Northumbria Research Link

The contingencies of purposeful co-production: Researching new migrant

employment experiences in the North East of England

Abstract

This paper presents methodological reflections from a programme of empirical research across two distinct but related projects, which culminated in an examination of the employment experiences of new migrants in the North East of England. This mixed-methods research focussed on the position and experiences of migrants from Eastern European countries joining the EU in 2004 and 2007, and refugees and asylum seekers from a broad range of countries. Co-produced by an inter-disciplinary academic team, migrants living and working in the region and voluntary sector organisations involving and supporting migrants, the research looked to address gaps in evidence to support education, advocacy and service provision. The paper argues that while co-production has tremendous potential to traverse the borders of theory and action in pursuit of positive change in people's lives, careful consideration needs to be given to distinct incarnations and the manner in which co-production emerges through specific conditions and relationships. We identify the principles underpinning this research, but also illustrate how our approach developed over time into a form of *distributed-resource*, which was able to connect organisations, people and resources from varied sources around shared values and an interest in outcomes.

Introduction

This paper contributes to debates around co-produced research (Mason, 2015) and the challenges of conducting research with marginalised communities (Goodman and

Phillimore, 2012), by reflecting on a programme of research culminating in an examination of the employment experiences of new migrants in the North East of England. The research - designed, conducted, disseminated and refined through an inter-disciplinary and cross-sectoral partnership - looked to address evidence gaps regarding the experiences of migrant groups, thus contributing to education, advocacy and service provision. This is of particular significance in a peripheralised region impacted by uneven development, austerity (Clayton et al, 2016) and experiencing relative demographic change (Rienzo and Vargas-Silva, 2016). Rather than highlighting this as a model, we emphasise both the importance of the principles of co-production and the realities of research that threw up a number of structural and practical challenges.

The paper opens by discussing intersecting concepts of co-production. We then outline the research background and methodology, indicating the emergent character of co-production. With reference to key relationships and research directions, we then consider challenges faced and responses to them. In an era where collaboration is championed as a remedy to socio-economic problems and a demonstration of relevance (Armstrong and Allsop, 2010), consideration must be given to distinct incarnations through which co-production takes shape. We identify the approach emerging in this case as one of *distributed-resource*, which connected organisations, people and resources from varied sources around shared values and an interest in outcomes.

This paper was written by two academics, in discussion with other members of the research team. As such, it does not represent all perspectives within the team, but

rather explores challenges faced by academics engaging in co-production in a particular context.

Purposes and principles of co-production

In focussing on relevant aspects of co-production, we make a distinction, yet not separation, between (a) co-production in public service delivery and (b) co-production as *research practice*. Coined by Ostrom and Baugh (1973), co-production in the former sense related to active citizen participation, specifically in crime reduction in the US. Building on this from a civil rights perspective, Cahn (2004) highlighted the role of non-market economies in revealing 'limitations of government efforts to empower people for whom the market had no use' (Stephens et al 2008: 1) – with attention to time banking[i]. More recently in the UK, as the role of the state in the design and delivery of public services has been challenged, co-production characterises new governance networks (Rhodes, 1996), through which the production and consumption of services are 'increasingly inseparable' (Bovaird and Loeffler, 2013: 1).

Bovaird (2007) suggests this has resulted in positive outcomes including the widening of choice based upon personal experience, a transfer of power from professionals and the mobilization of alternative social capital. On the other hand, he highlights that contestations may emerge due to differing values and unclear responsibilities, that the capacity of non-state actors to retain independence may be undermined, and that public accountability may be compromised. Questions also remain regarding *who* gets included and *how*, as well as the differential desire to become involved. More critically, co-prodcution can be viewed as a manifestation of neoliberal logics; a transfer of risk and responsibility to communities in an era where the state as a vehicle

3

for economic development and social welfare is undermined. There are then both democratic possibilities, but also limits when co-prodcution is imposed through prevailing discourses such as austerity.

