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Abstract: Among European countries, the UK remains one of the important destinations for many from Asian regions, specifically, India and Pakistan. “EU Countries Granted Citizenship” (2019) states that Indians are the majority (52%) to receive British citizenship. Relations between the State and the immigrants have always remained dynamic. This dynamism is due to the needs of the host and that of the guest, which keeps altering simultaneously. The mismatch in these needs creates conflicts and thus a gate-keeping by the host is introduced through Immigration Policies. There is a certain level of subtle negotiation that takes place as these policies get firmed up. The UK has a significant assurance for the migration population through its policies, despite political desire to curb the immigrant population. Hence, there seems to be a dilemma among the immigrants if the state is curtailing their presence or accepting them as one among the hosts. To understand the intention of the state, a five-step framework analysis (using the Ritchie and Spencer 1994 model) of the immigration policies of the UK is carried out. In this paper, an attempt is made to present the representation of interests of Indian immigrants in the Immigration Policies of the UK.
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PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT

People have been migrating from one place to another for times immemorial. Migration has become more complex with the emergence of nation states that act as gatekeepers. This gatekeeping exercise is largely carried out by devising policies as per the needs.

The United Kingdom has been a destination for many migrants, particularly from the earlier colonies including India and Pakistan. There is a considerable population from these regions that have settled in the UK. This diaspora has recently made it to the political life within the UK and is negotiating for a better integration of people originating from their home countries.

This paper tries to trace the interests of the immigrants, particularly from the Commonwealth, reflected in the policies of the UK during the ten-year period between 2007 and 2017. This helps in discussions between the state and the immigrants in reaching better understanding in the future.
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1. Introduction

Immigration Policy, like any other public policy, is dynamic. The demands are made by individuals and groups to satisfy their interests and values. In response to these demands, policies are proposed and authoritative allocation of values are made by the related political institutions (Easton, 1965). These are then binding on the society. Further, feedback is sought from the concerned public, which may alter the environment and newer demands arising from it, thus making the process dynamic.

Immigration is a necessity for many European countries due to ageing and declining population, leading to labour shortages. For these economies that largely depend on human resources from outside the country, to provide a feeling of belongingness to the immigrants becomes an additional responsibility. It is also important that these host countries provide access to societal participation to the immigrants and develop policy framework for the same to avoid marginalization and segregation. Sensing that integration is vital for social cohesion and economic development, the European Union (EU) has been developing policies and encouraging member states to support it. The UK is in a unique political position after Brexit that needs to balance its stand on the acceptance of immigrants from continental Europe as well as the Commonwealth, while at the same time regulate the type of immigrants it wants to accept.

Over the past few decades, there is an ongoing argument among the scholars regarding the efforts of the state (UK) in regulating the immigration. One set of researchers like Bhagwati (2003), Castles (2004a), Cornelius et al. (2004), and Düvell (2005) contend that the state has failed in providing restrictions for international migrations. They argue that the factors impacting the migrations are structural and are not influenced by the restriction policies. These policies would affect the types of migration like the increased use of family migration or irregular means of entry, but not the volume. (Czaika & De Haas, 2013). The other researchers like Bonjour (2011); Brochmann and Hammar (1999); Geddes (2003); Broeders and Engbersen (2007) have recognized the effectiveness of the policies, especially in detecting the irregular migrants. However, the states have minimal legal tools for immigration control because they are constrained by human rights principles, such as family unity and the protection of refugees, children, and other such vulnerable populations. In this context of the state’s effort to regulate the entry of the desired immigrant population, we study the policies to trace the representation of interests of the immigrants in the immigration policies of the UK. The UK has been a destination for many migrants from South Asia for long, particularly India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. There is a sizable diaspora constituting people from these countries in the UK. However, this paper concerns itself with only the Indian diaspora in the UK. First, we examine the Indian diaspora in the European canvas and then discuss its spread in the UK. We then study seven immigration policies using Ritchie and Spencer’s (2002) Frame Analysis method to arrive at frames that would indicate the interest representation of the Indian immigrants in the immigration policies of the UK.

1.1. Indian diaspora in Europe

With the persisting global wealth gap, aggravating living conditions due to rampant climatic changes and increasing conflicts, migration has become inevitable. Depending on the cause, duration and legality, migration, both voluntary and forced, have come to stay. Traditionally, the migratory movements were tracked as from the global south to the global north, from the periphery to western European countries, and from erstwhile colonies to the previous colonizers.

Mobility has become an important phenomenon in the EU countries, which has expanded significantly since 1990. Out of a total of 4.4 million migrants within EU in 2017, an estimated two million
were from non-EU countries (Eurostat, 2019). The EU registered more than a six-fold increase in the number of Indian immigrants from 88,968 in 1990 to 525,891 in 2019. (Sethi et al., 2021)

During the colonial times, there were regular travels by Indians to France, Portugal and the UK, be it as domestic help, industrial workers, or soldiers. On the one hand, Paris, Amsterdam, Berlin, and Rome became centres of attraction for the Indian elite. On the other hand, the missionary activities of Belgium, Denmark, Germany, France, and Portugal found India as a fertile ground for Christianity. They not only converted Indians but also brought them to Europe (Gautam, 2013).

