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Abstract

This dissertation investigates the impact of the UK government’s ‘no recourse to public funding’ (NRPF) policy on women with insecure immigration status who are survivors of domestic violence. These women are not entitled to welfare benefits of emergency housing or income support and so face a stark choice - either to remain in a violent relationship or face homelessness and destitution if they manage to leave (Saheli, 2008). The present study provides a snapshot of the current situation of such women. For this study, a series of first-hand interviews with female survivors of domestic violence under conditions of NRPF were conducted, complemented by an analysis of policy and academic literature. A key finding was that service provision and service responses to these vulnerable women were variable and inconsistent. All participants were living in conditions of poverty and deprivation. Furthermore, due to lack of access to safe accommodation, half of the participants feared for their own and their children’s safety. It is argued that by denying women fleeing violence the benefits they need to access safe accommodation and support, the UK Government is failing its obligation under international human rights law to act with due diligence to respect, protect and fulfil the human rights of all people within its jurisdiction (Amnesty International & Southall Black Sisters, 2008). Recommendations for policy and service provision are identified, most importantly a call to exempt women fleeing violence from the NRPF requirement. Finally, the need for further research, particularly comprehensive nation-wide research, is highlighted.
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Introduction & Literature Review

Gender inequality is a global system... No woman will be free until all women are equal (MacKinnon, 2006, p.13).

Violence against women is endemic in all societies worldwide, cutting across boundaries of wealth, race and culture (Amnesty International and Southall Black Sisters, 2008). The most common type of violence against women globally is domestic violence (UNICEF, 2000). The Home Office (2009) defines domestic violence as any violence between former or current partners in an intimate relationship. The violence may include physical, sexual, emotional and financial abuse (ibid.). It occurs regardless of age, race, sexuality, and class, but is most commonly experienced by women and perpetrated by men (Council of Europe, 2002). Domestic violence is one of the most serious causes of illness, disability, poverty and homelessness in women around the world (Meyersfeld, 2010). Analyses of separate domestic violence prevalence studies have consistently shown that between 1 in 3 and 1 in 4 women experience domestic violence in their lifetimes and between 6-12% annually (Council of Europe, 2002).

It is widely accepted that domestic violence is a violation of human rights (e.g. Meyersfeld, 2010). The notion of human rights implies principles that pertain to all humans, irrespective of nationality, culture, religion, age, sex, ability or circumstances (Ife, 2008). Some rights such as the right to life and the right to be free from torture, or cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment, cannot be restricted under any circumstances (Gibney, 2004). Particularly in its extreme and systemic forms, domestic violence can be seen as inhuman and degrading treatment and in the UK two women a week are killed by male current or former partners (Povey, 2005).

For decades, feminists have highlighted the failure of international law to address violence against women committed in private (Meyersfeld, 2010). MacKinnon (2006) claims that throughout history, women as a group have been identified with the private: a realm in which public authorities do not interfere. She goes on to say that "no state effectively guarantees women's human rights within its borders" (p.148) and "international law still fails to grasp the reality that [men] are dominating [women] in often violent ways all of the time" (p.266).
However, Meyersfeld (2010) argues that there is evidence in international law of a developing norm prohibiting domestic violence as a human rights violation. She argues that extreme forms of domestic violence warrant the application of international law because they are systemic, predominantly harm a discrete group (women) and are present in all societies worldwide. She points to the international law principle that if a state fails to protect a vulnerable group of people from harm, whether perpetrated by state actors or private individuals, it has failed its obligation to protect against human rights violation. The UK government has obligations in relation to a number of existing human rights instruments and standards which seek to ensure safety, protection and support to all women and children experiencing violence (Imkaan, 2008).

Many legal scholars argue that state failure to appropriately respond to domestic violence is a principal cause of its perpetuation (e.g. Meyersfeld, 2010). Nicola Harwin (2006), the director of Women’s Aid in England, reminds us that until the 1970s, domestic violence in the UK was considered a private matter. It was campaigning by Women’s Aid - the key national charity working to end domestic violence against women and children – that put domestic violence on the public and legislative agenda in the 1970s (ibid.). Today, Women’s Aid supports more than 500 refuge projects, helplines, and outreach services across England and works closely with a variety of other campaigning and advocacy organisations such as Southall Black Sisters\(^2\) (SBS) and Imkaan\(^3\) (ibid.). According to Amnesty International\(^4\) and SBS (2008), in the past decade in the UK, notable progress has been made in responding to domestic violence. Following the criminal justice white paper ‘Justice for All’ (Home Office, 2002), the government consultation paper ‘Safety and Justice’ (Home Office, 2003) outlined a national strategy for tackling domestic violence, addressed in the Domestic Violence Crime and Victims Act 2004. Examples of service and legislative initiatives include the introduction

---

\(^1\) These include the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, the International Convention on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women.