There are clear parallels with co-production when viewed *as research practice*. Specifically, the disruption of established power relations and questions regarding the locus of expertise. In this case with regard to research relations that are more horizontal than in conventional objectivist research (Pearce, 2008). In addition, there are also connections in terms of the challenges of participation related to resource, inclination, conflict/consensus, risk and responsibility.

Co-production *as research practice* is far from recent (Chambers 1994). Historical attempts to ensure research works beyond the academy, alongside more reflexive understandings of researcher/researched, are many and varied. This includes the work of social phycologists such as Lewin (Adelman, 1993), geographers such as Bunge (Fuller and Kitchen, 2004), the writings of popular educators like Freire (1970) and feminist scholars drawing attention to power imbalances within and beyond academia (Sharp, 2005). More recently, as part of a 'participatory turn' towards the democratisation of the research process (Gilchrist et al, 2015) those advocating a Participatory Action Research (PAR) approach have offered crucial contributions (Pain 2007). PAR looks to work *with* research participants (Heron and Reason, 2001) towards transformative research outcomes that advance causes, address problems raised by communities and bring tangible benefit.

In a context where issues of 'relevance' and 'usefulness' are in the spotlight (Armstrong and Allsop, 2010), there has been increasing interest in co-production. In

4

part, this reflects the 'impact agenda' of the UK Research Excellence Framework (REF)[ii], but is also in spite of it (Askins and Mason, 2015). Instrumental attention to co-production is problematic (Slater, 2012), but a renewed focus opens fresh consideration of its imperatives. This is exemplified in continued attention to public engagement and dialogue beyond the university in both sociology (Burawoy 2003) and geography (Fuller 2008).

In line with many of the tenets of PAR, Durose et al (2011), suggest co-production is characterised by those outside of academia taking greater control of research, sharing of expertise and working collaboratively towards outcomes that have discernible impact. Despite the clear crossover, Kagan (2013) argues what might distinguish co-production from PAR is recognition of the variability of participation, whilst retaining an emphasis on collaborative 'sense-making'. Pearce (2008) also contends that 'co-operative inquiry' does not *always* demonstrate strong participatory features. Nind (2014) uses the language of 'inclusive research' to commit to democratic, ethical and emancipatory principles, but exercises caution when thinking about the realities of commitment involved and the diversity of forms of participation apparent in the literature.

On reflection, our own research emerged around several working principles that speak to aspects of the discussion above:

1. People are experts in their own lives and are best positioned to articulate and interpret their experiences.

2. Understandings developed by frontline practitioners and community representatives through accumulated experience, can provide invaluable perspectives with which to contextualise individual experiences.

3. A commitment to public engagement as an iterative process, but beyond that to action aimed at helping to address challenges people face.

4. Commitment to take steps to avoid negative unintended consequences for those involved in the research.

5. To fulfil responsibilities, *not just* to those more directly involved, but also to wider collective interests.

These represent a commitment to collaboration as a means of bringing marginalised voices to the fore and challenging oppression through a unity of theory and action, conceptualised by Freire (1970) as *praxis* - speaking to concerns around dialogue, conscientization and informed action.

However, recognition of such principles does not mean their application is linear and straightforward. Commitment to participatory and action orientated research rightly sets the bar high, but there is a need to consider the circumstances under which different incarnations might emerge. When conducting research with marginalised communities, challenges entail degrees of adaptation. In this research some of the challenges encountered were structural, some practical, but they were also often emotional. This related to the political and ethical basis of *research interests* on behalf of academics involved (Gray, 2008), but also crucially to the investments by both those experiencing migration (Boccagnia and Baldassarb, 2015) and those looking to best support the interests of these communities (Clayton et al, 2015).

As Breitbart (2003) recognises, we need to consider what co-produced research might *actually entail*. This may differ from what research *looks like* based upon 'impact' criteria. We now outline this as applied to our research.

