Housing Association (AAGHA)</td>
<td>Gina Netto and Anne Fraser</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Date published</td>
<td>Geographic scope</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let Refugees Learn</td>
<td>Refugee Action</td>
<td>Refugee Action</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Qualitative Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot to learn: refugees, asylum seekers and post-16 learning</td>
<td>Nuffield Foundation</td>
<td>Lisa Doyle and Gill O'Toole</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Qualitative Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something to smile about: promoting and supporting the educational</td>
<td>Department for Education</td>
<td>Sarah Walker</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Qualitative Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and recreational needs of refugee children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and schooling for asylum-seeking and refugee students in</td>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td>Mano Candappa, with Miriam Ahmad, Ben Balata,</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland: An Exploratory Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rayenne Dekhinet and Dogan Gocmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing in order to understand multicultural classrooms</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Lorenzo Luatti</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational needs and experiences of refugee children in Scotland</td>
<td>What Works Scotland</td>
<td>Maureen McBride, Kevin Lowden, Chris Chapman and</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Date published</td>
<td>Geographic scope</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring for equality? Asylum seekers and refugees’ retention and achievement in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)</td>
<td>Refugee Council and the University of Birmingham.</td>
<td>Jenny Phillimore</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of Integration Policy related findings on employment, ESOL and vocational training</td>
<td>Refugee Council, Big Lottery fund via the University of Birmingham.</td>
<td>Kavita Brahmbhatt with Gaby Atfield, Helene Irving, James Lee and Therese O’Toole</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Lives Sharing Languages</td>
<td>Scottish Refugee Council; Scottish Government</td>
<td>Lavinia Hirsu and Emily Bryson</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival English</td>
<td>WEA</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian New Scots</td>
<td>WEA</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Date published</td>
<td>Geographic scope</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee peer education for health and well-being</td>
<td>NHS, Scottish Refugee Council</td>
<td>Alison B Strang</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration or isolation?: Mapping social connections and well-being amongst refugees in Glasgow</td>
<td>Positive Mental Attitudes, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde and Queen Margaret University</td>
<td>Alison B Strang and Neil Quinn</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health needs of asylum seekers and refugees</td>
<td>Academic paper</td>
<td>Angela Burnett and Michael Peel</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches to health provision in the age of super-diversity: Accessing the NHS in Britain’s most diverse city</td>
<td>Jenny Phillimore</td>
<td>Jenny Phillimore</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“They do not understand the problem I have”: Refugee well being and mental health</td>
<td>Joseph Rowntree Foundation</td>
<td>Jenny Phillimore, Ergul Ergun, Lisa Goodson and Deborah Hennessy with Birmingham New Community Network Community Researchers</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and Children First? Refused Asylum Seekers’ Access to and</td>
<td>Scottish Refugee Council</td>
<td>Sylvie Da Lomba and Nina Murray</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of Maternity Care in Glasgow</td>
<td>NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde Health Board</td>
<td>GoWell team</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First do no harm: denying healthcare to people whose asylum claims have failed.</td>
<td>GoWell</td>
<td>Ade Kearns and Elise Whitley</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Wellbeing and Social Inclusion of Migrants in North Glasgow</td>
<td>Academic paper</td>
<td>Julia Quickfall</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a model for culturally competent primary care nursing for asylum applicants and refugees in Scotland: A review of the literature</td>
<td>NHS Health Scotland</td>
<td>Neil Quinn, Sidra Shirjeel, Lindsay Siebelt and Ruth Donnelly</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An evaluation of the Sanctuary Community Conversation Programme to address mental health stigma with asylum seekers and refugees in Glasgow</td>
<td>Scottish Refugee Council, See me, Mental Health Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees, mental health and stigma in Scotland: Briefing Paper</td>
<td>Academic paper</td>
<td>Ade Kearns, Elise Whitley, Matt Egan, Catherine Tabbner and Carol Tannahill</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Migrants in an Unhealthy City? The Effects of Time on the Health of Migrants Living in Deprived Areas of Glasgow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A civilised society: mental health provision for refugees and asylum seekers in England and Wales</td>
<td>Lloyds TSB Foundation for England and Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Date published</td>