\(^2\) Southall Black Sisters is a London-based organisation working to defend the human rights of Black and Asian women who are victims of domestic violence or perceived injustices in the legal system.

\(^3\) Imkaan is a second-tier national charity specialising in capacity building and development for Asian Women’s Refuges.

\(^4\) Amnesty International is an international non-governmental organisation with the mission to conduct research and action focused on preventing and ending grave abuses of human rights.
of Specialist Domestic Violence Courts and the Domestic Violence Rule (see below). If a woman resident in the UK needs to leave home to escape domestic abuse, they have the option of being housed in temporary accommodation such as a refuge while permanent accommodation is sought for them and can receive financial support through public funds (Women’s Aid, 2009).

This study is concerned with women that do not have access to this vital support: women with no recourse to public funds (NRPF). The NRPF requirement applies to people with an insecure immigration status and is a condition attached to their stay in the UK which denies access to housing and social security benefits such as income support, housing benefit and child benefit (Amnesty International and SBS, 2008). This also means not having access to facilities such as refuges which are financed through public funds (Saheli, 2008). The term ‘insecure immigration status’ refers to people who do not have Indefinite Leave to Remain (ILR) in the UK (ibid.). Women with NRPF may be in the country legally on spousal visas, work visas, student visas, visiting visas or other temporary visas, or illegally, due to trafficking or visa expiration (Amnesty International and SBS, 2008). Women from European Union accession countries are also restricted in their ability to access public funds if they have been in the country for less than a year or are unemployed (ibid.).

Saheli⁵ (2008) refers to women with NRPF suffering from domestic violence as the ‘forgotten women’ in our society, “experiencing ongoing life-threatening violence due to the threat of deportation and the lack of viable options and facing destitution, extreme poverty and exclusion from mainstream service provision because of their immigration status when they do manage to leave the abusive relationship” (p.17).

There has been no comprehensive UK-wide research into the number of women with NRPF fleeing domestic violence. However, surveys carried out by SBS indicate a level of around 600 cases annually (SBS & Women’s Resource Centre, 2006). Saheli (2008) suggests that the actual figure is likely much higher, as the survey figures primarily represent those women who have managed to contact services despite barriers. In 2005, 27,285 women came to the UK on the basis of a marriage or an engagement (Home Office, 2006). Given the statistic that 6-12% of women are subjected to domestic violence annually (Council of Europe, 2002), according to Saheli (2008) the real figure of women in this situation is more likely to be in

---
⁵ Saheli is a specialist domestic violence service dealing with Asian women and children, based in Manchester.
the region of 3000 to 5000 cases every year – and this only represents recent marriage migrants.

Women who come to the UK to join their husbands/fiancés are subject to a two year probationary period of residency (Gill & Sharma, 2006). If the marriage breaks down during this period, these women no longer have the right to remain in the UK and face deportation. In 2002, the impact of domestic violence on recent marriage migrants was recognised by the government by the introduction of the Domestic Violence Rule which enabled women to apply for ILR during the two year probationary period if they could prove that domestic violence was the cause of the relationship dissolution. However, until a decision on the ILR application is reached, benefits and public housing are inaccessible to women with NRPF (Saheli, 2008).

A coalition of organisations, co-ordinated by Southall Black Sisters, is working to highlight the devastating impact of the NRPF requirement on women subjected to domestic violence. After rigorous campaigning by this coalition, in November 2009 the Home Office launched a pilot scheme - set to run until the 31st of August, 2010 – to assist those female survivors of domestic violence with NRPF who are eligible to apply for ILR under the Domestic Violence Rule by providing funding to refuges for supporting victims while they assemble ILR applications. The NRPF campaign group has expressed distinct reservations about this initiative, for several reasons (Women’s Resource Centre, 2009). Most importantly, the pilot, like the Domestic Violence Rule, applies only to those on spousal visas; excluding students, overstayers, asylum seekers, and women on other visas. In addition, the funding offered is for four weeks while applications are amassed and a further four weeks while they are processed. Evidence from refuges and Local Authorities shows that applications under the Domestic Violence Rule usually take seven to twelve months to be processed, and so this funding is likely to prove woefully inadequate (NRPF Network, 2008). Furthermore, this pilot offers no long-term, permanent solution.

