

THE WAGES OF FEAR: RISK, SAFETY AND UNDOCUMENTED WORK



THE WAGES OF FEAR: RISK, SAFETY AND UNDOCUMENTED WORK

Jon Burnett and David Whyte

We are the precarious, the flexible, the temporary, the mobile. We're the people that live on a tightrope, in a precarious balance, we're the restructured and outsourced, those who lack a stable job, and those who are overexploited; those who pay a mortgage or a rent that strangles us. We're forced to buy and sell our ability to love and care. We're just like you: contortionists of flexibility (Manifiesto Convocatoria Barcelona 'Forum 2004' – cited in Raunig, 2004).



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was written with financial support from the University of Liverpool and the Kenneth Miller Trust, and we wish to acknowledge this assistance. We are indebted to the input of a number of friends and colleagues who offered advice and support. Thanks in particular to Jon's former colleagues at Positive Action for Refugees and Asylum Seekers, and in particular Christine Majid, Fidelis Chebe, Lucy Insam, Beth Dixon, and Dzmitry Karpuk, for their advice and patience. We are grateful to Steve Tombs and Ciara Kierans for their expert insights on an earlier version of this report. Thanks go to James Greenhow for donating his skills and time to the design of this project. Above all, we would both like to express our sincere gratitude to the individuals who agreed to be interviewed about their experiences as undocumented workers in this report. As this report shows, talking about work in this context carries with it many risks and we are fortunate that the participants in this research were so open with us and so generous with their time.

ISBN: 978-1-899207-22-0

Copyright © Jon Burnett and David Whyte 2010

Published jointly by PAFRAS (Leeds, LS7 3DX www.pafras.org.uk)
and The University of Liverpool (Liverpool, L69 3BX www.liv.ac.uk)

Design and layout by James Greenhow (www.jamesgreenhow.co.uk)

Printed by Upstream Design and Print (www.upstream.coop)

PREFACE

‘I have a family and if I have a choice between working illegally or starving my family I will work illegal ... I will never let my family starve.’

These are the words of one of the so-called ‘failed’ asylum seekers interviewed in this report. Their ‘failed’ status comes from rejected asylum claims which are more often than not the consequences of inhumane asylum laws in the UK.

‘The Wages of Fear: risk, safety and undocumented work’ is an extremely important contribution to the research on the experiences of undocumented migrant workers in the UK, of which there is little. These undocumented migrant workers are the lifeblood of the UK economy doing the work that others are unwilling to undertake. Those interviewed are destitute after financial support has been withdrawn or are on very basic levels of support. They are in limbo – unable to return to their countries of origin for a variety of reasons yet barely able to subsist here.

Jon Burnett and David Whyte expose the institutionalised exploitation of the undocumented and their powerlessness to improve their working conditions or pay. As the report states, too little is known about what happens to people who are forced to work clandestinely/illegally in order to survive and eke out the most basic existence in the UK. Those interviewed here in one northern city provide a snapshot of what is without doubt being replicated across the UK, in factories, takeaways, shops, the construction industry and other places where the undocumented can find work. The work is often dangerous, unregulated and very poorly paid.

There is little support available for such workers. They cannot complain if they are badly treated, overworked or underpaid. This is a form of modern day slavery. These are people who are failed repeatedly by a state that cares for nothing other than feeding the economy with cheap labour – no matter what the human cost.

The experiences of the undocumented, who are the most vulnerable in our society and in most need of protection, should be a lesson to us all.

Harmit Athwal
Editor – IRR Race & Refugee News Service
www.irr.org.uk

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	6
‘FLEXIBILISATION’ AND PRECARIOUS WORKING	11
STRUCTURED VULNERABILITY	15
THE VIOLENT CONSEQUENCES OF PRECARIOUS WORK	25
CONCLUSION	32
BIBLIOGRAPHY	36
APPENDIX	39

The Wages of Fear: risk, safety and undocumented work

INTRODUCTION

The Conservatives took power in 2010 with a pledge to dramatically reduce non-EU migration. However, Prime Minister David Cameron's determination to impose tough immigration caps has met resistance from some Liberal Democrats in his cabinet. Business Secretary Vince Cable has warned of the 'very damaging' impact of immigration caps on the economy. This is a view that is increasingly supported by key business leaders (Ahmed, 2010). In public, this debate appears to present an over-simplified, bi-polar, choice between populism and free-market pragmatism. The reality of British government policy is that it is shaped by both.

Governments have for some years been the architects of a strategy of "managed migration." As the Home Office notes:

Immigration has contributed to the success of the UK economy... our job now is to make sure migration does even more to profit Britain, economically and culturally (Home Office, 2008a).

Migrant workers are increasingly recruited to do the dirtiest and least protected jobs. In the past two decades, migration policy has been reshaped to address the needs of labour markets more directly. The strategy of managed migration is ostensibly aimed at regulating flows of people into the UK by seeking to match human capital to labour shortages and requirements. This strategy represents a conjoining of labour and immigration policy through which the purpose is both to draw in, and expel migrants as and when required (Kundnani, 2007a: 143-147). As such, the aim is to enable routes into the country to be turned on and off with little notice, and little consultation. They can be closed down in order to maximise political capital or as a reactive response to moral panics around immigration as well as a response to labour market demands. This generation of politicians are by no means the first to exploit the issue of immigration in this way, and they are unlikely to be the last.¹

Reworking the fortress Europe policies of the 1990s, the development of a framework of managed migration is indicative of an emerging global architecture with ever more punitive outcomes. For at the same time as mechanisms are put in place to funnel and order migration according to specific needs and desires, these same instruments underpin new and emerging measures of expulsion and criminalisation. In June 2008 this was made acutely visible when the European Parliament passed a set of

¹ In January/February 2009 workers at the Lindsey Oil Refinery in North Lincolnshire and several other energy industry sites across the UK organised protests and industrial action against the employment of regular foreign workers. Former Prime Minister Gordon Brown's slogan, 'British Jobs for British Workers' took on a popular significance and appeared frequently in news media-reported crowd scenes during those disputes. On the 4th February 2009, responding to criticisms of his inflammatory language during Prime Ministers Question Time, Gordon Brown asked: 'Can anybody here say that they don't want British workers to get jobs in our country?'

reforms that allows a period of 18 months of summary imprisonment of ‘irregular migrants’ combined with a five year ban on re-entry (Burnett, 2008: 26).

These strategies, as we indicate above, are often politically driven. For whilst irregular migration is made the target of a concerted set of policies and directives aimed at control, expulsion, and management, it is important to note that it is these same mechanisms that establish what counts as ‘regularity’ and ‘irregularity’ in the first place. There are no valid estimates of the number of irregular migrants in the world, but there are many indicators to suggest that their number is increasing. The International Labour Organization (ILO, 2004) suggests that up to 15% of migrants are ‘irregular’. And whereas in 1960 there were over 75 million people who were classed by the United Nations as ‘international migrants’, by 2005 this number had increased to 190 million (United Nations, 2006). Using the ILO estimate, this would suggest that, in 2005, there were up to 30 million irregular migrants across the globe. In the same year, within the UK, Home Office research suggested that irregular migrants made up to a maximum of one in every 100 hundred of the population (Branigan, 2005: 1). Whilst, in 2009, research published by the Greater London Authority estimated that approximately 618,000 irregular migrants live in the UK (Gordon et al, 2009).

