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Abstract

In recent years, the numbers of refugees and migrants moving across borders has been unprecedented, with more than 68.5 million people around the world leaving their countries as a result of persecution, conflict, violence, or human rights violations (UNHCR, 2018a). Their journeys are perilous, crossing dangerous waters, often leading to death of family members. Upon arrival in Europe they continue to struggle, often living in detention-like conditions, unable to access basic protection and being vulnerable to traffickers. Most European governments offer emergency relief, without a common framework for legal protection or a clear vision of what statutory social services should provide. Like many other European countries, in the UK, designated social services are also limited and formal efforts to support refugees arriving in the UK remain uncoordinated, mostly provided by volunteers and non-governmental organisations. Drawing on the theoretical framework of social movements, this article offers a crtitique to current social work practices for refugees in the UK. Using the case of resettlement policies, it argues that sustainable social services to protect this vulnerable group could develop through the political opportunity structures created by non-governmental organisations. It concludes that community mobilisation can influence social work practice to better support the refugees.
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**Introduction: understanding refugee resettlement in the global context**

This article begins with an outline of the global context for the current refugee crisis, highlighting definitions and international strategies available to frame policies of resettlement and integration. It then focuses on the theoretical framework of social movements and it discusses its application to social work practice to the UK context. Like many other European countries, in the UK, designated social services are limited and formal efforts to support refugees arriving in the UK remain limited and uncoordinated, provided mostly with support from volunteers and non-governmental organisations. Using the case of resettlement policies, it argues that sustainable social services to protect refugees can develop through political opportunity structures created by non-governmental organisations through their community mobilisation.

Refugees are defined by the United Nation High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) as people forced to flee their country because of persecution, war or violence. They should be granted refugee status by the country they entered. It also includes people in refugee-like situations: those who have entered another country for the same reasons as refugees but have not been granted refugee status by the government (UNHCR, 2016). Internationally, the 1951 Refugee Convention is the key legal document that forms the basis of refugee relief. Signed by 144 State parties, it defines the term ‘refugee’ and outlines the rights of the displaced, as well as the legal obligations of States to protect them. The core principle of the Convention is non-refoulement, which asserts that a refugee should not be returned to a country where they face serious threats to their life or freedom. UNHCR serves as the ‘guardian’ of the 1951 Convention and its 1967 Protocol. An asylum seeker is a person aged 18 and over who has fled persecution and has made an asylum claim under the 1951 UN Convention, or against a breach of the European Convention on Human Rights. A refugee is someone whose claim to be at risk of persecution has been accepted. Under this convention, all governments are obliged to provide protection to people who meet the criteria for asylum.

Large numbers of refugees and migrants moving across borders is not a new phenomenon. By the end of 2017, approximately 68.5 million people around the world have been forced to flee homes as a result of persecution, conflict, violence, or human rights violations (UNHCR, 2018a). More than 467,000 refugees and migrants entered Europe by the end 2017, risking their life by crossing the Mediterranean sea into Spain, Italy and Greece (UNHCR, 2017a). Since 2015, hundreds of volunteers in Europe formed new organisations in attempts to help relieve the refugee crisis. However, the response to large-scale movements remains inadequate and underfunded, with most governments hesitating to develop clear strategies for refugee assistance. So far, no strategy or coherent plan has been agreed despite international pressures from the UN demanding governments to coordinate their efforts in terms of services provided to refugees and overall asylum seeking policies in Europe.

There are deep internal divisions between EU Member States over refugee resettlement resulting in conflicting approaches, such as the sustainability and protection approach versus border control and security one. Filippo Grandi, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees said: ‘*this is* *as much a crisis of European solidarity as it is a refugee crisis’* (Grandi,Public speech *2016).*

In an attempt to address some of these inadequacies, the UN developed the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF). The four points of this framework relate to reception and admission; support for immediate and ongoing needs; support for host countries and communities; and, offering durable solutions A key goal of this declaration is to encourage greater international cooperation for refugees, and to identify new approaches and pathways to protection and sustainable solutions (UNHCR, 2017a). Europe only hosts a small fraction of the world’s forcibly displaced population, with 85 percent asking for asylum in the world’s poorest nations (UNHCR, 2018b). Yet, internal immigration pressures make it difficult for European countries to achieve these aims, and the focus continues to be on border protection, leaving social workers mainly responsible for implementing strict legal requirements, with limited services available through local government arrangements. The next section will discuss how political opportunity structures created by international organisations and voluntary organisations could influence the development of statutory social services.