Cole (2006) argues that as human rights are based on one’s status as a human being, as opposed to one’s affiliation to a particular nation state, they are most relevant to, and most tested by, the treatment of foreign nationals. According to Amnesty International and SBS (2008), by denying a vulnerable group of people the benefits necessary to access safe accommodation and support, the UK Government is failing its obligation under international
human rights law to act with due diligence to respect, protect and fulfil the human rights of all people within its jurisdiction. International human rights law permits States to differentiate between citizens and non-citizens in some areas, but only when necessary and proportionate to a legitimate claim. This differentiation cannot apply to non-derogable rights such as the right to life, or the right to be free from torture, or cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment (CERD, 2004). The Council of Europe (2002) clearly recognises the right of immigrant women experiencing violence to support to the same level as citizens. Ife (2008) proposes that there are groups of people, such as refugees, who are excluded from our understanding of humanity and therefore also from access to their human rights. This chimes with MacKinnon’s (2006) argument that crimes, such as domestic violence, which are predominantly committed against women, have not been regarded as violations of women’s human rights. Ife (2008) claims that the denial of humanity is used by oppressors as justification for their actions. Amnesty International and Southall Black Sisters (2008) maintain that women with NRPF are particularly vulnerable to being dehumanised because of the layers of discrimination they encounter as women, ethnic minorities, and non-nationals.

This study also speaks to the literature on migration. Hollifield (2008) argues that in countries with highly developed welfare states, there is a fear of immigrants placing an unfair burden on public funds, leading to immigration policies focused on controlling, managing or preventing migration and refugee flows. The emphasis on control in the current government’s immigration policy is evident in new measures such as implementing biometric visas, ID cards for foreigners, electronic border controls, and allowing only those with necessary skills to enter the UK (Labour, 2010). Gill and Sharma (2006) acknowledge that there can be a ‘trade-off’ between the duty to protect abused immigrant women and the wish to control immigration, but hold that “the protection of vulnerable immigrant women experiencing domestic violence is a prime social duty of the legal system, one that should weigh more heavily than the need to prevent illegal immigration” (p.199). Other countries with the same international obligations as the UK, such as Austria, Canada and the USA, have found ways to ensure protection and support to women with uncertain immigration status fleeing domestic violence (Amnesty International & SBS, 2008).

Local Authorities in the UK have a duty to support a person if they are subject to immigration control, have NRPF and are ‘destitute-plus’. For someone to be considered ‘destitute-plus’ their need must not stem from destitution alone, but be heightened by circumstances such as
ill health, disability, because the case involves a potential breach of human rights law or because a child is involved (Saheli, 2008). If an assessed need for community care or mental health services can be demonstrated, Local Authorities have the power to provide support under section 21 of the National Assistance Act 1948\(^6\). However, in a study by Imkaan (2008) it was found that the criteria of ‘destitute-plus’ is interpreted narrowly and that the impact of domestic violence on its own is not sufficient. Local Authorities also have a legal obligation under section 17 of the Children Act 1989 to ensure that children who would otherwise be destitute are fed, housed and cared for\(^7\) (Saheli, 2008). However, according to the NRPF Network\(^8\) (2009), in the absence of statutory guidance from central government on their duties to support people with NRPF, Local Authority interpretation of their obligations remains inconsistent and variable.

Although some research had been conducted on minoritized women in or leaving abusive relationships (e.g. Burman & Chantler, 2005; Burman, Smailes & Chantler, 2004), until 2008 there was little research specifically on the experiences of women with no recourse to public funds (NRPF) fleeing domestic violence. In 2008, two specialist organisations, Saheli and Imkaan, published research on the NRPF issue, focusing on the experiences of South Asian women and Black Asian Minority Ethnic and Refugee women with NRPF respectively. Also in 2008, the widely disseminated Amnesty International and Southall Black Sisters (SBS) report entitled ‘No Recourse: No Safety’, discussed the plight of women with NRPF fleeing violence from a human rights perspective. These studies called on the government to guarantee women with insecure immigration status fleeing violent relationships access to safe accommodation, financial support and specialist advice by exempting such women from the NRPF rule, an outcome that has not been realised. In November 2009, Amnesty International UK organised a mass lobby of Parliament to raise awareness of the impact of the NRPF rule on women fleeing violence. In the same month, the government responded – nearly two years after three reports demanding immediate action to remedy the situation - by launching a pilot to provide funding for refuges supporting women eligible to apply for ILR under the

\(^6\) Section 21 deals with the duty of Local Authorities to provide accommodation for persons in need of care and attention that are not otherwise available to them.