New migrants in the North East: practicing co-production

This research looked to establish a better understanding of the position and experiences of new migrants in North East England. It was mainly focused on the distinct and shared experiences of asylum seekers and refugees (after the UK dispersal policy was initiated in 1999) and migrants from post 2004 EU accession states[iii] and included 2 projects. The first explored day-to-day challenges facing migrants, through a participatory filmmaking methodology, and the second examined the position and experiences of new migrants within (and beyond) the regional workforce, employing a mixed-methods approach.

The first project was interested in how austerity conditioned daily challenges for migrants in a region suffering disproportionately and where ethnic diversity was *relatively* speaking not clearly established.[iv] A daylong exploratory workshop was organised via regional third sector organisations and facilitated by the lead academic. This brought together 18 migrants from a variety of migration routes and with various immigration statuses to engage in collective critical reflection (Freire, 1970). The views expressed by this one group of refugees, asylum seekers and 'migrant workers' were not entirely representative and due to recruitment through community groups, it is likely that more excluded migrants face challenges that are even more pressing than those explored through this research.[v]

However, by starting with the everyday challenges faced by migrants, rather than with predetermined themes dictated by researchers, a sound base for further exploration was established. Participants discussed issues of concern and ranked these to generate a set of themes for further discussion (principle 1). Through a process of negotiation (with some degree of narrowing down), three key themes were identified, which cut across the distinct experiences of those of different ages, genders, migration routes and immigration statuses. These were: (i) integration and discrimination, (ii) employment and unemployment/incapacity support and (iii) education. With the assistance of a professional filmmaker, participants produced short films to illustrate these experiences (Mann, 2006). A further workshop allowed for discussion of the films and connections between them and the workshop discussions. Participants made decisions about how the films should be edited into a montage. Summaries of the workshop discussions were presented alongside the resulting short film to two regional audiences and formed the basis for discussions with regional stakeholders.

Despite some positive feedback, some stakeholders expressed emotive and critical concerns including the breadth of this initial focus, the ability of participants to identify connections between personal challenges and broader conditions, the short-term character of the workshop and the suitability of the films as effective mediums to inform policy. This clearly presented some challenges in evaluating the course of the research, and weighing up the range of responsibilities towards those invested in the project and the principles mentioned above. In particular, tensions between Principles 1, 2 and 5, mediated by the limitations of the research process were apparent. To respect the concerns articulated as well as the ongoing work of support

organisations in the region, the montage film was withheld from further distribution (principles 4 and 5). Despite these issues, a shared priority emerged in relation to employment. This was evident in the workshop where significant intersections were identified between the three themes mentioned above. For example, discrimination was illustrated in the short films in relation to work based experiences and/or access to work. We were then able to continue relating to the concerns raised by participants, but move them forward through more focussed and detailed research with our partners. This process also provided an important learning experience for the academics involved, highlighting the importance of the iterative character of co-production (principle 3) and informing approaches to the second project.

It became apparent that there was little systematic research addressing employment related concerns in the North East (Stenning and Dawley, 2009; Crossley and Fletcher, 2013). While research had taken place (CoMedia 2005; Fitzgerald 2005; Pillai 2006), this mostly preceded the economic crisis of 2008. In discussion with two independent third sector partners in the region (Regional Refugee Forum (RRF) and International Community Organisation of Sunderland (ICOS)), who had raised these issues previously (Fletcher, 2011), a small grant was secured to explore them further. This second more substantial project therefore emerged through a combination of academic interest, pressing issues identified by migrants themselves and those prioritized by organisations within the regional voluntary and community sector (principle 5).

Through discussions around the kind of evidence policy makers would be most receptive to (principle 3), the project employed mixed methods in three stages. Firstly,

a questionnaire, completed by 402 migrants, gathered data on employment positions prior to and following arrival in the UK. Questions were refined in consultation with partners and members of an advisory board, including a small pilot. Survey responses were collected face-to-face and through self-completion via support agencies, drop-ins, migrant community organisations, English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) classes and workplaces across most of the region.