**Social movements and political opportunities for refugee support**

Different understandings of citizenship and belonging have proved to be influential in shaping policy responses to refugee integration processes in Europe (Scholten and Van Nispen, 2015). In some contexts, especially where integration is understood as ‘assimilation’, the rights of a refugee to asylum will depend on their ability to share a set of qualities that define the new society, constraining the individual agency of refugees in the processes of integration (Mulvey, G. 2013). The theoretical framework of social movements will highlight the dynamic of community mobilisation and protest in a community needed to promote statutory services for the refugee resettlement.

Significant literature has addressed the dynamics that facilitate political mobilisation and political opportunity structures available to collective actors in various movements, however it has been criticised for its inability to explain why variations in culture and mentality among actors produce different mobilisations outcomes. If identified as critical, mobilisation of collective protest is deemed necessary. Yet, such protest cannot emerge in a political vacuum, and its success or failure depends on a range of contextual factors or on ‘properties of the external environment, relevant to the development of social movements’ (della Porta and Diani, 2006: 16; Koopmans et al., 2005). Success or failure depends on what is often labelled as the relevant ‘political opportunity structure’ in a given context. A theory of political opportunity structures, thus, recognises the influence of political institutions on the mobilisation, claims-making and outcome of social movements. Any given political context offers a fluid and dynamic set of opportunities and constraints that can enable or hinder the success of collective action (Koopmans et al., 2005: 16).

Creating new, supportive social services for refugees requires a certain political mobilisation. Banki (2013) argues that outcomes of political mobilisation are linked to different levels of ‘precarity’, depending on the availability of documentation, informal networks, and social protection structures. She explains that in a country with high precarity levels, there is a limited ability to reside, move and transact openly, and refugees face a high state of vulnerability, with some measure of protection offered by local, voluntary or international organisations, but little statutory protection. Refugees living in camps and those living in towns with no documentation and limited protection fall into this category, however these can also constitute extreme precarity as some may have neither documentation nor effective networks to access support. Although the lines between different categories might be blurred, it is useful to identify the possible connection between precarity and political mobilisation (Schierup and Jørgensen, 2016; Banki, 2013). Refugee mobilisation and protest has been considerably less visible in recent years as those opportunities for protest were rarely made available. The in/visibility of refugee mobilisations in Europe has been discussed in the literature (Banki, 2013).The role they play remains predominantly limited to either passive and/or ideally grateful recipients of governmental or civil society ‘help’. Rarely are refugees perceived as political subjects with claims to rights and recognition. They have also been portrayed as dangerous subjects undermining national sovereignty and threatening communities (Banki, 2013).

It is important to identify political opportunity structures as they facilitate the understanding of the mobilisation, strategies and results of social movements because they operate as ‘structuring cues’ for social movements (Kjellman, 2007; McAdam 1996). Such cues, which include the distribution of opportunities and threats, and repression and facilitation, impact differently on different groups in various political contexts. Having a positive will to act politically, to improve the conditions of particular groups, may be a characteristic of the state itself or of political parties or individual political representatives. The presence or absence of such political will, may, to some extent, determine the opportunities and constraints that non-governmental actors (such as organisations supporting the refugees) are faced with.

Precarity and its associated discontent has been known to provide motivation for collective action (Burgerman, 2001; Tarrow 2005; Banki 2013). It allows for external factors to influence the development of certain political opportunity structures. For example, international organisations can determine such structures to be formed within countries. The role of the United Nations in beginning to create such political opportunity structures in various nation-states, as well as the impact of trans-national networks on the formation of domestic policies, is evident and it has been recognised by scholars in relation to previous movements (for example Kantola and Outshoorn, 2007 in relation to women’s movement).