The report that follows focuses on one small sub-category of this section of the populace. It is based on detailed interviews with fourteen people² who are all seeking asylum but, having had their claims refused, are left in a form of limbo. Refused asylum seekers³ are not allowed to work, have no access to housing, little access to statutory services, and in many cases little optimism for what the future holds. Some of the people interviewed here have been destitute for years. Some of them have experienced destitution, but at the time of writing are receiving some form of support as a result of fresh evidence having been submitted to the Home Office regarding their claim for asylum. But all of them share one thing in common in that, regardless of what the government has ruled in relation to their asylum claim, they are too afraid to return home to face violence, torture, and potentially death. As such, in an attempt to eke out an existence, they have entered the labour market as undocumented workers.

²Details of who those people are and how they were identified are included in Appendix 1 of this report.

³ Before their claim has been decided asylum seekers are not allowed to work, and normally receive entitlements in the form of accommodation and cash support set at 70% of income support. If an asylum claim is refused all support is withdrawn from the individual after 21 days. With no right to work, no access to accommodation, and no welfare entitlements, refused asylum seekers are pushed into destitution. The immigration status of respondents at the time of interview may not have been the same as when the respondent was working. Some respondents, for example, worked only when they had all of their financial support removed after their claim for asylum was refused.

This report presents a study of precarious working conditions experienced by undocumented workers, and as such, it documents the harms that undocumented workers suffer and witness. It begins by exploring the importance of notions of labour market flexibility and flexicurity in government and trans-national government policy making. It argues that the exploitation of migrant workers and undocumented workers is structured by these labour market conditions. Second, it utilises the interview data to consider in detail this structural subordination, arguing that, combined with the at times contradictory imperatives of immigration policy, the precariousness of undocumented workers acts as a disciplinary tool. Finally it indicates that, in this context, the occupational risks to which undocumented workers are exposed need to be understood in terms of the highly dangerous and violent consequences experienced by those workers.

This report will describe how employers exploit undocumented workers in some of the dirtiest, most dangerous jobs as a matter of routine, and how they pay poverty wages for backbreaking work. They force long hours when needed, and summary dismissals when not. They coerce injured workers to carry on working and they fire those whose injuries are so bad that they cannot continue to work. With their very presence in the country criminalised, workers are much less able to formally organise themselves or join a trade union; they are less able to seek redress if and when they are abused; and are hesitant to seek medical assistance, sometimes after serious injuries.

Of the fourteen interviewees, not all were in employment at the time of their interview, but they may well be at the time of writing. As we shall see, undocumented labour is marked by periods of both frequent inactivity and frenetic intensity. These undocumented cleaners, labourers, car-washers, cashiers, factory workers, kitchen porters, and drivers are permanently available. They have to be. For when work is presented it offers an opportunity to secure a tentative foothold on the margins of society. If wages are paid – and as we shall see this is by no means a certainty – then the money that is earned offers a chance, for a short time at least, to be able to buy food, to pay rent, and if possible to support loved ones who have had to be left at home. Almost all of those interviewed have had to sleep on the streets at one point or another since arriving in the UK. Many of them will have to again. Working, often any work, is the only safeguard they have. Thus all of those interviewed have had numerous jobs, sometimes for a few days, sometimes for a few months - but always in conditions that are insecure, exploitative, and more often than not unsafe.

The dangers that workers face in this report raises are not solely the fault of nasty or rogue employers; the risks faced by workers are not created by immoral employers or ‘gangmasters’. The exploitative and often violent qualities of employers are much less significant than the fact that the interstices of a socio-economic context

and a consciously constructed labour market segment systematically produce the experiences that are documented here.

This report begins to unravel a story that is normally only told in the context of catastrophic events such as the Morecambe Bay disaster.⁴ But what follows provides a more mundane way of interpreting the dangers that migrant workers face. For, as the data analysed here reveals, those risks are everyday, routine, and in many ways part of the normalised experience of undocumented workers in the UK.

⁴ On 5th February 2004, 23 cockle pickers were drowned at Morecambe Bay on the Lancashire coast. This was the worst single industrial disaster in Britain since Piper Alpha. The dead were all irregular migrant workers from China who had been put to work on the highly profitable cockle beds of the Fylde coast (see Tombs and Whyte, 2007).

The Wages of Fear: risk, safety and undocumented work

CHAPTER 1: 'FLEXIBILISATION' AND PRECARIOUS WORKING

THE NEW FLEXICURITY

The introduction of 'flexibility' into the labour market has been a feature of successive UK governments since the 1970s (Monastiriotis, 2006: 9-10) and has been proposed as a means of delivering competitiveness in a globalised economy (HM Treasury, 2005). The growth in the informal economy that has occurred in recent years is tied to the UK governments demand for flexible labour markets (Castles, 2006: 745). Thus:

[G]reater flexibility means that firms are able to adjust prices, output, employment and investment more quickly in response to shocks and changes in macroeconomic policy. (HM Treasury, 2005: Para 2.10)

Government ministers have consistently argued that the provision of minimum employment standards that are sensitive to business conditions is a precursor to attracting foreign direct investment (for example, McFadden, 2007). The new Government's coalition agreement commits it to extending the "right" to flexible working to all employees (Hansard, 3rd June 2010 : Column 558). Thus, flexibility often translates in real terms as exemptions from working conditions such as guaranteed minimum working hours, paid leave and so on. Flexibility, from the current government's perspective, is seen as a way of guarding against the loss of autonomy implied by the globalisation of markets. Flexibilisation has under this government been a key plank of welfare reform and has been seen as central to the development of a broader set of welfare-to-work policies (Peck and Theodore, 2000 and 2001).

To a greater or lesser extent, flexible working has been adopted by all EU member nations. According to the Flexible Working Survey 2007, based on interviews across Europe, flexible working practices have been introduced at such a pace that they are now considered the norm (Puybaraud, 2007). In January 2008 IDC, a subsidiary of the transnational global technology company IDG (the International Data Group), estimated that by 2011 up to one billion people across the world will be classed as 'mobile workers' (IDC, 2008: 1). As a major employer of such workers, the IDC welcomed this prospect, since organisations that deploy 'mobile solutions...enjoy a strategic competitive advantage over their competitors who have not invested in integrating mobility into their cultural roadmap' (ibid). 'Flexibilisation' is therefore seen as an essential response to global economic conditions. Moreover, it is often presented as mutually advantageous for both employers and employees. Claims supporting this consensus are based on the promise that flexibilisation can be:

[B]eneficial both to employers who need to adapt to changing technologies and

turbulent markets, and to employees who want to bring their working career in line with the requirements of their private life (Bijwaard and Veenman, 2008: 1).

The idea of a common interest between employers and employees around flexibilisation is therefore based upon an acceptance and embracing of economic vulnerability on one hand (to meet employers' needs) and increasingly temporal and ever-changing life-style demands experienced by individuals (which means that workers also require, and benefit from, flexibility) on the other. The latter point is also often supported by claims in relation to the end of the predominance of traditional family structures, giving rise to a demand for non-standard shift patterns, new forms of homeworking and so on. In other words, the consensus position on flexibilisation is based on the idea that both employers and employees require more flexible working as a result of changes in social patterns of organisation. The emergence of flexibilisation to meet those demands is necessary to ensure that both employers and employees are not left behind by the new economy.

This 'common interest' claim around flexibilisation is the one that dominates in government and trans-national government agendas, and is quickly becoming an orthodoxy in the political statements of both national and trans-national government. The idea is a central component of the economic strategy of the European Union. The EU Lisbon Strategy – introduced in 2000 and re-launched in 2005 – based a vision of economic growth partly upon 'flexible management of working time and job rotation' (European Council, 2000: para 29). The term 'flexicurity' is used frequently in European Union policy documents to capture the idea of a common interest between employers and employees in the new economy (for example, European Commission, 2007).