The second stage involved in depth semi-structured interviews with a diverse sample (n=27) of those who completed the questionnaires (principle 1). An additional seven people were interviewed who had not completed the survey but helped to fill gaps in the data. Six pilot interviews, were also included, making a total sample of 40. Interviews were conducted by academic members of the research team.

The third stage involved a process of verification and triangulation through in-depth interviews with stakeholders, support organisations and representatives from the public and third sectors (n=12) (principle 2). As part of these interviews preliminary findings were presented and interviewees were asked to comment on connections between these findings and their own experiential knowledge.

Following initial analysis and production of a preliminary report, a policy seminar was organised. This involved a panel session with a range of stakeholders asked to respond to the draft report, followed by workshops around key themes. The event allowed for dissemination of initial findings, but also treated attendees (some of whom were involved in earlier stages) as active participants (principle 5).[vi] Workshop discussions allowed for the further verification of findings, as well as drawing upon broader expertise (n=50) in fine tuning recommendations (principle 2). The seminar also

offered an opportunity to extend networks between organisations and individuals, including opportunities for participants to meet with support organisations (principle 3).[vii]

In the first project there was more of an emphasis on co-production with migrants themselves, but in the second project this shifted towards co-production with partner organisations and a range of other stakeholders in the region. Through this process we increasingly recognised the value of different kinds of expertise as complimentary - assisting in the co-production of policy relevant scholarship - but also the reality of commitment involved. We reflect on these issues below.

Intensities of participation and negotiated action

As Kagan (2013) suggests, co-production represents a spectrum of participation. The first project involved a brief but intensive form of direct participation (Pain and Francis, 2003) - listening to migrant voices as a route to agenda setting. The primary sources of data for the second project required vital contributions from participants. However, migrants themselves were not strictly 'decision makers' in the direction of the research (Bergold and Thomas, 2012).

The limited scope of the second project based upon our discussions with partners and our advisory board meant that engaging with participants at every stage was not possible or arguably desirable. It is rightly recognised that inclusive research involves the flattening of hierarchies of power (White et al, 2004). However, attempts to bring participants on board to the point of them becoming 'co-researchers' would have been partial, but also potentially exploitative (Campbell and Vanderhoven, 2016). This

is particularly true for those whose lives were often constrained by finances, time and other resources.

Rather, for *this research* at *this stage*, the central practical relationship was with the two partner organisations previously mentioned, our advisory board and other external organisations in the voluntary and community sector. Whilst established with their own aims and priorities, these organisations were not external to migrant communities. Rather in many ways they were *constitutive of them* – particularly in the case of our partners who were focussed on providing a voice for and run by members of those communities. We therefore need to be cautious when calculating what 'authentic' co-production looks like. The role of partners was crucial in providing an insight into the dominant pressures faced. Not only did this add to the quality and quantity of data generated, but it also provided an insight into practical relevance. A further layer of complexity was present, as in defining 'new migrants' we identify a heterogeneous population, who nevertheless share some experiences. Collaborating with partners from organisations working in different ways with different (yet intersecting) communities (one more focussed on the needs of asylum seekers and refugees and the other more focussed – but not exclusively – on the needs of EU migrants) helped in creating a dialogue and solidarity around these experiences.

To claim co-production is an entirely smooth process is of course disingenuous. As Jung et al (2012) demonstrate there are a number of potential tensions including levels of engagement, expectations, clarity over roles, unsought for results and the potential use of those results. The first project was marked by some of these – such as which issues should be emphasised, how experiences should be communicated and

responsibility for the research. In order to learn from this an independent chair was appointed to the advisory group and terms of reference were agreed to establish common understanding. The emphasis fell on where priorities and interests overlapped (Finney and Risbeth, 2006).