International organisations such as the UN can provide useful tools in determining governments to sign up to certain conventions and potentially creating opportunity structures to develop. For example, [**The New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants**](http://www.unhcr.org/new-york-declaration-for-refugees-and-migrants.html), proposed by the UN in September 2016, aims to play such a role, promoting global solidarity and refugee protection at a time of unprecedented displacement across the world. Adopted by all 193 Member States of the United Nations, it aims to involve the Member States to respect the human rights of refugees and migrants and to support the countries that welcome them (UN, 2018d). The New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants provides a Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) for emergencies and protracted situations of forced displacement - as a recognition of the critical situation this group is currently facing (UN, 2017a). It is therefore necessary to look beyond the context of the nation-state in order to examine the political opportunities available to refugees’ movement actors and the constraints they face in attempting to produce policy changes towards protection (including to create new social services) and beyond border control.

The critical part of any structural or institutional theory is to explain how mobilisation facilitates supportive services. In conjunction with the dynamic aspects of opportunities, McAdam and Scott (2005) have been concerned with clarifying ‘transforming mechanisms’, which they claim, has the potential to trigger the mobilisation of protest. In this regard, McAdam and Scott’s concept of ‘destabilising events’ can be useful in understanding how precarity can contribute to mobilisation. In the context of refugees’ movements, such events could include any socio-political issues of particular relevance to refugees due to, for example, media attention on issues such as camp living conditions, boats arriving or being deterred from arriving on European shores.

Creating formal social services tailored for refugees becomes a complex task. Political opportunities can be seen as fixed and permanent or as fleeting and changing. An example of changing political opportunities would be regime changes and their respective ideologies influencing such policies and services. Moreover, social movements do not only act or react in relation to opportunities they are presented with; they are also agents of change and can create new opportunities in their own right. Political opportunities are, thus, not necessarily static or given, but may be relational or dynamic (Kjellman, 2007: 18 and 36). In practice, different social movements may be able or unable to take advantage of political opportunities. Favourable political opportunities, be they stable or dynamic, are no guarantee for the mobilisation of protest. Protest requires the recognition and framing of opportunities.

Often, voluntary associations, have been decisive in the formation and delivery of welfare state policies. Providing financial resources to organisations supporting refugees, which facilitates both the formation and mobilisation of such groups, can be seen as part of the institutional opportunity structure and a critical part of transforming political opportunities into formal structures and eventually statutory services. Collective actors or movements may engage with more established actors and create competition, alliances, or opposition. Relationships between the government and non-governmental organisations offering support to refugees are nurtured through formal and informal dialogue. Including such organisations in government consultations is a clear example of an available political opportunity structure. Therefore, opportunity structures can be observed by examining who is invited to particular events (such as hearings, committee meetings, consultations, etc.), or who is perceived as a legitimate representative of a particular group or issue. Such collaborations occur yearly during national events such as Refugee Week (usually around Refugee day on 20th of June) where several organisations come together to celebrate refugees through arts, cultural, social and political activities. Refugee Week started in 1998 as a reaction to hostility in the media and society towards refugees and asylum seekers. It is one of the leading international initiatives aiming to improve the lives of both refugees and host communities. As a national festival in the UK, it is run by a wide range of organisations, including community groups, local authorities, universities, schools, student groups (Refugee Week, online). Such events offer good opportunities to observe how voluntary organisations make alliances and who they view as central actors alongside themselves in policy areas such as resettlement and integration of refugees. Further research needs to explore such dimensions in more detail. Drawing on the political opportunities structures and social movement theory, the next section examines the resettlement policy and its implications on social work practice in the UK.

**Resettlement policy, community mobilisation and social work practice in the UK**

The theoretical discussion above highlights key elements of the social movement led by volunteers and campaigners in sustaining a humanitarian response to support refugees. Their influence and community mobilisation leads to political opportunities needed to persuade governments to create an adequate response; this involves designing and aligning policies, programmes and social services to protect the refugees (especially the most vulnerable ones, such as unaccompanied children) through their journey to a safe resettlement.

Resettlement is known as a formal process of moving refugees from one host country to another where they can settle permanently. It is recognised as one of the three ‘durable solutions’ used by the UNHCR to help refugees (the other two solutions refer to ‘local integration’ in the first host country, and ‘voluntary repatriation’ back to the country of origin). Resettlement is a humanitarian and political instrument based on a voluntary commitment of the countries involved (Bessa 2009; Nakashiba 2013); governments are then designing individual resettlement programmes depending on the political opportunity structures available in those countries. Definitions, implementation and procedures vary greatly among member states. Selection procedures differ, as well as the legal rights associated with admission. Some countries grant refugee status, others a permanent residence permit without refugee status, and in others people have to file an asylum application after arrival (Fratzke and Salant 2017: 15; European Resettlement Network, 2018).