After World War II, the European countries moved towards making themselves, multicultural, and multi-religious societies. After independence, there was an increase in travel to the European countries. Along with the unskilled labourers, people also travelled for higher education and industrial know-how. Indians also became a part of this new European canvas. The Indian diaspora growing in its strength by the day has presently created new spaces of network with the host culture as well as other immigrant diasporas, and initiated negotiations with the states for quality integration. In this section, we try to trace the relations of Indian diaspora with some of the member states of the EU.

After Poland joined the EU, it became a new destination for the Indian diaspora. Relatively a prosperous and well-educated diaspora, it contributed to the economic growth of Poland. It established religious, cultural, and economic associations, thereby setting up a platform for the engagement with the state. By building places of worship and conducting religious as well as cultural programs, the Indian diaspora hinted at permanent settlement. In their report on the India–Poland relations, Kugiel and Pedziwiatr (2014) highlight that the Indian diaspora managed to organize the congress of politicians of the highest rank within Poland and contributed towards Poland’s nation building initiatives. However, they also suggested that the diaspora formed lobby groups and promoted interest representation for extension of political rights to Indian diaspora.

The first association in the Netherlands having both Indians and Dutch as its members, intended to develop economic, cultural, and political relations with each other. Subsequently, a series of programs were organized inviting members of Indian media and orators, who provided glimpses of Indian culture and society. Gautam (2013) explains that under the policy of “imburgering”, the Dutch government allowed Indians to be Dutch citizens by neutralization. The diaspora was helped to learn the language and culture of Dutch by subsidizing the school education. The government also allotted sites for Gurudwaras to conduct religious and welfare services. The policy of “verzuiling” (compartmentalization on religious and political grounds) helped the diaspora in getting the media space and gradually promoting its cultural heritage and encouraging political participation. The government gave subsidies to the Indian diaspora while introducing the “self-help” groups, which later became active associations demanding and receiving places for playgrounds, worship, schools, cultural shows, from the local municipalities (Gautam, 2013).

The Indian diasporic associations in Germany were mostly cultural, religious and community-based that worked for the welfare of the diaspora. Gradually, the diaspora entered politics with four members in the German Parliament (Gautam, 2013). The diaspora used the online community “Indernet”, to provide information about India—politics, culture, philosophies, religions, and languages. It was also the platform for discussions regarding Indian identity and cultural heritage (Goel, 2008). A very strong infrastructure consisting of shops, weekly markets, religious centres, sports clubs, cultural programs, film shows, meeting centres continued interest representation in Germany. In its attempts to accommodate Indian diaspora, German government substituted German Work Permit with the immigrant law allowing highly qualified Indians to extend their stay in Germany. The universities opened doors to teach courses in Indian languages, cultures, religions, and philosophies. Indian students were funded and facilitated to conduct research in sciences and technology.
### 1.2. Indian diaspora in the UK

Among the member states, the UK reported the second largest total number of immigrants (917.1 thousand), next only to Germany (Migration and Migrant Population Statistics, 2019). Moreover, of all the states, the UK accounted for the majority intake of Indians. Among the entire population of the UK, 2.3% comprised Indians. (Statistics of Indians Abroad, n. d.). (See, Table 1).

Indian migration flows into the UK became significant after the World War II. The initial migrants from India were from specific regions, especially from Punjab and Gujarat, specific religious groups and castes (Williams, 2013). While the initial years of migration saw the domestic help who worked for the colonial employers, travel along with them to the UK, they were soon followed by the unskilled labourers migrating to the UK to work in the industries. These were joined by their immediate and extended family, after the enactment of the Commonwealth Immigration Act of 1962 and the Immigration Act of 1971. Successive waves of Indian migrants gathered momentum as workers were required to fill vacancies in transport, health service, textile mills, and other areas of manual work (Hiro, 1991). According to Unterreiner (2015), 61% Indian immigrants came to study or work, mostly holding mid-term or long-term visas. They majorly concentrated in London, Birmingham, Leicester, East and West Midlands (Peach, 2006).

The growth of the Indian community in the UK was affected by many factors. The foremost was the expulsion of Indians from Uganda in 1970s (Uche, 2017). Following this was the boom and subsequent industrial decline in UK, which reduced the need for unskilled labour. The introduction of restrictive immigration rules during the late 1990s encouraged family reunification of Indians in the UK. The socio-economic performance of burgeoning second generation,