\(^7\) Section 17 deals with the duties of Social Services to vulnerable children in need.

\(^8\) The NRPF network is a network of local authorities focusing on the statutory response to people with care needs who have NRPF.
Domestic Violence Rule. This pilot has been met with disappointment as it only covers those women who are on spousal visas and makes no long-term commitment to supporting all women with NRPF.

Since 2008, no research has been conducted to document the experiences of women with NRPF who are seeking support upon leaving abusive relationships. There has been an ongoing campaign by the NRPF coalition demanding reform. Has the situation improved for these women? Previous studies have found that Local Authority interpretations of their obligations and the power invested in them are inconsistent and variable (e.g. Saheli, 2008). Perhaps attention to this issue has made Local Authorities more sensitive to these women’s desperate circumstances.

The present study provides a snapshot of the current situation of women with NRPF who have survived domestic violence. The study aims to document the situation of this vulnerable group of women and explore their experiences of seeking support. Rather than focusing on a specific category of women with NRPF as has been done previously, this study concerns a cross-section of women with NRPF, with the secondary goal of comparing their experiences of accessing support. The participants were from Ghana, Thailand, Kenya, Kazakhstan, Angola, Brazil, Zimbabwe, Nigeria and Poland, and although the experience of domestic violence is a culturally specific phenomenon (Gill & Sharma, 2006), this dissertation is predicated on the conviction that there are distinct issues common to women with insecure immigration status suffering domestic violence irrespective of nationality or religion (ibid.).

This study was conducted in collaboration with Women’s Aid and access to participants was facilitated by professionals at four Women’s Aid centres in England. Women’s Aid welcomed this research because for them NRPF is the key issue which has not been sufficiently researched. A study such as this clearly demands a larger-scale analysis and would be ideal for post-graduate research.

Changing laws and policies will not end the incidence of domestic violence (Meyersfeld, 2010). However, if effective responses to the knowledge of such violence are promoted, the victim’s suffering can be limited to the duration of the violence and not a moment longer (ibid.).
Outline of dissertation

This dissertation documents and discusses research findings relevant to the experiences of female survivors of domestic violence with NRPF. Firstly, the research methods employed in this study will be outlined and their limitations highlighted. The relevant ethical concerns will also be set out. The results of the study will then be presented, followed by a discussion of the key issues arising from these results and consequent policy recommendations. In the last section, conclusions will be drawn and future research suggested.
Methods

This section outlines the methods employed in this study, including a description of the sample, data collection, procedure, data analysis and ethical considerations.

Participants

Eleven women participated in this study. Due to the vulnerable and transient nature of these women’s circumstances, the sample size was inevitably small. However, whilst in no way representative, this sample served to highlight important issues to explore in relation to the circumstances and experiences of women with NRPF who have survived domestic violence. 52,518 words of data were generated from the in-depth interviews.

All participants were adult female survivors of domestic violence between 25 and 45 years of age and were/had recently been subject to the no recourse to public funding (NRPF) requirement as a result of their insecure immigration status. Due to the delicate nature of the research topic and the vulnerability of the target group, it was not appropriate for the researcher to contact potential participants directly. Instead, participants were recruited by professionals at Cambridge, Harlow, Peterborough and Colchester Women’s Aid who were in close contact with prospective participants and approached them only if they deemed the women to be psychologically robust enough to be interviewed. The sample was thus self-selecting and restricted to those women with NRPF who had managed to access support from services.

These particular four Women’s Aid centres were chosen as they were known to deal with women with NRPF and due to their geographic location - close to Cambridge where the researcher was based. The geographic restriction of the study meant that the findings cannot be generalised to the rest of the UK.