MIGRANT WORK AS PRECARIOUS WORK

Migrant labour is articulated as a vital adjunct to the European vision of flexicurity and in 2007 the European Union estimated that 20 million non-EU workers were needed in order to maintain economic competitiveness (Bilefsky, 2007). However, in contrast with the dominant vision of 'flexicurity' that is disseminated by European government, not everyone is profiting equally from a flexible labour market. From a different perspective, flexibility can be understood as a transfer of vulnerability or the risk of doing business from employers to employees. Thus, as Lawrence (2004: 1) notes:

[E]fficient manufacturers and retailers talk of driving costs out of the chain. They avoid tiresome forward contracts committing them to specific volumes. Such contracts would help suppliers plan their factory rotas, but they also entail a risk

of under- or over-supply. Instead, retailers and manufacturers order 'just in time' from wherever is cheapest around the globe, waiting for their barcode scanning to tell them how much consumers are buying. Instant communications allow them to relay what they need at a moment's notice. Modern transport networks enable them to have it delivered with unprecedented speed. To survive in this brave new world, today's supplier must leap to in equally short order, so they pass the risk down the line to those at the bottom, to labourers who are turned on and off like a tap to meet fluctuating demand. And if necessary they must be kept hard at it until the orders are finished.

The realities of the precarious conditions that migrant workers face in the labour market very directly undermine the 'flexicurity' ideal of a mutual interest between employers and employees. Existing as a 'surplus population', migrant labour is utilised to form 'short-term, non-binding, sub-contracted workforces which can be hired and fired at will and are constantly threatened with replacement...' (Kundnani, 2007b: 1). Indeed, it might be said that the reality of flexibilisation is precisely the opposite of that claimed by the idea of flexicurity, for it is the processes that are supposed to improve 'work-life balance' (longer working hours, exemptions from paid leave, irregular wage structure and temporary employment contracts) that actually intensify insecurity and precariousness for workers.

The concept of precarity⁵ embraces the structural features of an economic insecurity that is mediated and reinforced by particular forms of labour commodification (i.e. the labour market) on one hand alongside the production of alienation, risk of injury and death and other forms of exploitation and inequality experienced directly as a consequence of working on the other. As a concept, it takes account of how gendered and racialised inequalities reinforce and are reinforced by particular patterns of work. Put simply, the concept of precarity enables us to understand how general (labour market) and particular (labour process) forms of exploitation are brought together by flexible working. Undocumented workers are by no means the only workers occupying positions of precarity. But as Neilson and Rossiter (2005) have suggested, the undocumented migrant is the exemplary precarious worker. This point is explored in more detail in the next chapter.

⁵ Taken from the French term *precarité*, the notion of precarity in the context of the labour market has been utilised since the 1980s but, according to Neilson and Rossiter (2005) only began to gather popularity within Western European countries since the beginning of the 21st Century. As Lima (2006) has shown, precariousness is by no means unique to the late 20th Century, but its terminological emergence has marked a concerted focus upon attempts to develop analyses of casualisation and flexibility as central components of globalisation.

The Wages of Fear: risk, safety and undocumented work

CHAPTER 2: STRUCTURED VULNERABILITY

In this chapter we explore in more detail how the labour market and the labour process structures the precariousness of undocumented or irregular migrants' working lives. The experiences of workers recorded and analysed in this chapter provides background on labour market conditions and employment practices that are necessary to more fully understand their experience of health and safety conditions in the workplace.

TEMPORARY WORK

Working as an undocumented worker, as the interview respondents in this study all asserted, often means having no contract of employment, and no regular pattern of working hours and times. All fourteen respondents emphasised how their working lives have been marked by instability and insecurity. A job that provides work for more than 6 months is rare, and when work is secured, the hours worked each week can differ enormously. The reasons for this vary. But of central importance is the structural position that undocumented workers occupy in the labour market.

Undocumented workers must show their willingness to work as and when required. Bekele, for example, worked for an employment agency where they assisted him in falsifying a national insurance number to secure employment. Ready to work, he was told to turn up at the agency early every morning to see what was available. As he explained:

You just sit in the office till nine in the morning. You go at six in the morning, and sit there waiting for a job. They have employers who work with them continuously and somebody rings and says 'I need people'.

In such a context there was never any guarantee that work would be available. And when it was, it would only be for such a time that was required by the employer, often to meet upturns in supplier demands. Bekele explained the bluntness of this framework and discussed how, for example, one job he had from this agency lasted just two days: 'Then it stopped, they didn't need people anymore. Maybe they do now, I don't know. When they do, they [the agency] ring and people go'.

Existing as a 'just in time' workforce, in this way undocumented workers provide employers with a pliable pool of labour – easily hired and easily fired. Such experiences were commonly related by respondents.

INTENSITY OF WORK

Undocumented working is therefore marked by insecurity and uncertainty. Hours worked may be curtailed when labour is no longer needed, and there may be periods

when work is simply not available. In periods when work is available, undocumented workers are frequently required to work unusually long hours.

Fabio explained this in detailed terms:

You work 12, 13 hours [a day] because they know you haven't got permission... Basically they abuse everybody. But still, when you are working they act like they are God to you because they know you haven't got work permission... I work 90 hours a week, seven days a week and up to 12, 13 hours a day. Well between 80 and 90 hours a week. No less than 80.

Similarly, Richard reported that one of his previous jobs had been as a cashier in a shop where he worked between twelve and fourteen hours a day:

I was working every day for two months - 12-14 hours working. And that means not having even one hour to rest, to have a break. Because, you know, he doesn't pay tax for the people. It's good for him. It's so easy to find a job like that but it's using people.

Whilst the EU Working Time Directive provides adult workers with entitlement to 20 minutes break every six hours worked (Trades Union Congress, 2008), for many undocumented workers breaks and rests are denied. As Hamad explained, 'You are sometimes not even allowed to have a break for 10 minutes... [I]f it is eight hours, you have to do eight exactly'. Extreme levels of fatigue were commonly reported by respondents. Working without a break often means working without any chance to stop and eat.

Respondents reported that working long hours is necessary to compensate for low wages. As Fabio reported, 'I am shattered but I have no choice'. It is to the issue of how this lack of choice – central to the exploitation, casualisation, and subordination that undocumented workers experience – is reinforced by the manipulation of wages that the report now turns.

POVERTY WAGES

Most respondents reported having worked for 'cash in hand' or 'off the books'. The highest wage that anyone reported receiving was minimum wage level or slightly above. The lowest was £1.50 per hour. This finding is supported by other studies. Ram et al (2002: 23) for example, cite an employer they had interviewed who employed both undocumented and documented workers and made clear that he employed undocumented workers predominantly for financial reasons, maintaining

that ‘all the rest are paid at the NMW [national minimum wage] rate, if I paid them all the same, I might as well not employ illegal workers’.

Abdul recalled his first labouring job in the UK:

I was working for somebody and they didn’t give me any money at all...Sometimes people are like that. For the first time I came to this country, in London, there were three of us and we came back and they didn’t pay.