### Table 1. Indians in Europe

| Country          | Indian population | % of total population |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| United Kingdom   | 1,451,862         | 2.3                   |
| Italy            | 150,000           | 0.25                  |
| Netherlands      | 123,000           | 0.7                   |
| Germany          | 161,000           | 0.2                   |
| Republic of Ireland | 91,520   | 1.9                   |
| Portugal         | 70,000            | 0.7                   |
| France           | 65,000            | 0.1                   |
| Russia           | 40,000            | 0.01                  |
| Spain            | 29,000            | 0.07                  |
| Norway           | 14,698            | 0.03                  |
| Switzerland      | 13,500            | 0.02                  |
| Austria          | 12,500            | 0.15                  |
| Sweden           | 11,000            | 0.01                  |
| Belgium          | 8,500             | 0.07                  |
| Greece           | 7,000             | 0.06                  |
| Denmark          | 8,500             | 0.01                  |
| Ukraine          | 3,500             | 0.007                 |
| Poland           | 12,000            | 0.03                  |
| Romania          | 1,200             | 0.0055                 |
| Finland          | 7,010             | 0.13                  |
| Slovakia         | 100               | 0.004                 |
| Lithuania        | 100               | 0.003                 |
| Bulgaria         | 150               | 0.002                 |
streamlining of economic and education migration rules, attracted both professionals and students to move towards the UK. However, when the bogus college scandal of 2009 showed multiple colleges operating dubious institutions as fronts for illegal work (UKBA (UK Border Agency), 2010), it resulted in the tightening of the visa system: language requirements were raised; border interviews of “credibility” were introduced; institutions were required to keep more records; and the post-study work visa was eliminated (Lomer, 2018). These restrictions saw a drastic fall by 50% of its Indian student numbers in 2011–2014 (Global Education Monitoring Team, 2019). This led to policy changes in 2015–2018. As noted by the British High Commission New Delhi, 2019, they comprised the revision of criteria for digital technology applicants in tier 1, the addition of nurses and four occupations of the digital technology sector in the Shortage Occupation List of tier 2, and extension as well as many facilities given to students to remain in the UK for up to 30 days at the end of their study. These inclusions saw an increase of 63% of the mobility of Indian students to the UK in 2019.

The new post-Brexit immigration policy allows students who completed undergraduate and master degree to stay back for a maximum period of two years and up to three-year after PhD to explore work opportunities. (UKCISA(UK Council for International Student Affairs), 2021). The recent inclusion of Indian nationals in the Youth Mobility Scheme, effective January 2022 may also provide access to more Indians. The new “points-based immigration system” that was introduced in January 2021 is open to skilled migration, thus, selecting migrants who would contribute the most to the UK’s economy. By removing the cap on the number of skilled workers who can migrate to the UK, and allowing recurrent extension of work visa, the skilled worker can live indefinitely in the UK. (Walsh, 2021). Apart from these policy interventions, there are a few inherent advantages that Indian migrants enjoy over others.

Though they come from diverse linguistic backgrounds, immigrants from India were more likely to be proficient in English than other immigrants settled in the UK. The main reason for this proficiency could be the importance accorded to the learning and usage of English as a medium of communication in higher education and work environments. The Kothari Commission (1970) introduced the “three-language formula” where it urged for the strong foundation in English at the school level in India, which would help its usage in higher education. Moreover, English was associated with power, wealth, and higher social status. The more recent acceptance of the specific usage of English by the Indians termed as “Indian English”, was related by Krishnaswamy and Krishnaswamy (2006), to its wide use in the development in the field of Information Technology. Further, as published in English language skills (2019), 63.33% Indian immigrants reported their main language as English and 29.18% reported they could speak English very well even when they had other mother tongues. Therefore, the UK undoubtedly became a chosen destination for many Indians looking for greener pastures.

1.3. Immigration policies in the UK

With increasing influx of immigrants, a policy architecture to streamline the process was inevitable. Therefore, policies were devised in this regard with their basic function to act as gatekeepers in deciding whom to allow entry into the country. The policies were framed to control the legal avenues through which the people could enter.

Policies were also framed to influence the living conditions for the immigrants and help them integrate with the host community. This encouraged a win–win situation, where both the immigrants and hosts benefitted from the policy decisions. The areas that encouraged such acceptance were trade and education. The radical policy changes taking place both in India and the UK reinforce the necessity to ensure increased trade relationships. The 2011 census recorded the contribution of 6% Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the UK by the Indian Diaspora, one of the largest ethnic minority communities in the country. According to the India–UK Business Council, the Business Services sector contributed around 65% of India’s global services exports and, not surprisingly, was the largest contributor to India’s exports to the UK. The recent report of London
Economics, highlighting the benefit of education policy, showed that the total net impact of international students on the UK economy was estimated to be £20.3bn. The benefit of hosting non-EU higher education students was 14.8 times greater than the total cost. This not only benefitted the UK but also suggested the propensity of the education policy towards attracting the students from India.

There was a demand for medical and technical professionals even after the amendment to the UK Immigration Policy in 2017 suggesting the intention to curb the immigrant population. The encouragement of flexible labour market policy to boost the demand for both high and low skilled labour explained the demand for migrant labourers, despite political desire to curb the immigrant population (Castles et al., 2013).

Migration policies were established to affect the behaviour of a target population (potential migrants) in an intended direction. In this light, we analyze the immigration policies that are drawn as a purposive course of action to find solutions to the inimitable problems faced by the immigrants in the process of integration in the UK.