---

9 As EU citizens, the two Polish participants did not have an ‘insecure’ immigration status. However, women from European Union accession countries are restricted in their ability to access public funds if they have been in the country for less than a year or are not working (Amnesty International & SBS, 2008). It was important to include these women in the study to illustrate that even EU citizens face obstacles in accessing support for domestic violence. These two interviews were mediated by a translator.
The participants were originally from Ghana, Thailand, Kenya, Kazakhstan, Angola, Brazil, Zimbabwe, two from Nigeria and two from Poland. They had been in the UK for periods ranging from four months to twelve years. Ten out of eleven of the participants had at least one dependent child. An overview of the profile of each of the participants is included in the Appendix. Six Women’s Aid workers were also interviewed at the different locations to develop a more holistic understanding of the treatment of this vulnerable group of women.

Data collection

Data was collected through semi-structured one-to-one interviews as opposed to questionnaires as the aim was to gain insight into these women’s experiences rather than simple facts (Denscombe, 2007). The semi-structured format was deemed appropriate as it allowed the interviewer to steer the interview onto topics relevant to the research focus while giving the respondent the space to re-define the topic in order to generate novel insights for the researcher (Willig, 2001). The interviews were conducted by the sole researcher: a final year undergraduate student at the University of Cambridge. The positionality of the researcher as a student from a prestigious university was identified as a possible threat to openness on the part of the participants. To counteract this, the researcher acted in an unintimidating yet professional manner.

An interview topic guide was designed and reviewed by a Women’s Aid professional to ensure that no inappropriate wording or questions were used. The topic guide was piloted in the first interview. As the revision resulting from this was minor, the pilot interview was included in data analysis. More factual questions about the respondent’s immigration background were chosen for the beginning of the interview to allow for rapport to be developed between the interviewer and respondent before moving onto more delicate matters concerning the pathways out of the abusive relationship. Questions were open-ended and simple, informal language was used to ensure clarity of meaning and to make the interview more conversation-like and thus more comfortable. Interviews were oriented around the following topics: background and immigration status, experiences of contacting and accessing services, accommodation and financial situation, and future prospects. No direct questions about participants’ experiences of domestic violence were asked, but if participants themselves raised this topic, they were given the space to speak about it.
Procedure

Interviews were conducted in the period December 2009-March 2010 and took place at the outreach offices or refuges of the four Women’s Aid centres to ensure access to Women’s Aid staff members should the participants need support during or after speaking about their experiences. Interviews were held in private rooms in order to ensure privacy and confidentiality. Prior to the interview all participants were required to sign a consent form of which they were given a copy to keep. Respondents received a verbal briefing in which the aim of the project and the nature of the interview were reiterated. All interviews were recorded on an audio file using an iRiver recorder and this was transferred to the researcher’s personal laptop following the interview. During the interview, the interviewer made notes on any key observations to record initial ideas and to assure the respondent that what they were saying was interesting, but detailed note-taking was avoided so as not to reduce eye-contact and thus threaten the rapport between interviewer and respondent. The interviewer was careful to play a neutral role to avoid injecting personal opinions of the responses (Fontana & Frey, 2008). Directly following the interview all respondents received a de-briefing. The interviews lasted between 20 and 90 minutes, the length dictated by the participant’s time constraints and how much they were willing to reveal about their experiences. Staff interviews were conducted directly following the participant interviews and staff were also required to read and sign a consent form and received a verbal briefing and de-briefing.

Data Analysis

Interviews were fully transcribed into Microsoft Word format according to the conventions outlined by Silverman (1997). Data analysis took the form of identifying convergent and divergent themes emerging from iterative readings of the interview transcripts (Burman & Chantler, 2005). Thematic analysis was deemed a suitable method of data analysis for the study as it can summarise key features of a large body of data, bring to light similarities as well as differences within the data set and can generate unanticipated insights (Braun & Clarke, 2006). During the first reading of the transcripts, notes on the content of the data and initial interpretative ideas were made in the margin. During the second reading, coding began. Codes identify features of the data which appear interesting to the analyst and which organise data into meaningful categories (ibid.). Different codes were sorted into potential themes: broader units of analysis which interpret rather than merely organise data (ibid.). Some
themes were combined to form main-themes, others became subthemes and some were discarded.

**Ethical considerations**

Ethical approval for this project was granted by the Psychology Research Ethics Committee of the University of Cambridge in November 2009. Research on violence against women poses important ethical challenges in addition to those raised in any research involving human participants (WHO, 2001). The physical safety and psychological well-being of the research participants and at times the researcher can be put at risk if necessary preventive measures are not put into place (*ibid.*).