Hamad also reported that he had been forced to work for no money at all:

[O]ne week when I was homeless, a week when it was raining and I had nowhere to stay, I asked a friend if he knew anybody who could give me some work. He introduced me to this one guy who was a builder, he used to go to broken houses and repair them. And he said ‘you come work for me’. I told him I had nowhere to stay and he said ‘Ok, I will find you a room. You stay a week with me’. He found me the room; it was very broken with no light. It was the only option though to protect me from the cold and the rain. He said that it was only for one week and on the Friday I asked him for my money. He said, ‘sorry I can’t give you any money’. So I had been working for him a week and I asked him why he couldn’t give me any money. He said ‘you have been staying with me, in my accommodation, this is my house. You don’t have any place and it is better than anything you have – rain and cold’. Maybe if I had anything he would have paid me, maybe £2.50 or something. It was a very hard job, that turned out to be digging the roads. So it was hard, but what was I supposed to do? I can’t complain, I can’t go to the police, because I am not allowed to do it.

With no access to welfare benefits there is no safety net for undocumented workers and it remains difficult for ‘refused’ asylum seekers to access medical treatment. For most of our respondents, being ill is not something that can be afforded. In Bekele’s case, he was eventually forced to beg for the money to pay for (private) acupuncture to ease the pain stemming from a head injury.

THE THREAT OF DESTITUTION AS A DISCIPLINARY MECHANISM

The destitution that often follows a claim for asylum being refused, quite literally forces people into work in order to survive. As Richard explained:

I have a family and if I have a choice between working illegally or starving my family I will work illegal. Whether they catch me or not, I will never let my family starve. We apply hundreds of times to get work papers but they always say no. The reason?

No reason, they just say no.

Whilst not all undocumented workers have immediate family to support, Richard is not alone in having to make a simple choice: break the law by working, or live on the streets and starve. He is one of hundreds of thousands of refused asylum seekers living in destitution who, as a result, exist as a labour force with no negotiating power except that which they collectively muster among themselves and those campaigners who offer solidarity and practical support. Taking any work that is available is often the only option that is on offer. When asked about what forced him into working whilst in the UK, Mike replied: ‘I have an obligation to be alive’. Thandie related a period when she was working three separate jobs in order to support her child, to raise solicitors fees for assistance with her asylum claim, and to send money home to support the rest of her family.

Amir – a middle-aged man with leg problems that made walking sometimes agonising – described how the relative powerlessness in the labour market experienced by undocumented workers ensures compliance with exploitative working practices and conditions. Speaking of his labouring job, he pointed out:

They give you harder work. They just give you orders. Do this, do that. And you know that it is not your job but you have to do it because if you don’t, you lose your job. And then, nothing. You sleep outside again.

The threat of destitution compounds the relative powerlessness of workers and disciplines them into compliance with degrading working conditions. The fact that employers have ‘more workers waiting’ is an integral part of the economy of undocumented labour. Indeed, it is this, combined with the stark reality of the situation that undocumented workers find themselves in that forces them to acquiesce to appalling conditions of work.

WAGE MANIPULATION, THEFT AND SLAVERY

With low wages enforced as a common condition of work, employers are empowered to make use of a variety of strategies to ensure that their financial costs are reduced yet further. The manipulation of wages is integral to the economic spheres in which undocumented workers enter.

Many employees are paid a set amount for a days work as they can then be forced to work overtime with no increase in wages. Whilst in turn this can be compounded by a series of incremental wage deductions that penalise workers. Richard explained one job he had where:

[T]he shop owner was very badly treating us. He didn't pay good. He was using us too much, for more than 14 hours a day. It was for £25 and if we were late for just half an hour he would take £5 from our wages.

Wage manipulation of this kind can have a devastating impact upon people who are paid well below the minimum wage, and exist far beyond the poverty line. Yet mechanisms of redress are virtually non-existent and employees are aware that complaining may risk dismissal. The consequences of a lack of organised representation are reinforced by the fact that there are many others in a similarly vulnerable position waiting to take the place of undocumented workers who leave their employment. Richard was bold enough to challenge his employer about the level of his wages and explained 'I complained every day but he didn't care. He said "if you want to go then just go. There are a thousand people out there wanting this job"'.

Predicaments such as the one that Richard found himself in are reinforced by policies which effectively criminalise undocumented workers for supporting themselves through work. It is the constant risk of detection by the authorities that intensifies the vulnerability of workers to arbitrary decisions by their employers. But it was not only in 'cash in hand' jobs that such problems arose. As Bekele reported:

Well I was owed £600 from the agency [that he was working for]. I was paid the week after I worked and one week I had worked six days, and four the week after, which was 10 days overall. Also they used to pay holiday money when you worked three months straight. I was owed this, about £600. The day before I was going to be paid he [the employment agent] rang me to come into the office. In those days... he used to have a lot of illegal people. He knew everything really. He didn't really ask for many documents. He gave me a false NI number. So he rang me, I used to get a pay slip, and the payslip had already come. He already knew I didn't have real documents. I went there and he looked like he knew nothing but he was friendly, he knew me. They would ring us every night before work, to tell us when to start and everything. If he said 'no you can't work', I understand that. Almost 90% of his workers have no papers. I went with three other people and my friend went first and he was owed £60 and the boss said he needed proof of documents in two weeks time, but he paid him the £60. He called me next and said he had checked my documents. The documents, they just photocopy a Home Office letter to say you can stay and put in a false name. He said he had checked my documents and knew it was not right. He said if I could get the right document I could keep my job and get my money. But I was owed £600.

Bekele has yet to receive any of the money he claims he is owed. As his asylum claim was rejected he was forced into homelessness, and, at the same time, had serious health problems. As such, whatever money he earned had to go on medicine, rent, and food and as he explained his wages gave him 'enough to survive, but not to live'.

Employers inculcate a series of wage debts that practically foster slavery among certain workers (see the discussions in Pai, 2008). In this context it is hardly surprising that respondents often used the word 'slavery' to describe a situation whereby their wages paid only provided for bare levels of subsistence. One respondent, Fabio, who had been an undocumented worker in the UK for 6 years, described his plight in precisely those terms:

[W]e are just wasting our time and our lives. I think this is slavery actually, it is slavery. The government says it is not but it is... basically they are taking our lives, for nothing. So that is slavery. We are working just to eat and survive. That's what we are doing, and that's what the government is doing to us... This is the governments fault. This is slavery. Maybe in the governments' eyes its not but actually that is what they are doing to us. Not just to me, to all of the refugees, asylum seekers, all of them. ... The government is saying fuck off.

Notwithstanding the built in reductions in wages for undocumented workers, the theft of money from some workers was compounded by the manner in which they received wages. It was reported that some employment agencies would only pay money directly into a bank account rather than handing over cash. However, as a result of our respondents' immigration status, it was not possible for them to open a bank account. The exclusion from normal banking facilities commonly faced by undocumented workers compounds their vulnerability to having wages manipulated or 'taxed' by unscrupulous employment agencies.

In one reported example of this type of 'taxing', Bekele was introduced to a job by 'Daniel' – a man who befriended him and allowed him to use his bank account to receive his wages – and whilst he was unsure if Daniel was in some way connected to the agency, when he did receive his wages, a sum had been deducted.⁶ Undocumented workers enter a market in which they have very little power relative to employers. Employers are empowered by the knowledge that they are more desperate for work than other groups of workers and that there is a ready supply of equally vulnerable labour.

⁶ Pai (2008) also discusses in detail the context within which workers pay upfront to get registered with an 'employment agency'.

The data from the interviews also revealed how employees were disempowered and made structurally vulnerable by their legal status. It is to the exploration of this crucial issue that the chapter now turns.