Underpinning the agreement was recognition of different forms of expertise members of the team could offer, but also recognition of different priorities and constraints. For the academics, there were responsibilities in meeting the requirements of the grant and expectations of specific outputs. For the non-academic partners the key priority was with producing outputs that aligned with their objectives, filled the gaps in data that enhanced advocacy, whilst not compromising those they supported. A principle of partnership and ongoing discussion was adopted, whilst recognising contributions would vary. This also allowed for the possibility of independence in the interpretation of data collected if required. In addition, the preliminary report and policy seminar presentation did not offer definitive recommendations. Rather, findings were discussed in a provisional format and event participants were asked to discuss and actively co-design recommendations.

Despite the desire of third sector partners to play an active role in the research, there were other factors that influenced the character of engagement. Recent years have seen severe curtailment of access to funding in the region (Clayton et al, 2015). This has acted as a brake upon some forms of participation and limited involvement to more advisory roles. As one partner indicated, for their organisation and for those who contribute time and effort voluntarily, the squeeze on/disappearance of funding, particularly Core Funding have had a considerable impact.

Most pressing was staff time and availability (Campbell and Vanderhoven, 2016), especially as our partners were working with those whose needs were often urgent. There were funds available to our partners to conduct certain activities, although these were limited due to the scale of the bid and, as with academic staff, did not cover staffing costs. Where this is the case, organisations must assess whether the time input required matches the outcomes for which the organisation is funded. As one partner expressed: *"…unless funded to deliver specific research actions the Voluntary and Community Sector can only really assist with advisory or steering group input, and to cascade information."* From the perspective of this organisation, the implications of this are of interest, suggesting *"…the USP [unique selling point] of each partner organisation needs to be carefully identified along with their current objectives and capacity, so that their actual role in the project can be designed to maximise their particular contribution. This could mean that some partners play a greater role that others…but all roles are offering unique value."* This allows us to see that forms of co-production are contingent upon the policy context in which partners operate, sometimes resulting in uneven, yet still crucial engagement. In addition, it raises the question of what we (as academics) are able to ask of external organisations and whether our expectations are reasonable or adequately thought through.

This project also involved working with colleagues across disciplines. Initially a sociologist and a geographer constituted the academic team, but this expanded to include those in Law and Business with interests in migrant self-employment and other research staff who became involved in analysis and dissemination activity. There has been considerable attention to competing orientations of partners inside and

outside of academia (Breitbart, 2003), but less to the participation of academic partners. In spite of different disciplinary traditions, shared links to practice-related research and interest in dimensions of migrants' working lives were most important. Challenges related to structural and practical limitations on participation.

Within UK post-1992 Universities[viii] - home to staff with different career trajectories and levels of engagement with research cultures, there are challenges for both finding time to research and to work collaboratively (Moore, 2003), challenges which are also gendered (Grant and Knowles, 2000). Certain roles were more prohibitive for some staff, especially those arriving later in the project, less experienced in conducting research and working to part-time contracts with heavy teaching workloads. This particularly reduced capacity to contribute to more strategic discussions and at certain points it was difficult to involve all members in decision making.

With regard to contributions made by both academics and 'external' partners, the second project shifted over its course from one concentrated on working intensively with a small number of individuals and organisations to one engaged with a wider range of organisations and drew upon a range of expertise and labour. That we could communicate through trusted organisations who had both professional and affective investments was crucial in relation to data collection and the refinement of the findings. For example, there was no funding to translate questionnaires but we were able to address a lack of participants with lower levels of English by asking intermediaries with appropriate skills to help. Organisations involved in data collection both welcomed the need for the research and acted in a protective role by

holding the research team to account and making important decisions such as who they felt might be appropriate participants.[ix]