1.4. Interest representation
In this study of the policies directly impacting Indian diaspora, it is important to first understand the representation of Indians in the process of lobbying. Griffith (1939), in his pluralist approach, observed the diversity of individuals involved in lobbying activities. He suggested concentrating on these interest groups rather than the formal government institutions to understand the prevailing patterns of representation. Under this group theory, it was assumed that the representatives were balanced, active, and responsive, which led to effective representation. Conversely, it was observed that the groups had a strong influence on the drafting of policies, and the outcomes of the policies in turn would have an influence on these interest groups (Greenstone, 1975). Mawhinney (2001) pointed out the fundamental issues being, “who wields power and influence and whose views are represented in a democracy”. Hence, it would not be the representation of the “real” issues that the immigrants faced, rather the issues that the influencers deemed fit to represent. Lowi (1969) argued that even if such conflict was possible, the interest groups that were involved sought goals of self-interest rather than those of common interest, thus posing a problem to the democratic mechanism.

Gradually, the focus from the representatives moved to the “dynamics” of the interest groups. Olson (2012) in his “logic of collective action” negated the group theory by pointing out its major flaw that all representative groups had equal opportunity to participate. He indicated that small, well-organized groups that were highly focused, especially with business orientation, were better able to mobilize their representation.

A parallel theory was being formulated at the same time: Democratic theory of interest representation. This theory suggested that the interest in the past two decades was driven by the political landscape where the elected representative competed with other informal kinds of representations like the associations of the diaspora. Urbinati and Warren (2008) believe that the interest focused on the fairness of representation, especially for minorities and women. According to Beyers et al. (2008), organization, political interests, and informality define an actor as an interest group. While the immigrants formed interest groups, the government as a traditional participant in the policy process also attempted to uphold the interests of the state while supporting the cause of the immigrants. In recent times, there has been an increase in the representation of immigrants in the political structures within the UK.

The UK, where many colonial and post-colonial immigrants were treated as citizens upon arrival, had 27 Members of Parliament who were ethnic minorities in 2010. This number represented only about 4% of all parliamentarians, while ethnic minorities accounted for more than 8% of the total population. However, it must be noted that as many as 15 Indian-
origin candidates registered victory in the recently held UK general elections—2019 and entered into the House of Commons. Significant barriers prevent or retard the full political incorporation of immigrants; the dynamics of minority representation also appear to vary across European countries and between immigrant and ethnic minority groups (Bloemraad & Schönwälder, 2013). This situation prompted us to study the interests of the Indian immigrants as reflected in the immigration policies of the UK.

2. Method
To locate the interest representation of Indians in the immigration policies of the UK, we opted for a study of policies within a period of 10 years using the frame analysis. Both the selection of policies and the frames considered in the study are explained in this section. The study period chosen was from 2007 to 2017. The Lisbon Treaty, signed in October 2007, proposed the changes in the powers and procedures of EU policies on immigration. These changes strongly affected the UK’s decisions regarding their own immigration policies. Therefore, the policies post-2007 were considered for the study. A period of 10 years was taken until 2017 in which the following seven documents (see, Table 2) were considered for analysis. It is interesting to observe that the UK decided to leave the EU during this period though the actual distancing of the UK and EU took years of negotiation.

A bird’s eye view of the UK Borders Act 2007 directed the attention to the Immigration Act 1971 with considerable reference made to it. Hence, we reconsidered to study the Immigration Act 1971 to get familiarized with the policy to draw frames from it, and then continue with the UK Borders Act 2007. Before getting into the analysis of the thematic frames that evolved during the study, the foundational structures of the Acts chosen for the study were reviewed, thereby bringing out the differences among them. The Immigration Act 1971, which was taken as the base Act for the study was of 65 pages, in terms of length. It formed the foundation that gave the power to the Secretary of State for the Home Department to regulate the entry into, and stay in the UK, of immigrants, including categories and duration of stay. The UK Borders Act 2007 was of 37 pages; the Criminal, Justice, and Immigration Act 2008 had 336 pages; the Borders, Citizenship & Immigration Act 2009 was covered in 55 pages; the Immigration Act 2014 was of 137 pages; whereas, in the Immigration Act 2015 only statutory instruments were considered, hence covered in 8 pages; and finally, the Immigration Act 2016 consisted of 236 pages. Therefore, it was possible to say that the coverage of policies depended on the scope of the subject that was discussed. The UK Borders Act 2007 mainly contained rules and regulations to be followed in borders, hence it could be covered in 37 pages. In the 2008 Act, many issues and rules related to crime and justice and immigration were also included, which increased the length of the Act to a whopping 336 pages. The 2009 Act contained citizenship-related rules, covered in 55 pages.

| Year | Title | No. of Pages |
|------|-------|--------------|
| 1971 | Immigration Act | 65 |
| 2007 | UK Borders Act | 37 |
| 2008 | Criminal, Justice and Immigration Act | 336 |
| 2009 | Borders, Citizenship & Immigration Act | 55 |
| 2014 | Immigration Act | 137 |
| 2015 | Immigration Act (Statutory Instruments) | 8 |
| 2016 | Immigration Act | 236 |
2.1. Policy frames at work

Once selected, the next step involved analyzing the representation of immigrants in these policy documents using the frame analysis. The five-step Frame Analysis method adopted in the study comprised familiarization, identification of thematic framework, indexing, charting, and mapping and interpretation (Ritchie & Spencer, 2002). The familiarization with different Acts helped to identify the relevant aspects mentioned in the policy documents.