The UN’s Refugee Agency, UNHC, identifies refugees in need of resettlement in the region. Refugees selected for resettlement in Britain receive health assessments and cultural orientations prior to arrival and the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) ensures their safe arrival. Planning happens before resettled refugees arrive in the UK; local councils, service providers and charities work together to ensure that everything is in place to ensure a smooth transition, however services vary in each local authority and statutory social services remain limited. Refugees usually reside in private accommodations obtained through voluntary donations and they are supported to adapt to their new life with the help of local charities and volunteers, in cooperation with local governments. Non-governmental organisations like the Refugee Council, Migrant Voice and City of Sanctuary (among many other national and local organisations) coordinate the social work support for refugees throughout their first year in the country, offering personalised services such as support with housing, accessing the job market, education, healthcare and mainstream services. However, as the support from local authorities is limited in most regions, these services can vary widely around the country.

The UK government aimed to resettle 23,000 refugees from Syria and the surrounding region by 2020. However only 15,000 refugees have arrived so far under the resettlement schemes currently in existence. In addition, over 8,000 Syrian asylum seekers and their dependents were accepted in the UK from 2011 to 2017 from applications made after arrival in the UK (Home Office, 2017). Previous asylum application have followed a dispersal system. Ten local authorities are responsible for supporting more than one third of all asylum seekers in the UK (35.5%). Six of these, Manchester, Bolton, Rochdale, Nottingham, Leicester and Swansea, have a median annual income that places them in the poorest 25% of the country (Lyons and Duncan, 2017).

As argued in the section above, the precarity of formal, governmental intervention in most European countries including the UK, created a strong solidarity among activist groups who provide informal, yet increasingly specialised, professional support to newly arrived refugees. Their activist work involves campaigning, pressurising governments to create new services or amend legislation, but also offering a range of activities from mental health support to legal advice on asylum applications. One example of campaigning resulting in legislative change in the UK is section 67 of the Immigration Act 2016, known as the Dubs Amendment, which allows unaccompanied children to be reunited with their family. Other similar legislative changes regarding refugee children refer to the care of unaccompanied migrant children and victims of modern slavery. A new statutory guidance for local authorities has been issued in November 2017, section 7 of the Local Authority Social Services Act 1970, which requires local authorities to exercise their social services functions. This guidance replaces the care of unaccompanied and trafficked children: Statutory guidance for local authorities on the care of unaccompanied asylum seeking and trafficked children from 2014 (Department of Education, 2017). There has been international legal recognition of the specific needs and vulnerability of separated child refugees since the 1924 Declaration of the Rights of the Child ([Bhabha and Crock, 2007](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0020872812447638)). However, this legal recognition has not guaranteed the protection of their rights and in the UK, as in most countries, they still encounter fundamental tensions between immigration policy and child welfare ([Aspinall and Walters, 2010](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0020872812447638)).

A few other examples are various schemes introduced in the UK in recent years such as the Gateway Resettlement Scheme and the Vulnerable Children Resettlement Scheme. The traditional route is the Gateway Resettlement Scheme, which has been used since 2004. Groups of refugees are chosen by the UNHCR and resettled to cities across the UK. Currently, 750 refugees are resettled per year under this scheme. The Vulnerable Children Resettlement Scheme was introduced in September 2015 and pledged to resettle 3000 unaccompanied minors and other vulnerable refugee children. Following Dubs Amendmentin April 2016, pledging to resettle an unspecified number of unaccompanied minors from camps in Europe to join family members in the UK, 200 young people were resettled in 2016. However, in 2017, the UK government announced that the scheme would be capped at 350 places. Several organisations have since campaigned to remove this cap. Voluntary organisations like SOS Children Villages had been key players in this campaign along with an expansion of safe regular channels for refugees, including resettlement; an end to the immigration detention of children; and refugee family reunion (SOS Children Villages, 2019).

These few examples illustrate the complex situation created by resettlement programmes with various implications for social work practice. In order to address the complex situations refugees experience during resettlement (especially the most vulnerable ones, such as women and children), a wider movement using community resources towards community social work is needed, with sustainability and empowerment as core professional values being upheld.