To supplement our small grant, we also sourced pots of money from our respective departments to enhance the project, for example through incentives and additional staffing. Effectively the project became a *distributed-resource*[x] project, one characterised by a number of uneven yet vital dispersed contributions towards a shared goal. This division of labour, skills, interests and expertise can be seen as one way of co-producing impactful research (in a broad sense), whilst also navigating a context of resource pressure faced by all partners and stakeholders. Of course such contributions were made in good faith and therefore carried a tremendous responsibility to ensure the research was beneficial. This became a necessary practical aspect of the project in order to achieve its objectives, but was also underpinned by principles for more rigorous, inclusive and public research. While the longer-term benefits are currently hard to assess, participants were keen to play a part in raising the profile of these issues, moments of positive connection between migrants and support organisation were facilitated and those attending the policy seminar were optimistic about how the research might inform their own future work.

Conclusions

This paper raises questions of who gets involved and how they get involved in co-produced research, drawing on a research project interested in the experiences of new migrants in North East England. We highlight this as a reflection on the challenges and contingencies of such a process. For this research there were a number of structural and practical dimensions including: responses to earlier critiques and

discussions regarding the direction of the research; the requirements for specific data; the scale of the project; the character of the organisations involved; the issues at stake and the broader constraints acting on all 'producers' in a resource pressured context. In addition, it is important to recognize many of the challenges faced were also affective–revolving around research relationships, investments and emotional labour involved in attempting to maintain an 'equal conversation' (Nind, 2014).

It is clear then that there is not one 'pure' or ready-made form of co-production (Breitbart, 2003: 175). For this research, different elements and intensities of participation by individuals positioned within migrant communities, partners and other stakeholders were involved at different stages, resulting in what might be characterised as an uneven, but nevertheless valuable, distributed-resource project. This was a result of ongoing negotiations between a range of actors, which came down to what we had in common and what we are able to contribute. Of course, this raises questions about whose voices get heard and how research may take different courses dependent on the identity of academic and non-academic partners – categories which are too broad to generalise across. Through reflexive approaches informed by the principles outlined earlier, there was a largely successful attempt here to balance and layer contributions. While individual migrants themselves were not the *primary* co-producers, in the final instance their voices and experiences were centre stage.

Co-production also varied in process and product. Whilst crucially important to the integrity of co-produced research, emphasis placed on the process of inclusive research may lead to neglect of what emerges from it. One of the principles guiding this work was a sense of responsibility both to direct participants, but also to broader

collective interests. Co-production as product was particularly important in providing an enhanced evidence base. The manner in which the research was disseminated, but also refined through stakeholder participation also allowed for dialogue between academia, the third sector and the policy and funding realm to be reinforced, including representatives from government departments.

Academic and non-academic partners can sustain mutual benefit from working together, both as a result of financial and political pressures, but also to address shared concerns. We emphasise that collaboration, even when based around principles of co-production, entails a certain 'messiness' that comes from an emergent process of working with others (Askins and Pain, 2011). In many ways this should be valued for providing valuable lessons and new insights (Cook, 2009), but it also speaks to the constraints acting upon such ways of working including prevailing contexts of funding, tensions between principles and practicalities, the emotive character of social research and the requirements and interests of those involved. Recognition of this can only facilitate more effective co-production that is in the interests of those at the sharp end of processes under investigation.

References

Adelman C 1993 Kurt Lewin and the Origins of Action Research, *Educational Action Research* 1 1 7-24

Armstrong F and Alsop A 2010 Debate: Co-production can contribute to research impact in the social sciences *Public Money & Management* 30 4 208-210

Askins K and Mason K 2015 Us and Us: Agonism, Non-Violence and the Relational Spaces of Civic Activism *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* 14 2

Askins K and Pain R 2011 Contact zones: participation, materiality, and the messiness of interaction *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29 5: 803-821

Clayton J Donovan C and Merchant J 2015 Emotions of austerity: Care and commitment in public service delivery in the North East of England *Emotions, Space and Society* 14: 24-32