THE DISCIPLINARY POWER OF LEGAL STATUS

Whilst the vagaries of the market may be a key reason underpinning the insecurity of undocumented work, as stated above, it is not the only reason. As Bekele's experience in the previous section indicated, the legal status (or lack of legal status) of undocumented workers is a major factor in the reproduction of their vulnerability. In our sample of workers, legal status was acutely important. All but one of the respondents in this research were refused asylum seekers, and a number of interviewees were working quite simply to stave off literal destitution. In all cases, they were breaking the law by taking up employment. Hamad related this predicament:

If you don't have the paper, wherever you go you will never get treated the same as other people. They will shout at you, scream at you, pushing you to work really hard... we never ever complain to anybody. If we [do then] we just get sacked as he has more workers waiting.

For undocumented workers their labour is threatened not only by the whims of their employers, but also of being caught by the government and the caution that our interviewees consequently exercised was not unfounded. The government has funnelled significant resources into preventing undocumented working and in 2007 the government set out a 'seven point plan' to 'shut down illegal working' (Home Office, 2007: 3) of which a key strand was increased enforcement activities. These activities were bolstered, in 2008, by the creation of a 'watch list' of immigration offenders to be tracked down and local immigration teams were established to assist in this process (Home Office, 2008b). One of the implications of this intensified immigration control was, for our respondents, a concomitant intensification of the risks that were being taken by working without papers.

With their labour rendered a criminal act, some of the interviewees here could have been removed from the country if caught working. For others, as Peter explained, taking up employment could lead to financial penalties:

I myself have been caught twice. The first time they cut some of my NASS [National Asylum Support Service] money. Then you used to get about £38 a week. It got cut down to about £29. They said it will stay like that till 2015, until the money that I had earned had been repaid! That's what they tried to

imply [that his claim would not be resolved by this date]... The second time they cancelled all my support. Instead of cutting it down, they cut it all completely.⁷

Respondents also reported that employers, increasingly nervous about raids by enforcement authorities, are quick to use them as a justification for summary dismissal. Fabio has lost more than one job without warning when his then employers told him that he had to dismiss him quickly, as they suspected they were going to be investigated:

Sometimes I have worked for people for two or three weeks and they haven't paid me and have kicked me out. What can I do? Go fighting? Go make a complaint?

As he made clear, there was little that could be done to redress this situation (a point that we will turn to later). Instead, he was forced to accept that he had been made to work for no wages, and look elsewhere. The constant threat of immigration raids also disciplines workers in more subtle ways. In some cases workers reported that the threat of raids encouraged them to keep moving from job to job. Thandie related how she had adopted just such a strategy:

...sometimes you leave a job when you start getting that fear because when you are working illegally there is always the fear of 'what if they catch me?' At times, you have to work and you see maybe three or four people wearing suits and you think, 'oh, what if it is immigration'. And sometimes there is the gossip as well, the grapevine within the workplace, where people say, 'I think the Home Office, blah blah blah', and in most cases you will quit, to try to be on the safe side.

Peter discussed how an employment agency that he worked for would threaten to reveal the immigration status of those who wanted work, in order to quell any signs of dissent at conditions of work. 'I've often heard them threatening people over the counter, saying 'we are going to call immigration for you lot one day', he explained, adding that the subtext was clear: 'It was a threat – "push your luck and we will deal with you"'.

And as we saw in the previous section, employers used the vulnerability of workers quite explicitly to keep wages low. Hamad's experiences reinforce this point:

⁷ The National Asylum Support Service (NASS) was established through the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 and, effectively, separated asylum support from 'normal' welfare entitlements. In 2008, the new UK Border Agency incorporated the functions of NASS.

...the only thing we can find is black jobs, building, chicken and chips or whatever. And these people they do not ask for nothing, they treat you really badly, even for £2 [per hour]. You can't ask them for money. If you ask them two or three times, the next day you go, you are fired. And where do you go? There is nobody to look after you. So you have to keep quiet.

Complaining, or organising any form of action against mistreatment or work conditions is consequently avoided by many of those who cannot risk discovery by the authorities. 'We can't complain because we are doing a 'black job', Amir explained. 'We can't do anything, we don't want trouble. We had trouble, that's why we came here. We don't want any more trouble'. And even where employers do not know that their staff do not have permission to work any abuse that undocumented workers suffer may nonetheless be borne in silence.

For all of the reasons outlined in this chapter, then, undocumented workers are frequently given the worst tasks to do and subordinated within their places of work. Or as Joseph put it 'if they know you haven't got a paper they treat you different. They give you the crap jobs'.

This report has so far analysed the precarious position of workers in general, and has indicated how their working lives are made precarious at the level of the labour market and at the level of the workplace. It has also demonstrated how this precariousness is intensified by coercive state practices that are aimed at controlling immigration. The following chapter explores the specific effects of this structural vulnerability upon health and safety conditions experienced by workers.

The Wages of Fear: risk, safety and undocumented work

CHAPTER 3: THE VIOLENT CONSEQUENCES OF PRECARIOUS WORK

THE VIOLENT CONSEQUENCES OF PRECARIOUS WORK

There is little conclusive evidence that migrant workers are intrinsically more at risk of injury and death than other workers. What is known is that migrant work tends to be concentrated in sectors that are casualised and, by definition, relatively dangerous (Lee and Wrench, 2000; Wrench and Lee, 2002). And within the most dangerous sectors, migrant workers tend to be particularly vulnerable. One recent study showed that migrant workers are at least twice as likely to be killed in the UK construction industry (Centre for Corporate Accountability, 2009).

In the UK employers are universally bound by health and safety law, regardless of the status of their workers. Furthermore the Health and Safety Executive and local authority safety enforcement departments are responsible for protecting all workers. In other words, in law there is no distinction made between the regulatory protections granted to documented and undocumented workers.

In practice, however, undocumented workers are much less likely to be aware of or benefit from legal provisions put in place to protect them. As Warshaw (1998: 24.11) notes:

The informal or ‘undocumented’ sector includes workers who agree to work ‘off the books’ – that is, without any formal registration or employer/employee arrangement...The employer’s responsibility for informal worker’s health and safety is only implicit, at best, and is often denied.

Risks to the health of undocumented workers are constituted by the precarious nature of the labour market and labour process. It is in this context that we have to understand the very high rate of injuries workers are exposed to. Nine respondents reported having been injured (sometimes on multiple occasions) or having been made acutely ill by work. Two respondents who had not been injured themselves reported having witnessed a workmate being injured.

Injuries resulting from work reported in the interviews are set out as follows:

Chemical irritation/burn	3
Burn as a result of scalding by water/cooking oil	2
Burn as a result of exposure to oven	1
Crushing	2
Injury as a result of fall	1
Injury as a result of heavy lifting	1
Cut requiring stiches	1

THE VIOLENT CONSEQUENCES OF PRECARIOUS WORK

Most respondents reported very poor health and safety protection in the workplace. Some reported a reckless approach to protecting the workforce on the part of their employer. According to Amir this was often a function of working for small contractors on a cash-in-hand basis:

They did nothing. For health and safety you need money. You need money first. But he hasn’t got money. He is just doing small contracts. He hasn’t even got a van.

Mohammed noted of his time working in a kitchen ‘my boss cared more about money than about people. Well, more than people with no permission to work’. Whilst Hamad, who also worked in a kitchen, said:

Nobody ever mentions health and safety. What concerns them is to get the job done. If you get burnt, hurt, they don’t care about that. They want to do the job and you have to do it. Anything you are told, you have to do it.

Hamad’s comments on his employer are not untypical of the experience of undocumented workers.

In UK law, employers have responsibilities to ensure the provision and exchange of information that enables employees to be properly informed about risks and health hazards and to provide appropriate training.

The Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 and the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999, require employers to provide necessary information, instruction, training and supervision on health and safety during work time. The law specifies situations where health and safety training is particularly important, for example when people start new jobs, or are exposed to new or increased risks. In law, safety training requirements are likely to apply particularly to migrant workers who find themselves working in unfamiliar environments. Yet none of our respondents received anything approximating to the type of safety training required by law. Three respondents reported some form of communication on safety issues. One who worked in construction reported that he was given safety briefings on a regular basis and one reported that he had regular ‘safety talks’ at a factory he worked at. Another respondent reported receiving safety leaflets written in English.

The Safety Representatives and Safety Committees Regulations 1977 and the Health and Safety (Consultation with Employees) Regulations 1996 require employers to establish mechanisms to consult employees, or their representatives, on health and safety issues. In circumstances where there is no trade union recognition (which was the case for all of our respondents), the regulations allow for the company to choose

between a system of consultation through safety reps elected by the workforce or a system of direct consultation. Yet none of our respondents reported having been involved in any workplace safety consultation mechanism.

Respondents drew attention to a range of problems in relation to their ability to raise safety issues with their employer on a day to day business. Only two of our respondents reported having been able to raise safety issues with their employer freely in any of the jobs they had in the UK. Richard reported:

We couldn't open our mouths because the point is we have no right to open our mouths. If we did open our mouths, if we did talk, we would be just asked to leave work. Like I told you, there are thousands waiting outside for our jobs. Thousands of people who cannot legally work, they are waiting for a chance to get any work.

Tommy pointed out a rather different dimension to the silencing of undocumented workers. He experienced some racist insults during his work leafleting the streets and noted how his ability to defend himself was undermined by his status: 'You can't say anything because you are not legal.'

The only form of consultation was reported by Peter who explained how safety concerns were channelled through the agency he worked for, rather than being dealt with in the workplace:

If you are on a building site and something goes wrong, you have to come back to the office in the evening to get paid. Before you get paid, you have to sign this sheet where you make all complaints and whatever....Occasionally it worked. Sometimes you would get sent back to the same job. Or sometimes they would say 'if you don't do it, then we will send someone else.' There is always someone else to take your job.

Lack of safety equipment was reported by almost all respondents. The key piece of legislation in relation to the use of protective equipment in the workplace is the Personal Protective Equipment at Work Regulations (1992). In law, personal protective equipment should be supplied that is appropriate for the task and for the substances to which it is applied. A failure to comply with those regulations was indicated in almost all cases. Abdul, for example, worked in a freezer storage unit and was not provided with any specialist warm clothing. All of those who had worked on building sites and almost all of those who worked in other sectors reported that they were expected to provide their own safety equipment.

Joseph, who worked as a cleaner for a number of agencies reported that protective gloves were sometimes provided, but:

It depends on which agency. Some they don't bother. Some they will ask you to go clean with no gloves, you go and clean and you clean toilets without gloves. Some care, but some don't.

For Thandie a lack of protective gloves led directly to severe itching and blistering of her skin:

Well I have been in a situation where I was a kitchen porter and there was this detergent that reacted on my skin, whilst I was doing the dishes, it reacted on my skin. I think there was no health and safety there. We were not advised to wear gloves or anything and I had to leave the job just for my own health. I felt I was damaging my hands, so I had to leave the job. I stayed for a bit but after a few weeks I had to leave because it was getting worse and worse.

Many of the injuries reported by respondents were serious enough to require immediate medical treatment. Yet only one worker reported that his employer had arranged for medical treatment or transportation to a hospital or doctor. In this case, Peter, who was working in a warehouse loading television sets, cut his finger on a glass screen. He was immediately taken to hospital and the incident was logged in his employer's accident book.

More often, employers actively discourage the emergency services being called and in many cases, workers were simply told to leave the premises when they were injured. As Richard noted:

They can't. They will never do it, especially the owner. Sometimes the owner will never be in the shop 24 hours a day, when the owner hears about this stuff he will just say, don't call anyone. He knows that he's got illegal men working for him so if the police come he will be in trouble. He will never call the authorities because they are not legal. So he will pay a fine and the worker will go to prison, so none of them will want to go to the police, not even the injured person.

Fabio, working in a catering job, reported a serious injury where a fellow worker sustained head injuries after falling onto the corner of the table. His employer did not call an ambulance and the worker had to bandage himself and make his own way to hospital. When Fabio was asked if he would ever call the emergency services from work following a serious incident, he replied:

Well it depends how bad you are. If you are dying, then you would have no choice but to call them. If it's not an excessive injury, if it's not a massive injury then no because you don't want to fuck your job. You don't want anyone to know you are working.

Similarly, Mike noted that emergency services would not be called unless the injury was a life-threatening one:

Even if you get some injury that you keep, you do not inform anybody else because you don't have the right to do that job...Unless someone is unconscious. You would be obliged to announce that to save a life. Otherwise you keep it secret.

Mohammad, working as a kitchen porter, suffered serious scalding when a pan of boiling water was spilled over his arm. He requested that an ambulance be called, but his employer refused. Instead, his fellow workers bandaged his arm. Mohammed couldn't use his arm for eight weeks afterwards and when he returned to work, his employer told him that he had been replaced and could not have his old job back.

It is common for workers attending hospital to invent a story about their injury to prevent anyone finding out it was sustained at work. According to Richard:

I know one guy who was working with me in the shop where I was. A fridge freezer fell on his legs and he had no papers, no insurance, no nothing, so they just took him down to the hospital, said he was a friend and that he had fallen down in the house.

Respondents reported that both employers and employees would avoid calling emergency services to ensure that they would not risk detection by the authorities. Several workers reported covering up their own injuries as well as those of fellow workers. Hamad, recalling a serious incident that was not reported, explained:

I used to work in a chicken and chips place and this guy burned himself, his face his body...with oil. He put some water in the place where you cook chips by mistake and it started burning his face, his body. Now maybe half his face is gone, and he can't do anything. If the doctor asks he will just say he has been cooking.

In this case, no emergency services were called. Hamad explained why:

...if you don't have papers, you can't call the police, you can't call an ambulance, because they will come to the accident and they will ask you who you are. If the police know who you are then you could get into trouble. Better that you

get £2 an hour than you are put in prison. Even if you call an ambulance they may investigate, ask what really happened. So we avoid them, to avoid these problems.

Bekele reported an injury sustained by a worker stacking magazines in a warehouse. The worker's finger was severed and, eventually, almost amputated. His fellow workers bandaged him and then drove him to a doctor rather than call an ambulance.

As previous sections of this report have highlighted, undocumented workers live in constant fear of discovery by the authorities. The fear of discovery combines with an awareness that there is no shortage of other workers who are prepared to work for low wages and poor conditions to produce acute vulnerability. The vulnerability of their position prevents them from making complaints to their employers about safety conditions, and prevents those workers from even contemplating contacting trade unions or government authorities such as the Health and Safety Executive in cases where they feel they are being made to take unnecessary risks.

The Wages of Fear: risk, safety and undocumented work

CONCLUSION

The working lives of undocumented workers betray the realities of flexible working and, for the vast majority of undocumented workers there is little or no option but to continue working in exploitative, dangerous, and oppressive conditions. A complex set of factors – albeit differing in particular contexts – ensure that vulnerability is consolidated. Whilst for others, their immigration status locks them into a form of perennial servitude.

Many ‘refused’ asylum seekers are pushed into a psychological limbo where their presence has been criminalised (see Burnett, 2008), but they will not, or cannot, return to the country they fled from. And it is these factors which underpin their precariousness within the labour market.