“To Frame is to select some aspects of perceived reality and make them more salient in communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and/or treatment recommendation for the item described” (Entman, 1993). Here, the focus was on the role of language and how it was used to uncover the way social reality was produced (Bergstrom & Boréus, 2005). The language was taken as central while studying the frames designed as policies. The tone emerging in the language used was differentiated as positive, negative, and neutral. The provisions in the policy that threw a positive light in the interest of the immigrants were considered as “positive tone”, e.g.: A court shall not recommend a person for deportation unless he has been given not less than seven days' notice in writing … [1971—Part 1 Section 6 (2)]. In the same way, the statements suggesting a negative impact in the interest of the immigrants were taken as “negative tone”, e.g.: An immigration officer or constable searching premises under section 44 or 45 may seize a document which the officer or constable thinks is a nationality document in relation to the arrested individual. [2007—Section 46 (1)]. The statement where the rights of the immigrants were portrayed using the tone that was neither for nor against the interest of the immigrants was considered as “neutral tone”, e.g.: A person who enters the United Kingdom lawfully under Sec 8 (1), and seeks to remain beyond the time limited by section 8(1), shall be treated for purposes of this Act as seeking to enter the United Kingdom [1971—Part 1 Section 11(5)].

Most of the content in these policy documents focused on establishing the status of the immigrants and implementing rules that would determine their acceptance or non-acceptance into the British society. As a result, despite considering the entire text, some parts were omitted post the indexing, to keep in line with the objective of the study. Some of the recent Acts were addenda or repetitions of the orders mentioned in the previous Acts, with changes in some words that do not add or change the meaning of the original policy. Such mentions and certain preliminary parts as well as schedules were not included in the charting as they had no value to add directly to the findings of the analysis.

After familiarization, in line with the steps of framing (Ritchie and Spencer), a thematic framework was chosen in the form of an index. The frames chosen for this research were generic frames, which transcended thematic limitations as they could be identified across different policy issues as opposed to issue-specific frames (Matthes, 2012). The predefined frames, which would guide the content analysis, were chosen following a deductive approach, and were selected based on previous research (An & Gower, 2009; Berry et al., 2016; Boydston & Glazier, 2013; Fryberg et al., 2012; Helbling, 2014; Hendrickson, 2005; Lindström, 2017; Neuman et al., 1992; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000).

The frames that emerged based on the content of the Immigration Acts were Economic frame, Quality of life, Equality, Law and Order, Security and Defence, Cultural Identity, Health, and Safety, External Relations, Women and Child Welfare.

While studying the content of the policies that corresponded with the aforementioned frames, it was observed that some terms were recurring. These were coded according to the “primary” frame category used. Moreover, in cases of the presence of more information or discussion, additional frames were employed. For example, Part one section one (4) of Immigration Act—1971 focused towards the impact on Equality of immigrants like the “right to abode, study, visitors, dependents”. It also included the “employment” aspect that came
under Economic Frame. However, the Equality frame was marked as primary as that formed the core category. The different frames and the corresponding terms recurring in the policies were as follows:

**Economic Frame:** This included the monetary implications of the issue, either the benefits or expense to the individual/family/community or economy. Economic Frame was fixed based on terms, such as employment, make payments, expenses, debt, economic well-being, charge, and fees.

**Quality of Life Frame:** This contained policy issues pertaining to either the lack or the availability of physical, geographical, and spatial resources, to the immigrants. The effects of a policy on individuals’ wealth, mobility, access to resources, happiness, social structures, ease of day-to-day routines, quality of community life, etc., were identified under this frame. It consisted of terms like the right of abode, permanent residence, continuous employment, citizenship leave, welfare.

**Equality Frame:** This consisted of the expected balance of rights or interests of an individual or group with that of the other. Hence, the equality or inequality with which laws, punishment, rewards, and resources that were applied or distributed among individuals or groups found a place under this frame. It was identified based on terms like equal opportunity, human rights, inclusion, discrimination, and equality.

**Law and Order Frame:** This covered specific policies in practice and their enforcement, incentives, and implications. It also included breaking laws, loopholes, fines, sentencing, and punishment. The Law and Order Frame was set based on recurring terms such as penalty, lapse, comply, breach, enforce, consequences, justice, obligation, criminal, deportation, etc.

**Security and Defence Frame:** This included rules regarding security, threats to security, and protection of an individual, family, group, nation, etc. Generally, an action or a call to action that could be taken to protect the welfare of a person, group, nation, sometimes from a not yet manifested threat, was considered here. Security and Defence Frame was identified with the recurring terms like biometric information, defense, security, protection, refuge, immunity, safeguard, and harm.