Clayton J Donovan C and Merchant J 2016 Distancing and limited resourcefulness: Third sector service provision under austerity localism in the North East of England *Urban Studies* 53 4 : 723-740

Bergold J and Thomas S 2012 Participatory Research Methods: A Methodological Approach in Motion *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 13 1

Boccagnia P and Baldassarb L 2015 Emotions on the move: Mapping the emergent field of emotion and migration *Emotion, Space and Society* 16 73–80

Bovaird T 2007 Beyond Engagement and Participation: User and Community Coproduction of Public Services. *Public Administration Review*, 67: 846–860

Bovaird T and Loeffler E 2013 *We're all in this together: harnessing user and community co-production of public outcomes* University of Birmingham, Institute of Local Government Studies

http://www.sharedservicearchitects.co.uk/write/Documents/Community_Co-Production_of_Services_-_2013.pdf

Breitbrat M M 2013 Participatory research methods in **Clifford N J** and **Valentine G** eds *Key Methods in* Geography Sage London 161-178

Burawoy M 2003 Public sociologies *Social Forces* 82 1603–18

Cahn E 2004 *No more throwaway people: the co-production imperative* Washington DC Essential Books

Campbell H and Vanderhoven D 2016 *N8/ESRC Research Programme: Knowledge That Matters: Realising the Potential of Co-Production* Economic and Social Research Council

Chambers R 1994 The Origins and Practice of Participatory Rural Appraisal *World Development* 4 7 953-969

CoMedia 2005 *The Intercultural City: making the most of diversity - A study for One North East into The Attraction and Retention of Migrants to the Tyne and Wear City Region.*

Cook T 2009 The purpose of mess in action research: building rigour though a messy turn *Educational Action Research* 17 2 227-291

Crossley S and Fletcher G 2013 *Written out of the picture? The role of local services in tackling child poverty amongst asylum seekers and refugees*, North East Child Poverty Commission and Regional Refugee Forum North East.

Durose C Beebeejaun Y Rees J Richardson J and Richardson L 2011 *Towards co-production in research with communities: Scoping study report to AHRC Connected Communities Programme* AHRC Swindon

www.ahrc.ac.uk/FundingOpportunities/Pages/connectedcommunities.aspx

Finney N and Rishbeth C 2006 Engaging with Marginalised Groups in Public Open Space Research: The Potential of Collaboration and Combined Methods *Planning Theory & Practice* 7 1 27-46

Fitzgerald I 2005 *Migrant Workers in the North East of England* Northern TUC and Northumbria University.

Fletcher G 2011. *Skilled: Finding routes for Refugees to use their skills and experience and contribute to the North East region's economic future* Regional Refugee Forum North East

Freire P 1970 *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* Continuum London

Fuller D 2008 Public geographies: taking stock *Progress in Human Geography* 1–11

Fuller D and Kitchen R Ed 2004 Radical theory/critical praxis**:** making a difference beyond the academy? 1-20 Praxis (e)press

Gilchrist P Holmes C Lee A Moore N and Ravenscroft N 2015 Co-designing non-hierarchical community arts research: the collaborative stories spiral *Qualitative Research Journal* 15 4 459 – 471

Goodman L and Phillimore J Eds 2012 *Community research for participation: From theory to method* Policy Press Bristol

Grant B and Knowles S 2000 Flights of imagination: academic women becoming writers, *International Journal of Academic Development* 5 1 6–19

Gray B 2008 Putting Emotion and Reflexivity to Work in Researching Migration, *Sociology* 42 5 935–952

Heron J and Reason P 2001 The Practice of Co-operative Inquiry: Research with rather than on people in Reason P and Bradbury H eds *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice* Sage London 179-188

Jung T Harrow J and Pharoah C 2012 *Co-producing research: working together or falling apart?* CGAP Briefing Note 8

http://www.cgap.org.uk/uploads/Briefing%20Papers/CGAP%20Briefing%20Note%208%20-%20Co-producing%20research.pdf