The asylum seekers in this report who work ‘illegally’ risk imprisonment and, ultimately, refused asylum seekers risk deportation. These are risks that the respondents in this study were well aware of. The fear of being discovered by immigration authorities acted as a disciplinary mechanism that reaches into all aspects of the labour process: the enforcement of low wages, long working hours and poor safety conditions. In stark contrast to government rhetoric about work-life balances and mutual employment consensuses these are the realities of flexible working.

Flexicurity means the transfer of risks from employers to employees, but not just the economic risks normally identified in the literature. The trade-off here is a much more human one where economic flexibility is exchanged for increasing the physical risks experienced by undocumented workers. Of the fourteen interviewees, nine had been seriously injured whilst at work. Others who had not been injured had witnessed incidences where their workmates had suffered.

This study has explored an indeterminate space between health and safety law and immigration law which illustrates a basic contradiction at the heart of the state. This is a contradiction of law enforcement that ensures legal health and safety protections for workers are directly undermined by the enforcement of immigration law. The protection of the workforce is compromised by tougher immigration enforcement in two ways.

First, it impacts upon the relationship between workers and employers at the level of the workplace. Tougher responses of the state to immigration act to produce a more compliant workforce, ever fearful that they risk arrest and deportation. Where this fear intensifies, unscrupulous employers are in a strong position to exploit workers and drive down standards of working conditions. Indeed, the threat of immigration raids makes it less likely that workers will make demands on their employers

CONCLUSION

for safe working practices and the provision of safety training. Second, risks to workers are created because immigration raids, rather than health and safety raids constitute the greatest threat to the existence of a firm employing undocumented workers. The UK Health and Safety Executive is woefully overstretched as it is, and for almost a decade now has faced intensified political attacks upon its ability to enforce the law in the 'regular' sectors (Tombs and Whyte, 2008). The task of protecting undocumented workers is one that is currently way beyond its means. It is therefore not the Health and Safety Executive but the UK Border Agency that the most exploitative employers fear. Under such conditions, securing compliance with universal health and safety legislation is barely feasible.

In a grotesque twist of the idea that flexibilisation can satisfy the mutual interests of employers and employees, some respondents reported that they needed to be constantly on the move between jobs, to avoid discovery by the authorities and its consequences (at best the loss of their livelihood and at worst, deportation). The desire for flexibilisation in our sample is therefore not born out of a desire for a particular type of lifestyle, and is not a consequence of the free choice of workers, but is a result of the ever present threat of state violence. Flexibilisation in this context can only be understood as a process that results from the structural degradation of working conditions on the one hand, and the violence of immigration control strategies on the other.

The vulnerability of undocumented workers is structured by a combination of government policies on labour market regulation and border control. As we have seen, this political combination has brutal consequences for undocumented workers: there can be no doubt that systematic disregard for basic safety rights has exposed workers to unbearably high thresholds of risk of injury and death; and often severe injuries are hidden by employers and by workers themselves to the point that emergency treatment is eschewed for fear of discovery.

This pattern of structural subordination cannot be simply understood, as the government would have it, as a consequence of rogue employers who tarnish the reputation of the majority of responsible businesses (Home Office, 2008c). Neither can it be blamed upon language difficulties or cultural differences (Anderson and Rogaly, 2005). And it certainly cannot be blamed upon the choices made by irregular migrants themselves. Undocumented workers are injured and killed by intensified working conditions, conditions that are re-enforced by a lack of legal protections.

It is the political strategy followed by state institutions that ensures those legal protections are not upheld and in turn are systematically undermined by this brutal combination of labour market and immigration policy. We cannot know whether

CONCLUSION

the consequences of this policy are intended or unintended by its architects. But this report has begun to show how the origins of the violent subordination and victimisation of this section of the workforce can be found in the careful planning and execution of government policy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahmed, K (2010) 'GE chief attacks 'damaging' UK immigration cap', *Daily Telegraph*, 18 September.

Anderson, B and Rogaly, B (2005) *Forced Migration and Labour to the UK*, London: Trades Union Congress.

Bijwaard, G. E. and Veenman, J. (2008) 'Unequal Chances on a Flexible Labor Market, the Case of the Netherlands', *Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper TI 2008-005/4*, Rotterdam, Tinbergen Institute.

Bilefsky, D. (2007) 'EU "blue card" seeks to attract highly skilled immigrants', *International Herald Tribune*, 23 October, <http://www.ihf.com/articles/2007/10/23/business/card.php>

Branigan, T. (2005) 'Illegal immigrants could top half a million', *Guardian Unlimited*, 1 July, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2005/jul/01/immigration.immigrationandpublicservices1>

Burnett, J. (2007) 'Section 4 Support', *PAFRAS Briefing Paper No.1*, Leeds: PAFRAS.

Burnett, J. (2008) 'The Criminalisation of Diversity', *Criminal Justice Matters*, 74, 26-27.

Castles, S. (2006) 'Guestworkers in Europe: A Resurrection?', *International Migration Review*, 40(4), 741-766.

Centre for Corporate Accountability (2009) *Migrants' Workplace Deaths in*

Britain, London: Centre for Corporate Accountability.

European Commission (2007) *Towards Common Principles of Flexicurity: more and better jobs through flexibility and security*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

European Council (2000) *Lisbon European Council 23 and 24 March 2000: Presidency Conclusions*, Luxembourg: European Parliament.

Gordon, I. Scanlon, K. Travers, T. and Whitehead, C. (2009) *Economic impact on the London and UK economy of an earned regularisation of irregular migrants to the UK*, London: Greater London Authority.

HM Treasury (2005) *Globalisation and the UK: Strength and Opportunity to meet the Economic Challenge*, London: HM Treasury.

Home Office (2007) *Shutting Down Illegal Working in the UK: Illegal Working Action Plan Update and Next Steps*, London: Home Office.

Home Office (2008a) 'Government's response to the House of Lords Committee's report on the economic impacts of migration', *Home Office News*, 11 June. <http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/newsarticles/economicimpactmigration>

Home Office (2008b) 'Local immigration teams launched', *Home Office News*, 19 June, <http://www>.

homeoffice.gov.uk/about-us/news/local-immigration-teams

Home Office (2008c) 'Preventing Illegal Working', *Home Office*, Downloaded 24 October, <http://ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/employers/preventingillegalworking/>

IDC (2008) 'IDC Predicts the Number of Worldwide Mobile Workers to Reach 1 Billion by 2011', *IDC Press Release*, 15 January. <http://www.idc.com/getdoc.jsp?containerId=prUS21037208>

ILO (2004) '86 million migrants workers active in global economy, says report', *International Labour Organization Press Release*, 21 May, http://www.ilo.org/global/About_the_ILO/Media_and_public_information/Press_releases/lang--en/WCMS_005197/index.htm

Kundnani, A. (2007a) *The End of Tolerance: Racism in 21st Century Britain*, London: Pluto Press.

Kundnani, A. (2007b) 'Rights not rhetoric', *Guardian Online*, 2 November, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2007/nov/02/rightsnotrhetoric>

Lawrence, F. (2004) 'Wanted: workers who are flexible, cheap, expendable', *Guardian Online*, 9 February, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2004/feb/09/globalisation.immigration>

Lee, J. and Wrench, J. (1980) 'Accident-Prone Immigrants: an assumption

challenged', *Sociology*, vol. 14, no. 4, 551-566.

Lima, H. E. (2006) 'Under the Realm of Precariousness: slavery and the meaning of freedom of labour in the nineteenth century', *Topoi – Revista de História*, 2, 1-34.