**Cultural Identity Frame:** This contained thrust of social norms, trends, values, language, and customs constituting culture(s), that would help integrate or marginalize the immigrants. Cultural Identity Frame was identified by frequently occurring terms like good character, speak fluent English, integrate.

**Health Frame:** This consisted of rules related to healthcare access and effectiveness, illness, disease, sanitation, and mental health effects. The care and hospital facilities available to the immigrants is discussed in the policy. Health Frame contained terms like illness, hospital, care, and health services.

**Women and Child Welfare Frame:** This comprised any considerations towards the empowerment of women and support for children. It was identified based on terms, such as child, woman, and welfare.

Over the years, many statutory Acts and amendments were made in the UK Borders Act (2007), the Criminal, Justice & Immigration Act (2008), the Borders, Citizenship & Immigration Act (2009), the Immigration Act (2014), and the Immigration Act (2016) to expand or clarify the framework of immigration. Though law and order rationale was still in the priority list, over the years, the stress had also moved towards other rationales, such as quality of life, economic, women and child welfare, and cultural identity.
2.2. Findings
The following Table 3 represents data related to recurrence or frequency of frames across different Acts selected for the study. As the 1971 Act was taken as a base, it is also presented below along with the other six policies considered in the study.

The immigration policies included strategies to select immigrants who could enter the host country, settlement policies upon their arrival, and also improvement policies to help them after their arrival. Mobility being the main concern, the policies were drafted to include all immigrants irrespective of the country of origin. However, there were special mentions for “commonwealth citizens” in the base policy, Immigration Act 1971. These mentions were made specifically while discussing the right to abode, “The rules shall be so framed that Commonwealth citizens settled in the United Kingdom at the coming into force of this Act and their wives and children are not, by virtue of anything in the rules, any less free to come into and go from the United Kingdom than if this Act has not been passed.” It was also mentioned in the 1971 Act, “A person is under the Act to have the Right of Abode in the United Kingdom if— a) he is the citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies who has that citizenship by his birth, adoption … “. Mentions of Commonwealth citizens were also made in subsequent Act, 2009. The words “Commonwealth citizens” and “Colonies” refer to Indians/India, along with other Commonwealth countries. Other than these, no special interests of Indians were represented in the policies. However, by this mention, new legal distinctions were made between the rights of the UK born and UK passport holders. This meant people from former British colonies—including India became subject to immigration control, where they lost their automatic right to live in the UK. It should also be noted that in the subsequent Acts, any mention of the term, “Commonwealth citizens” would mean an exceptional consideration for the people who come under such category, which also included Indian immigrants.

As many as 32 instances were recorded under the Economic Frame in 2008 and 2009, which substantially increased in the years 2014 and 2016. These Acts introduced the five point-based system (PBS) indicating the division of immigrants into different tiers, regarding their work or study. Hence, the introduction of the point-based system was an attempt to assert control over and manage immigration as a response to the fear of the British public of losing their jobs to the immigrants. At the same time, the creation of the PBS emphasized on the skilled labour migration,

| Table 3. Frequency of instances of frames in immigration policies of UK from 1971 to 2016 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Frames                          | 1971 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | TOTAL |
| Economic                        | 35   | 9    | 32   | 32   | 39   | 9    | 51   | 207   |
| Quality of Life                 | 15   | 0    | 1    | 18   | 13   | 1    | 20   | 68    |
| Equality                        | 1    | 1    | 3    | 2    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 8     |
| Law and Order                   | 55   | 42   | 75   | 18   | 59   | 2    | 66   | 317   |
| Security and Defence            | 6    | 5    | 21   | 3    | 19   | 1    | 10   | 65    |
| Health                          | 5    | 0    | 6    | 1    | 4    | 0    | 1    | 17    |
| Cultural Identity               | 1    | 0    | 0    | 4    | 6    | 0    | 3    | 14    |
| Women and Child Welfare         | 6    | 1    | 7    | 4    | 7    | 0    | 4    | 29    |
| TOTAL                           | 124  | 58   | 145  | 82   | 148  | 13   | 155  | 725   |
thus postulating immigration as an instrument for economic growth. Since Tier 1 and 2 regulated the skilled labour, these inclusions in the Acts benefitted the Indian immigrants, which was the main reason for the migration of Indians into the UK. Tier 4 was earmarked for the overseas student population, which also was of benefit to the Indian students who made the UK their destination country for higher studies. In 2007, Indians made up 6.4% of the country’s 374,000 foreign student enrollments, as reported by the Atlas Project—up from 4% in 2003 (Naujoks, 2009).