Kagan C 2013 *Co-production of research: for good or ill?* Edge Hill University,

http://espace.mmu.ac.uk/609524/1/Co%20production%20reserach%20ormskirk%20b%2013.pdf

Mann K 2006 *Connecting Futures Through Film: The evaluative story of the focUS – connecting futures participatory video project* ICAR London

http://icar.livingrefugeearchive.org/ConnectingFuturesThroughFilm.pdf

Mason K 2015 Participatory Action Research: Coproduction, Governance and Care. *Geography Compass* 9 497–507

Moore S 2003 Writers' retreats for academics: exploring and increasing the motivation to write *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 27 3 333-342

Nind M 2014 *What is inclusive research?* Bloomsbury London

Ostrom E and Baugh W H 1973 *Community Organization and the Provision of Police Services* Beverly Hills Sage

Pain R and Francis P 2003 Reflections on participatory research *Area* 35 46–54

Pain R 2007 *Participatory action research approaches and methods: Connecting people, participation and place* Routledge London

Pearce J 2008 *We Make Progress Because We are Lost': Critical Reflections on Co-producing Knowledge as a Methodology for Researching Non-Governmental Public Action*, Non-Governmental Public Action Programme Working Paper 27, http://www.lse.ac.uk/internationalDevelopment/research/NGPA/publications/WP27_Methods_Pearce_Web.pdf

Pillai R 2006 *Destination North East? Harnessing the regional potential of migration* IPPR North

Rienzo C and Vargas-Silva C 2016 *Migrants in the UK: An overview* Migration Observatory University of Oxford http://www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Briefing-Migrants_UK_Overview.pdf

Rhodes R A W 1996 The New Governance: Governing without Government, *Political Studies* 44 652-667

Sharp J 2005 Geography and gender: feminist methodologies in collaboration and in the field, *Progress in Human Geography*, 29 3 304 - 30

Slater T 2012 Impacted geographers: a response to Pain, Kesby and Askins. *Area*, 44 1 117-119

Stephens L Ryan-Collins J and Boyle D 2008 *Co-production: a manifesto for growing the core economy* Lond

Stenning AC and Dawley S 2009 Poles to Newcastle: Grounding new migrant flows in peripheral regions *European Urban and Regional Studies* 16 3: 273-294

Vickers T, Clayton, J Davison, H Hudson, L Cañadas, MA Biddle, P Lilley, S Fletcher G and Chantkowski M 2016 'New Migrants' in the North East Workforce: Final Report. Nottingham Trent University.

White G Suchowierska M and Campbell M 2004 Developing and systematically implementing participatory action research, *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 85 2 S3 – S12

---

[i] Using time spent helping others as credit, which can be used to purchase help from another member of the bank.

[ii] UK higher education funding bodies allocate research funding to UK universities on the basis of a periodic assessment of research 'quality' and societal benefit or 'impact'. Since 2014 this has been known as the Research Excellence Framework (REF).

[iii] Including Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia in 2004 and Romania and Bulgaria in 2007.

[iv] The proportion of the region's population born outside the UK is now 5.2% (2014 estimates).

[v] One such issue raised by stakeholders following the workshop (illustrating the value of principle 2) was the level of destitution faced by many asylum seekers and refused asylum seekers.

[vi] All interview participants were invited to attend, with travel expenses provided, and some did so. However, an absence of funding for childcare and the timing of the event on a weekday limited participation.

[vii] This seems important since the research indicated that awareness of support organisations was low (54%).

[viii] Refers to former polytechnics, technical colleges and other institutions given university status through the Further and Higher Education Act 1992.

[ix] Through ESOL classes, surveys were welcomed as a learning aid for developing English language skills and in some cases were incorporated into classes.

[x] As in a distributed computing system in which components located on networked computers communicate and coordinate their actions by passing messages. The components interact with each other in order to achieve a common goal.