<td>Geographic scope</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practice for community involvement in the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Programme</td>
<td>Refugees Welcome Scotland</td>
<td>Lowri Richards and Sabine Gundel</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Welcome? Understanding public attitudes to asylum seekers in Scotland</td>
<td>Institute for Public Policy Research</td>
<td>Miranda Lewis</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Scotland with focus on Glasgow</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidencing the social and cultural benefits and costs of migration in Scotland.</td>
<td>COSLA Strategic Migration Partnership</td>
<td>R. Kay and A. Morrison</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Institution/Project</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Research Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Impact of Migrant Children in Glasgow Schools</td>
<td>COSLA, University of Glasgow, Glasgow City Council</td>
<td>Stephen Dillon</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening the Welcome – Exploring experiences of refugee resettlement approaches in Scotland</td>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td>The Scottish Community Development Centre (SCDC)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing: UK Public Opinion toward Immigration: Overall Attitudes (5th Revision)</td>
<td>The Economic and Social Research Council.</td>
<td>Scott Blinder and Lindsay Richards</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Scotland different on race and migration?</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>Alistair Hunter and Nasar Meer</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘He’s a Cracking Wee Geezer from Pakistan’: Lay Accounts of Refugee Integration Failure and Success in Scotland</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>Steve Kirkwood, Andy McKinlay and Chris McVittie</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Some People It's Very Difficult to Trust’: Attributions of Agency and Accountability in Practitioners' Talk About Integration</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>Steve Kirkwood, Andy McKinlay and Chris McVittie</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘People Look at Us, the Way We Dress, and They Think We’re Gangsters’: Bonds, Bridges, Gangs and Refugees: A Qualitative Study of Inter-Cultural Social Capital in Glasgow</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>Ross Deuchar</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoWell Findings: Asylum Seekers and Refugees in Glasgow’s Regeneration Areas, 2006-7</td>
<td>Glasgow Community Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impacts of migrants and migration into Scotland</td>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing: Anti-Racist Education</td>
<td>Educational Institution Scotland</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing to adapt: Institutional barriers to RCOs engagement in transformation of social welfare</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Date published</td>
<td>Geographic scope</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees’ Experiences and Views of Poverty in Scotland</td>
<td>Scottish Poverty Information Unit</td>
<td>Kate Lindsay, Morag Gillespie and Louise Dobbie</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Even Among Asylum Seekers we are the Lowest’: Life on Section 4 Support in Glasgow</td>
<td>Scottish Poverty Information Unit</td>
<td>Gareth Mulvey</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Second Destitution Tally: An indication of the extent of destitution among asylum seekers, refused asylum seekers and refugees</td>
<td>The Asylum Support Partnership</td>
<td>Kate Smart</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They think we are nothing. A survey of destitute asylum seekers and refugees in Scotland</td>
<td>Scottish Refugee Council</td>
<td>Mhoraig Green</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I want to participate’: transition experiences of new refugees in Glasgow</td>
<td>Institute for Global Health and Development, Queen Margaret University, Edinburgh, UK; Scottish Refugee Council, Glasgow, UK</td>
<td>Alison B. Strang, Helen Baillot and Elodie Mignard</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees without refuge – Findings from a survey of newly recognised refugees</td>
<td>The Refugee Council</td>
<td>The Refugee Council</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 days later: experiences of new refugees in the UK</td>
<td>The Refugee Council</td>
<td>Lisa Doyle</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your inflexible friend The cost of living without cash</td>
<td>The Asylum Support Partnership</td>
<td>Sile Reynolds</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty and Asylum in the UK</td>
<td>Oxfam and the Refugee Council</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungry and Homeless: The impact of the withdrawal of state support on asylum seekers, refugee communities and the volunteer sector</td>
<td>Published by the Refugee Council with funding from Oxfam</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor health, no wealth, no home: a case study of destitution</td>
<td>British Red Cross</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>South-Yorkshire</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seekers and refugees: a litmus test for Scotland?</td>
<td>Migration Scotland</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty and Income Inequality – Improving Data for Ethnicity and Religion</td>
<td>Scottish Government Intern Project</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RST Destitution Grants 2017-18</td>
<td>Refugee Survival Trust</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RST Destitution Grants April – December 2017 (Q1 – Q3 2017-18)</td>