**Informed consent and voluntariness**

As access to participants was facilitated by Women’s Aid, an organisation on whose support most of the participants depended, care was taken to avoid the risk of coercion to participate in the study (Campbell & Dienemann, 2001). The importance of voluntariness was emphasised to professionals at the different locations who were involved in recruiting. Three women approached by Women’s Aid professionals did indeed choose not to participate indicating that the women approached were aware of their right to withhold consent.

Participants were informed of the procedure and aims of the study and the voluntariness of participation in the information sheet, the consent form\(^\text{10}\), and during the pre-interview briefing. They were assured that refusing to participate or withdrawing from the research would not have any impact on their present or future access to services (Saheli, 2008).

**Confidentiality**

Issues concerning confidentiality, including people’s right to control their information and protect their privacy, were augmented in this study by the participants’ vulnerability to further victimisation by their abuser or public authorities if their anonymity were to be violated (Fontes, 2004; Ellsberg et al., 2001). To minimise this risk, only the researcher had access to the recordings and transcripts of the interviews and participants’ names, and respondent numbers were assigned for the purposes of this report. The interview recordings

---

\(^{10}\) For the two interviews that were mediated by a translator, the consent form was verbally translated to the participants in the presence of the researcher prior to the interview.
were stored on the researcher’s personal laptop and deleted once analysis was complete. Participants were informed of their right to request that no audio recording be made of the interview, however, none of the participants requested this. Contact details of the researcher and the study supervisor were provided on the consent form should participants wish to add to, clarify, or withdraw their responses at a later date.

Fontes (2004) points out that in order to ensure that her abuser is not able to recognise his victim from violence against women research reports, more details than usual may need to be disguised. Furthermore, there are additional confidentiality issues for immigrant women: ethnic communities in many towns and cities are small, making the identification of individuals through minor demographic details easier (ibid.). Participants’ responses were therefore carefully edited to ensure that no identifying details were mentioned in this report.

**Nonmaleficence**

The Helsinki Declaration on human research ethics articulates that the well-being of study participants should take precedence over the interests of science and society (as cited in Loue, 1999). In addition to safety concerns, other potential harms needed to be guarded against in this study. It was crucial to minimise the risk of retraumatisation as a result of asking women to recount their experiences of escaping abusive relationships (Campbell & Dienemann, 2001). To this end, no direct questions about the nature of the violence experienced were posed to participants and they were reminded that they did not have to answer questions they did not feel comfortable answering. Feedback from the participants’ support workers at Women’s Aid indicated that speaking to someone clearly interested in their stories was a positive experience for the women.

The well-being of the researcher was also seen as a legitimate ethical concern in the context of the distressing nature of the women’s stories. The researcher had previously interviewed domestic violence survivors for another study and had received training for this purpose. The researcher met with the study supervisor and a Women’s Aid key contact regularly to discuss not only technical issues, but the experience of interviewing.

**Dissemination**

According to the World Health Organisation (2001) guidelines, researchers have an ethical obligation to ensure that their findings are properly interpreted and used to advance policy
and intervention development. This report was presented to Women’s Aid who facilitated its dissemination to other specialist agencies and stakeholders in the policy process, such as Amnesty International UK and Southall Black Sisters.
Results

They haven’t got that safety net that other women have got in the UK so when it all goes wrong, there’s nobody there to catch them so they can fall quite far in society in terms of deprivation. (Women’s Aid worker)

This section presents the results of the study. Key themes emerging from the thematic analysis of the participant interviews have been organised according to five overarching themes: background and immigration status; patterns of abuse; pathways out of the relationship; accommodation and financial situation; future prospects. The content of these themes will be discussed and illustrative quotes provided. It can be assumed that the selected quotations are representative of the views expressed in other comparable responses. It was a privilege to have been entrusted with in-depth personal life accounts during the interviews. It is not possible to include specific ‘story back-drops’ (Browne, 2006) to the responses in this study, but personal elements are included in many of the quotations indicating the parallels and differences in the women’s circumstances and experiences.

Background and immigration status

Reasons for coming to the UK

Of the eleven study participants, two women came to the UK as students, two as asylum seekers, one as a dependant of her husband (a work permit holder), and five women on spousal visas as the wives of UK citizens.