The Law and Order Frame with 317 instances found the highest record. Most of the instances from the policies of 2007, 2009, 2014, and 2016 were regarding the “foreign criminal”, the deportation rules, and the rehabilitation of the youth in cases of anti-social behaviours. They also contained laws for illegal immigrants and refugees. The Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants drew a model for the regularization scheme, where it proposed that the illegal immigrants who were residing in the UK for at least two years were entitled to the right to stay. It aimed at a solution to the illegal immigrants in the UK, including failed asylum seekers, trafficked immigrants, and overstayers (“Government rules out amnesty,” 2006). The policies included sections detailing the rules and regulations that concerned such immigrants. Indians account for 4% of the asylum seekers as per the "Migration Observatory Report" (2019).

One of the new frames drawn from the policies was the Cultural Identity frame. The words that indicated the interest of the state to either support the immigrants in integration or marginalized them were located in the policies in 2009, 2013, and 2014. Though there were a few instances of cultural identity frame in the policy documents, they appeared as attempts of the state in accepting the culture of the immigrants. “Requirement of good character” and “ability to speak English” were the most important mentions in the policies. The term “good character” was not explained; however, it could be related to the acceptance of India as one of the “safe countries of origin” in certifying an asylum seeker (“Safe country of origin,” n. d.). Hence, it could be deduced that the concept of good character would work in the interests of the Indian immigrants. Another new frame, “Women and Child Welfare”, was suggested during the study. Though there was less priority given to women, some of the policies specifically mentioned the welfare of women and children. However, it should be noted that the incidents were all neutral. This was accounted by Finch (2008) to the belief of the welfare state of the UK in women as the carers within the home and men, the main breadwinners. This was demonstrated by the obligation of fathers to provide for their children, and by limited state provision of childcare.

3. Discussion
The study could be seen from the lens of the democratic theory of interest representation. As a traditional participant, the state worked towards the interests of the hosts. Simultaneously, the fairness of representation was visible in the drafting of policies highlighting the welfare of women and children and the cultural representation of the immigrants.

It is important to recognize that the UK had a long tradition of post-war immigration. Initially, most of the Indian migrants were perceived to be colonists and hence, embraced as the subjects of British Crown. Further, to enhance the feeling of equality among the immigrants and help them identify themselves as one among the hosts, the 1948 British Nationality Act provided equal legal, political, and social rights. This meant that the emphasis was needs-based, where equal opportunities in the fields of education, labour, housing, healthcare were ensured. The policy aimed at providing opportunities as well as removing obstacles for individual immigrants integrating into the society. Thus, by specifically stressing the anti-discrimination issue, they could get benefits already offered by the system.

Besides, the state has maintained quite visibly through the Acts, provisions for “quality of life” for the immigrants. The facilities for right of abode, permanent residence status, continuous employment are attractions for the immigrants. However, when it comes to considering “equality” status
of the immigrants, the state through its policies makes mention, but it is extended to only where the human rights issues are concerned, because of the obligation of the UK under the Refugee Convention. With 55% budget cuts for the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) and the end of mandatory equality impact assessments, it is not surprising that the UK’s commitment to equality plummeted since 2011. It is also noted that the language of provisions is vigilant. On the one hand, it allows—“P is to be treated as having a right to rent in relation to a dwelling-house if the Secretary of State has granted P permission for the purposes of this ground to occupy a dwelling-house under an assured tenancy.” However, it also cautions, “(2A) An individual who is resident in the United Kingdom may not apply for a premises licence authorising premises to be used for a licensable activity within section 1(1)(a) or (d) unless the individual is entitled to work in the United Kingdom” (Immigration Act, 1916).

It is noted, through the years, the levels of migrations, especially of the Indians, in the 1950s rose exponentially. The partition of Punjab between India and Pakistan created immense pressure on land resources, instigating many Sikhs to emigrate. Moreover, the fear of the doors being permanently closed to the immigrants obliged the family members to join the immigrants in the UK. This, in turn, saw the rise of public hostility toward migration, and the occurrence of a series of focus events in the late 1950s until the 2000s (Joppke, 2004) compelled the UK to implement more restrictive immigration policies. The European Pact on Immigration and Asylum signed by the 27 states in 2008 was one attempt to curb the influx of illegal immigrants to Europe. The role of foreigners and the foreign networks in the terrorist attacks of Westminster (March, 2017), Manchester Arena (May 2017), London Bridge (June 2017), visibly exposed the multifaceted and variable nature of immigration threat. The aftermath of 9/11 strengthened previous associations between immigration and crime, thus definitively placing importance to security in the policy agenda and defining a new integration policy called, “beyond multiculturalism” (Castles, 2009) that could be witnessed in the Borders Act 2007 and Criminal, Justice, and Immigration Act 2008.

Considering immigrants as a threat or not is dependent upon the citizens’ opinions about them. The opinions are made based on the framing of issues by elite politicians to fit their interests (Chong & Druckman, 2007). Vincze et al. (2008) discusses two frames, Illegal Frame and Security Frame based on the pact. The illegal immigrants are not accepted by the hosts, which was reflected in the policy that illegal immigrants would be expelled to be returned to their country of origin. The border security would be strengthened to keep the illegal immigrants outside the EU territory. Both the frames suggest that the general attitude towards immigrants was negative as they were seen as illegal, and the security should be enhanced to protect hosts. From the traditional economic and cultural threat during the World War II period, the immigration issue conspicuously transformed into a predominant framework of physical and national security during the present times (Lahav & Courtemanche, 2012). There is a usual tug of war between the traditional participant, the host, and the immigrant representative group in such cases. Finally, the multiple events of threat are seen as evidence to allow the state to focus on the interest of the hosts.