<td>Refugee Survival Trust</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Decade of Destitution: Time to Make a Change</td>
<td>British Red Cross and Boaz Trust</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Children and Family Reunion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date published</th>
<th>Geographic scope</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘She Endures With Me’ An evaluation of the Scottish Guardianship Service Pilot</td>
<td>The Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund</td>
<td>Heaven Crawley and Ravi KS Kohli</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a good place to live and think about the future… The needs and experiences of unaccompanied asylum-seeking children in Scotland</td>
<td>The Glasgow Centre for the Child and Society and the Scottish Refugee Council</td>
<td>Peter Hopkins and Malcolm Hill</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An inspection of family reunion applications</td>
<td>Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration</td>
<td>David Bolt</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe But Not Settled: The impact of family separation on refugees in the UK</td>
<td>The Refugee Council and Oxfam</td>
<td>Eilidh Beaton, Anna Musgrave and Josephine Liebl</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘One Day We Will Be Reunited’ Experiences of Refugee Family Reunion in the UK</td>
<td>Scottish Refugee Council</td>
<td>Judith Connell and Gareth Mulvey</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a minor offence: unaccompanied children locked up as part of the asylum system</td>
<td>Refugee council</td>
<td>Judith Dennis</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives in the Balance: The quality of immigration legal advice given to separated children seeking asylum</td>
<td>The Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund</td>
<td>Laura Brownlees and Terry Smith</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author/Institution</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringing the Changes: The impact of guidance on the use of Sections 17 and 20 of the Children Act 1989 to support unaccompanied asylum-seeking children</td>
<td>Refugee Council</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Case for Change: How refugee children in England are missing out</td>
<td>The Children’s Society, Save the Children and Refugee Council</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daring to dream: Raising the achievement of 14 to 16 year old asylum-seeking and refugee children and young people</td>
<td>Funded by KPMG Foundation, published by Refugee Council</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where are the children? A mapping exercise on numbers of unaccompanied asylum-seeking children in the UK: September 2000 – March 2001</td>
<td>The Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated Children in the UK</td>
<td>The Refugee Council and Save the Children</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How reuniting families can provide solutions to the refugee crisis</td>
<td>British Red Cross</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not So Straightforward: the need for qualified legal support in refugee family reunion</td>
<td>British Red Cross</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voices of Strength and Pain: Impacts of separation, loss and trauma on health and wellbeing of reuniting refugee families</td>
<td>British Red Cross</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We started life again”: Integration experiences of refugee families reuniting in Glasgow</td>
<td>British Red Cross</td>
<td>Ruth Marsden and Catherine Harris</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Date published</td>
<td>Geographic scope</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving on? Integration and onward migration of dispersed refugees in the UK.</td>
<td>ESRC (Economic and Social Research Council)</td>
<td>Emma Stewart and Marnie Shaffer</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>Alastair Ager and Alison Strang</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees, Acculturation Strategies, Stress and Integration</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>Jenny Phillimore</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration: Mapping the Field</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Stephen Castles, Maja Korac, Ellie Vasta and Steven Verotovec</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration: mapping the field volume II - distilling policy lessons from the &quot;mapping the field&quot; exercise'</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Claire Fyvie, Alastair Ager, Gavan Curley and Maja Korac</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Shared Future</td>
<td>Commission for Integration and Cohesion</td>
<td>Commission for Integration and Cohesion</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Settlement: Can Communities Cope?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maknun Gameledin-Ashami, Libby Cooper and Barry Knight</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Refugee Integration: a Quantitative Analysis of Integration and Social Policy Outcomes</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>Sin Yi Cheung and Jenny Phillimore</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-level Policy-Making and Migrant Integration in Britain.</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>Gareth Mulvey</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Integration in Scotland</td>
<td>Scottish Refugee Council</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees and asylum seekers: A review from an equality and human</td>
<td>Equality and Human Rights Commission</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rights perspective</td>