McFadden, P (2007) *Speech to BERR Globalisation and Labour Market Conference as Minister for Employment Relations and Postal Affairs*, BERR Conference Centre, London, 13 December, <http://www.berr.gov.uk/aboutus/ministerialteam/Speeches/page42940.html>.

Monastiriotis, V. (2006) *Employment Flexibility and UK Regional Unemployment: Persistence and Macroeconomic Shocks*, Employment Relations Research Series, 65, London: Department of Trade and Industry.

Neilson, B. and Rossiter, N. (2005) 'From Precarity to Precariousness and Back Again: Labour, Life and Unstable Networks', *Fibreculture*, 5.

Pai, H-H. (2008) *Chinese Whispers: The true story behind Britain's reserve army of labour*, London: Penguin.

Peck, J. and Theodore, N. (2000) 'Commentary. "Work First": workfare and the regulation of contingent labour markets', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, vol. 24, no. 1.

Peck, J. and Theodore, N. (2001) 'Exporting workfare/importing welfare-to-work: exploring the politics of

Third Way policy transfer', *Political Geography*, vol. 20, no. 4.

Puybaraud, M. (2007) *Flexible Working Survey 2007 Five Years of Learning*, Hampshire: Johnston Controls Ltd.

Ram, M. Edwards, P. and Jones, T. (2002) *Employers and Illegal Migrant Workers in the Clothing and Restaurant Sectors*, London: Department of Trade and Industry Central Research Unit.

Raunig, G. (2004) 'La inseguridad vencerá. Anti-Precariousness Activism and Mayday Parades', *European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policies*, <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0704/raunig/en>

Tombs, S. and Whyte, D. (2007) *Safety Crimes*, Cullompton, Devon: Willan.

Tombs, S. and Whyte, D. (2008) *The Crisis in Enforcement: the decriminalisation of death and injury at work*, London: Crime and Society Foundation.

Trades Union Congress (2008) *Take a Break! Your Working Time Rights*, Downloaded 30 September, http://www.tuc.org.uk/tuc/rights_takeabreak.cfm#Know_your_working_time_rights

United Nations (2006) *Trends in Total Migrant Stock: The 2005 Revision*, New York: United Nations.

Warshaw, L (1998) *Precarious Labour and Child Employment*, in Stellman, J (ed.) *Encyclopaedia of Occupational Health and Safety*, Geneva: International Labour Office.

Wrench, J. and Lee, J. (1982) 'Piecework and Industrial Accidents: two contemporary case studies', *Sociology*, vol. 16, no. 4, 512-525.

APPENDIX 1: SAMPLE AND METHODS

Undocumented work is, by definition, illegal work. As a result research access to this population is extremely difficult and the subject matter tackled by this report, highly sensitive. All of the respondents were selected through contacts developed through PAFRAS. Every one of the respondents, at the time of interview, was seeking asylum but their claim had been rejected. Some had submitted fresh evidence in support of their claim. As a result, the interviewees did not make up a wholly representative sample of undocumented workers (many undocumented workers are not seeking asylum). The research sample, however, was underpinned by the highly sensitive nature of the research questions, and the availability of interviewees. All of the respondents were living in the North of England at the time of interview. The fourteen respondents for this report were all interviewed between June and September 2008. As Table 1 below shows, all of them were either in employment at the time of interview, or have worked previously whilst in the UK without legal permission to do so.

The interviews all lasted between 30-60 minutes and were semi-structured around an interview schedule. The interviewees were asked to sign a consent form before the interview, after the purpose of the research was explained in detail. All interviewees were assured that their names and the names of any of their employers would not be mentioned. All of the interviews were conducted on the premises of an asylum support agency. Interviewees were also asked to adopt a pseudonym for the purposes of this research. Interviews were recorded on audio tape and interviewees were told that they could stop the interview at any point, or refuse to answer any question if they chose to do so.

All of the interviewees had reached a negative decision on their asylum claim but different interviewees were in receipt of varying entitlements. All of the respondents, when working, were either awaiting a decision on their asylum claim, in receipt of 'Section 4' support,⁸ or were left completely without support. One respondent stopped working when he began to receive support from his local authority.⁹

⁸Section 4 of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 refers to temporary support available to 'refused' asylum seekers who are destitute but fulfil one of the following criteria of agreeing to leave the UK 'voluntarily', cannot be returned due to medical reasons, have made an application for a judicial review of their case, or must be provided with accommodation in order to avoid a breach of their Convention Rights within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998. Single recipients of Section 4 support normally receive £35.39 per week which can be spent through an 'Azure' payment card. These cards can only be used in certain supermarkets and retail shops. For discussion of Section 4 support, see Burnett (2007). At all stages of the asylum process people do not have permission to take up employment. ⁹Under S. 21 of the National Assistance Act 1948 an individual who has no recourse to public funds can be assessed by their local authority, in order to establish whether they are classed as 'destitute plus' (i.e are at risk of significant harm if accommodation is not provided). Local authority support provides accommodation and financial support.

Interviewee	Age	Nationality	Gender	Immigration Status	Present employment at time of Interview	Has the interviewee been injured at work?	Number of jobs done in the UK	Wages
Mohammad	25-29	Sudanese	Male	Refused asylum seeker - section 4 support	Not working	Yes	1	£30 a day - 12 hours a day (£2.50 p/h)
Bekele	25-29	Ethiopian	Male	Refused asylum seeker - section 4 support	Not working	No	1 and numerous with an agency	£5.25p/h (highest amount) - one job £5p/h but the agency
Abdul	25-29	Iranian	Male	Refused asylum seeker - no support	Working	Yes	Unsure - 5+	Between £30 - £40 per day, working 8-10 hours a day
Hamad	20-24	Sudanese	Male	Refused asylum seeker - section 4 support	Not working	Yes	Unsure - 5+	Highest £3 p/h. Lowest £2.50 p/h
Amir	40-44	Iranian	Male	Refused asylum seeker - no support	Working	Yes	Unsure - less than 5	12 hours or more a day for £40 (3.33 p/h maximum)
Peter	25-29	Zimbabwean	Male	Refused asylum seeker - section 4 support	Not working	Yes	Unsure - 5+	Minimum wage 'or slightly above if you were lucky'
Mansoor	40-44	Iranian	Male	Refused asylum seeker - no support	Not working	No	2	40 hours a week for £150 (3.75 p/h)
Tommy	25-29	Libyan	Male	Refused asylum seeker - no support	Working	No	1	£20 a day - between 5 and 10
Thandie	30-34	Zimbabwean	Female	Refused asylum seeker - no support	Not working	Yes	Unsure - 5+	Maximum 80 hours a week for £400 (£5 p/h)
Nelson	25-29	Zimbabwean	Male	Refused asylum seeker - no support	Not working	No	4	Between £4.35 and £5.10 p/h
Mike	25-29	Eritrean	Male	Refused asylum seeker	Working	No	1	Between £2 and £3 p/h
Fabio	35-39	Iranian	Male	Refused asylum seeker - section 4 support	Not working	Yes	Unsure - 5+	Lowest £1.50 p/h and highest £5.50
Richard	25-29	Lebanese	Male	Refused asylum seeker - Social service support	Not working	Yes	2	Lowest £25 for 14 hours (£1.79 p/h). Highest £5 p/h
Joseph	30-34	Zimbabwean	Male	Refused asylum seeker - section 4 support	Not working	Yes	10+	Minimum wage

THE WAGES OF FEAR: RISK, SAFETY AND UNDOCUMENTED WORK