In the study of the policies, two new frames were registered: Women and Child Welfare frame and Cultural Identity Frame. In the 1971 policy, separate mentions were made for the right of abode of women immigrants. At the same time, an adopted (legally or not) child was also given recognition, as belonging to the adopter. Not only was the right of recognition as separate entity accorded to women, but vigilance was insisted—“Provided that no woman or girl shall be searched except by a woman” (Immigration Act 1971), when the immigration officers had to “search” or take action during the detention of immigrant women. Further, from providing legal status to the child in 1971, the Act took more stringent action of protecting the child by including the punishment to the child sex offenders. This instilled a sense of being wanted among the immigrants, especially the women and child immigrants, thus proving the fairness of representation. Another frame that gradually took shape was the Cultural Identity Frame. A few mentions are made regarding the recognition of the culture of immigrants in the recent Acts of 2014 and 2016. Two striking indications are towards the possession of fluency in speaking English and having “good
character”. It is important to note that the fluency in the English language is expected mainly of the immigrants who work for the public authority in a customer-facing role. Though the expectation of fluency in the English language would be indicating the integration into British Culture, it is not discouraged to continue with the original language of immigrants, who had other roles to play. With reference to “having good character”, no explicit differences were mentioned about the meaning of the character of a British and an (Indian) immigrant. Thus, Joppke (2004) underscores the aim of the UK towards the “civic integration” of the immigrants through the policies.

In addition to the discussion of the interest of the immigrants depicted in the policy documents, attention should be drawn to the language used that would guide in understanding the intention of the state in accepting the immigrants. It should be noted that initially the immigrants were termed as “aliens” (Aliens Restriction Act 1914, amended in 1919), which in general meant strangers or people from different spaces. This highlights the notable cultural difference of the immigrants and hence, was accepted with caution. Gradually, the term refugee or immigrant was used based on the situation of the arrival of the immigrants. Again, while discussing the law and order to be followed, words and phrases like enforce, comply, exercise power, impose, etc., were used to underline the importance given to the expectation of obedience by the immigrants. In the Cultural Identity Frame, the words used to express the expectations from the immigrants were—“It is in the public interest, and in particular in the interests of the economic well-being of the United Kingdom, that persons who seek to enter or remain in the United Kingdom are able to speak English” (Immigration Act, 2014). It is a very clear message that though the policy invites immigrants, they need to adhere to the requirements of the state. So, the cultural identity is established with the underlining of the culture of the host.

4. Conclusion

The results of the analysis elucidate that there is a progressive representation of the immigrants in the policies over the years. The interest representation of the Indians is not precisely given in the policy documents. However, specific mentions are made for the Commonwealth citizens and safe countries of origin in the policy documents. India being enlisted in both categories it could be considered that substantial representation of the Indian immigrants is evident in the policy documents.

Immigration policies have largely covered the areas of Law and Order, and Economy. It is also observed that the least attention is paid to Cultural Identity, Health and Equality, which probably need larger representation. It is important to find increasing reference to Law and Order frame, where emphasis is on addressing the long-standing problem of illegal migration. The recently signed migration agreement by the governments of the UK and India would help address this issue of illegal migration and provide monitoring mechanisms for better management and integration of Indian diaspora in the UK. At the same time, it is also aimed at supporting people to live and work in both countries. (Home Office, 2021). The Economic frame obtains the second highest place in the immigration policies of the UK in the number of references it gets. This also signals the increasing emphasis on skills-based system in which any easy passage is provided for the high-skilled immigrants and students. As this would have a positive economic implication for the host UK, it finds most mentions in the document.

Special attention is paid to the welfare of the women and children in the recent policies. However, move towards a distinct status for women migrants has been hindered because social policies are still based upon the definition of social citizenship. According to this definition, the right and obligation to undertake paid work is built upon the man, who is considered as the breadwinner of the family (Finch, 2008).

Another interesting observation is that while the Quality of life frame is given prominence, the Equality frame is least represented in the policy documents. With the shift of political rhetoric from multiculturalism in the UK towards interculturalism, emphasis is on the contact-based policy approach, which aims at fostering communication and relationships among people from different
backgrounds, including national citizens (Zapata-Barrero, 2017). Hence, it becomes important for the UK to engage with immigrants and bring change in the policies with more mentions of equality. A supportive space is essential for the immigrants to conduct these deliberations with the state. Indian Diasporic Organizations could provide such a platform to these Indian immigrants in communicating with the state. The collective voice of the Indian immigrants through the Diasporic Organizations could help in creating a space for themselves and other such immigrants in the UK. The shift of attention from the individual immigrants to the Diasporic Organizations in communicating with the state for interest representation could be a path for future research.
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