<td>Peter Aspinall and Charles Watters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Refugee’ is only a word: a discursive analysis of refugees’ and asylum</td>
<td>Academic Work</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seekers’ experiences in Scotland</td>
<td>Steven Michael Kirkwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Search of Normality: Refugee Integration in Scotland</td>
<td>Scottish Refugee Council</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Integration in Scotland Statistical findings from stage 1</td>
<td>Scottish Refugee Council</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A journey towards safety: A report on the experiences of Eritrean</td>
<td>UNHCR, the Refugee Council and the</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refugees in the UK</td>
<td>Scottish Refugee Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England’s forgotten refugees: out of the fire and into the frying</td>
<td>Refugee Council</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Mixed Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pan</td>
<td>Josephine Basedow and Lisa Doyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘This is my village now’: Post-status refugee needs and experiences</td>
<td>Glasgow Campaign to Welcome Refugees</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Glasgow</td>
<td>Duncan Sim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Integration: Emerging Trends and Remaining Agendas</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of limited leave on refugees in the UK</td>
<td>Refugee Council</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting There? The Effects of Functional Factors, Time and Place on</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Social Integration of Migrants</td>
<td>Ade Kearns and Elise Whitley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee inclusion: A literature review</td>
<td>Welsh Assembly Government</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>EU, UK and Scotland</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees and other new migrants: a review of the evidence on successful approaches to integration</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement of Syrian Refugees in West Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>What Works Scotland</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>West Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant social integration in Glasgow’s deprived communities</td>
<td>GoWell</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Hanging In-Between’: experiences of waiting among asylum seekers living in Glasgow</td>
<td>Ph.D. Thesis</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The integration of dispersed asylum seekers in Glasgow</td>
<td>Ph.D. Thesis</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Paradigms, Marginal Reality: Refugee Community Organisations and Dispersal in Britain</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking safety beyond refuge: the impact of immigration and citizenship policy upon refugees in the UK.</td>
<td>Academic Article</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the everyday life information needs and the sociocultural adaptation barriers of Syrian refugees in Scotland</td>
<td>Academic Work</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Grant Fund Progress Report</td>
<td>Glasgow City Council</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Region(s)</td>
<td>Method(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees Welcome? The Experience of New Refugees in the UK. A report</td>
<td>All Party Parliamentary Group on Refugees</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the All Party Parliamentary Group on Refugees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New issues in refugee research: The integration and onward migration</td>
<td>UNHCR Policy Development and Evaluation Service</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of refugees in Scotland: A review of the evidence</td>
<td>Emma Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Policy Creates Politics: the Problematizing of Immigration and</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Consequences for Refugee Integration in the UK</td>
<td>Gareth Mulvey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Status and Refugee Integration: a UK Perspective</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Integration Policy: The Effects of UK Policy-Making on</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees in Scotland</td>
<td>Sylvie Da Lomba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing like a region: parliamentary discourses on asylum seekers and</td>
<td>Susanne Schech</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refugees in Scotland and South Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and South Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An evidence base on migration and integration in London</td>
<td>ESRC Centre on Migration, Policy and Society,</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
<td>Ben Gidley and Hiranthi Jayaweera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction: Critical Reflections on Refugee Integration: Lessons</td>
<td>Academic Article</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from International Perspectives</td>
<td>Geri Smyth, Emma Stewart and Sylvie Da Lomba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges programme annual report 2005-2006</td>
<td>Bridges Programme</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges programme annual report 2008-2009</td>
<td>Bridges Programme</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges programme annual report 2009-2010</td>
<td>Bridges Programme</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges programme annual report 2010-2011</td>