Sustainability and empowerment are key concepts for the discourse on refugee assistance (UNHRC, 2018d), however, as this article argues, several challenges emerge in relation to how social services are able to implement these concepts in order to support, protect and empower this vulnerable group.

Empowerment, as a concept, stems from a critical shift in social work practice, which began developing in the late 1980s against a deficit-focused, medical and pathology model, towards an inclusive, strength-based approach, attempting to give voice to most marginalised groups in different communities (Chapin, 1995; Early and GlenMaye, 2000). In this process, service users become partners or participants in a process of learning, development, and social change (Pease, 2002; Peeters, 2012a; 2012b). Participation and empowerment represent ways of addressing social inequality, exclusion and human rights violations, and have been used in social work practice in the UK for decades. However, a careful look is needed to understand how voice, representation and empowerment play out for this particularly vulnerable group of people and what role social workers can have to support them on this journey.

Because of a lack of general consensus about the legal framework and increasingly bureaucratic procedures, social workers often lack preparation and legal training for working with refugees and are not equipped to offer the necessary support. Previous research shows that this situation is not new. Social workers involved with asylum seekers and refugees feel guilt, resentment and frustration because they do not have the legal knowledge to offer good services to this neglected and vulnerable group (Hayes and Humphries 2004). Previous critiques to social work practice are still prevailing, for example the focus on assessment, monitoring, evaluation and inter-agency coordination rather than on the social work practice itself (Rogowski, 2008; Rogowski, 2011). The community care reforms of the early 1990s were a pivotal point in the shift of power and control from practitioners to mangers, with the role of social workers becoming more prescribed and inflexible (Carey, 2003).  Community social work, while influential in the 1970s and 1980s, is no longer a significant part of social work in the UK (Hasting and Rogowski, 2015). A large part of the supportive work with asylum seekers, particularly failed asylum seekers who have not been detained and cannot be returned, has been traditionally provided by voluntary-sector agencies, (Humphries, 2004; Fell, 2013). Social workers have volunteered to help refugees outside their professional roles, due to overwhelming tensions created by legal requirements in statutory settings; one example is the requirement to inform the UK Border Agency (UKBA) about people with uncertain immigration status who approach their agencies for services, as required by the 2002 Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act) (Fell and Fell 2013); another example is the requirement to engage with medical services to conduct age assessment on unaccompanied young asylum seekers. This controversial practice has been criticised as it is believed it crosses boundaries towards control rather than meeting the needs of the people; due to an overall lack of clarity in the role social workers have, young people have been reported to have difficulty in distinguishing between social workers and immigration officials ([Humphries, 2004](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0020872812447638); Cemlyn and Nye 2012).

Challenges faced by social work professionals have been discussed in the literature in relation their role and ability to help vulnerable people. Rogowski (2011) argues that changes in the welfare state in recent years, following a neo-liberal ideology, increasingly influenced public services to be managed much like the private sector. He further claims that that this change in discourse has contributed to the deformation of social work as a profession, initially in relation to adult users and now in relation to children and families, where practitioners’ success is often measured in terms of targets that have to be met. (Rogowski, 2011; Hasting and Rogowski, 2015). This article argued that that such a ‘precarity’ of statutory social work intervention determines a certain political mobilisation among activist and charity groups, which in turn could provide opportunities for new social services, towards community social work..

**Conclusion**

Using social movement theory, this article discussed refugee resettlement policy and its implications for social work in the UK; it argued that the precarity of a coherent, formal government intervention with regard to refugees resettlement creates opportunities for political change. It highlighted that social services are currently struggling to meet the needs of this vulnerable group and can only partially do so relying on support from charities and voluntary organisations. Offering a few examples of issues arising from resettlement programmes in the UK, the article discussed the implications for social work practice. It argued that precarity of social services has created mobilisation among activists and charitable organizations able to influence resettlement policies for refugees, and that further efforts are needed in order to develop comprehensive policies and services for refugees in the UK. One solution suggested in this article is for social workers to take advantage of political opportunities created through activist work and begin to reapply principles of community social work, where people are encouraged to come together to identify issues of concern and take action to resolve them.
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