<td>Bridges Programme</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges programme annual report 2011-2012</td>
<td>Bridges Programme</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges programme annual report 2012-2013</td>
<td>Bridges Programme</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges programme annual report 2013-2014</td>
<td>Bridges Programme</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey on Policy and Practice Related to Refugee Integration</td>
<td>European Refugee Fund Community Actions</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Council client experiences in the asylum process</td>
<td>Refugee Council</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners of Terrorism? The impact of anti-terrorism measures on refugees and asylum seekers in Britain</td>
<td>Funded by Oxfam, published by the Refugee Council</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't Stay. Can't Go. Refused asylum seekers who cannot be returned.</td>
<td>British Red Cross</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Asylum Seekers, Developing Good Practice</td>
<td>ASAP – Asylum Seekers´ Active Partnership Work Group 5 Equal Initiative – Asylum Seekers</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees: Renewing the Vision. An NGO working paper on improving the asylum system</td>
<td>The Refugee Council in partnership with Amnesty International UK, Immigration</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Older Refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date published</th>
<th>Geographic scope</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older Refugees in the UK: A literature review</td>
<td>Refugee Council</td>
<td>Naomi Connelly, Lora A. Forsythe, Guy Njike and Anja Rudiger</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## LGBTI Refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Geographic scope</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary, Safety and Solidarity Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Asylum Seekers and Refugees in Scotland</td>
<td>Equality Network, BEMIS and GRAMNet</td>
<td>Tim Cowen, Francesca Stella, Kirsty Magahy, Kendra Strauss and James Morton</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Women Refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date published</th>
<th>Geographic scope</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raising refugee women's voices: Exploring the impact of Scottish Refugee Council's work with the Refugee Women’s Strategy Group 2011-2015</td>
<td>Comic Relief</td>
<td>Melanie Quintero, Nina Murray, Elaine Connelly and Fiona Ballantyne</td>
<td>Pos. 2015-16</td>
<td>Across Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Geographic scope</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Struggle to Contribute: A report identifying the barriers encountered by refugee women on their journey to employment in Scotland</td>
<td>Refugee Women’s Strategy Group</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women seeking asylum: Safe from violence in the UK?</td>
<td>Asylum Support Appeals Project and Refugee Council</td>
<td>Helen Baillot and Elaine Connelly</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When maternity doesn't matter: Dispersing pregnant women seeking asylum</td>
<td>Maternity Action and the Refugee Council</td>
<td>Rayah Feldman</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disabled Refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Geographic scope</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A study of asylum seekers with special needs</td>
<td>Refugee Council</td>
<td>Helen Murshali</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Qualitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people in refugee and asylum-seeking communities in Britain</td>
<td>Joseph Rowntree Foundation</td>
<td>Keri Roberts and Jennifer Harris</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date published</th>
<th>Geographic scope</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area reputation: An examination of newspaper coverage of the Sighthill estate</td>
<td>GoWell</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Glasgow (Sighthill)</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area reputation: An examination of newspaper coverage of the Red Road Estate</td>
<td>GoWell</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Glasgow (Red Road)</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Together: Ideas for working with asylum seekers, refugees, the media and communities</td>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy and Strategy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date published</th>
<th>Geographic al scope</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicators of Integration: Final Report.</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Alastair Ager and Alison Strang</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Borders Safe Haven: Integration with Diversity in Modern Britain</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a Place in the Global City: the Relevance of Indicators of Integration’</td>
<td>Academic work</td>
<td>Jenny Phillimore and Lisa Goodson</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda for Integration</td>
<td>Refugee Council</td>
<td>Refugee Council</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Literature Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Date published</td>
<td>Geographic scope</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics on Asylum seekers in the UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date published</th>
<th>Geographic scope</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asylum tables</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative Method</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>