I have met on the internet my husband...we have started to feel that we do love each other. He has left for me an invitation to come to UK (Respondent 5)

Immigration status

I don’t have an immigration status at the moment, I’m floating, waiting for an answer from the Home Office. (Respondent 7)

At the time of the interview, six participants were ‘in limbo’, waiting for a decision on Discretionary Leave to Remain (DLR), Indefinite Leave to Remain (ILR) or asylum applications. These women had been waiting for decisions for periods between twelve weeks and six years. The two Polish participants could remain in the UK indefinitely without a visa as courtesy of being EU citizens. One participant had recently been granted DLR in the UK
and two of the participants were still on spousal visas at the time of the interview. For one participant, risk of deportation was imminent.

[The Home Office] wrote a letter in November to say that I should come down with the children... The solicitor saw the letter and she said that they were going to deport me and that I shouldn’t go for the interview... every moment they might come... every day I live in fear. (Respondent 3)

**Reasons for overstaying**

Four out of eleven participants were, at the time of the interview, classed as ‘overstayers’. Government rhetoric often reflects the assumption that overstayers are trying to abuse the system (Saheli, 2008). However, in two cases, not renewing her visa was part of the abuse tactics of the perpetrator.

When I with him two year, nearly finished visa, I go to [city in England] for re-apply more visa, pay £350... after one month, me and my husband have a problem and he call, cancel my visa and now I’m over visa (Respondent 2)

**Returning home**

In exploring the options that are available to these women, the participants were asked whether they had considered returning to their home country. Ten out of eleven of the participants did not see this as a viable option. Five participants talked about having nothing to go back to: no job, nowhere to stay, no support networks. For the two women who came here as asylum seekers, returning home would be a direct threat to their safety.

I can’t go back to Angola because the situation hasn’t changed, I’m still in danger... my father was a politician and they’ve killed my father. And also they were looking for me... If I go back to there maybe I will be dead (Respondent 6)

**Patterns of abuse**

The participants’ discussion of why they left their abusive partners indicated that women with no recourse to public funds (NRPF) face intensified domestic violence in addition to specific forms of abuse. According to Saheli (2008), these can be attributed to the imbalance of power between the perpetrators and the women, an imbalance created by the status of women as recent migrants and the NRPF policy which leaves women few options but to stay with their abuser. Fleeing from the relationship would mean destitution, homelessness and possible deportation (Imkaan, 2003). According to Moller Okin (2008), any factor that detracts from
the wife’s exit option thereby gives the husband additional bargaining power in the relationship.

**Lack of bargaining power**

Eight of the eleven respondents spoke about their abusers being aware of the lack of options available to them as a result of the immigration law and using this as a tool to sustain their oppression.

*He knew because I don’t have paper, I don’t have anything, he can do anything he want with me... I was feeling like I was slave.* (Respondent 6)

**Specific forms of abuse**

Ten out of eleven of the participants had suffered physical abuse, including being pushed, slapped, beaten with objects and threatened with a weapon. Five participants explicitly reported fearing for their lives while in the relationship. Participants also spoke about suffering sexual abuse and emotional violence. In addition to these ‘customary’ manifestations of domestic violence, the participants reported forms of abuse which were specific to, or intensified by, their status as recent migrants and their lack of recourse to public funds. For instance, five participants spoke about their abuser threatening them with deportation.

*He has started to threaten me that I have got your passport and he said to me the baby is British, you’re not British. Go away from the country and without our baby.* (Respondent 5)

Another specific form of abuse experienced by these women was economic abuse, ranging from the perpetrator refusing to give money for food to stealing the woman’s credit card and travelling abroad with it. Four participants were not permitted to work due to their status as overstayers and others were not able to work because of childcare commitments. Ten out of eleven participants were thus financially dependent on their abusive partner, magnifying the asymmetry of power in the relationship.

*You don’t have work, you’re heavily pregnant, you have no money. Then he puts £5 whenever he wants on the table for you... He knew I had no recourse to public funds so I am not getting money from anywhere so he controlled all my financial things* (Respondent 2)
Accommodation and financial situation

Eight of the participants had managed to leave the abusive relationship, despite many constraints. At the time of the interview, four of the participants were housed in Women’s Aid refuges. As access to participants was facilitated by Women’s Aid, women housed in refuges were overrepresented in the sample. Imkaan (2003) surveyed eight specialist refuges and found that of the 251 women with NRPF who were referred, only nine were successfully housed, indicating the extent of this overrepresentation.

Refuges are dependent on the rental income paid to them for each resident via housing benefit or other public funding and are therefore usually unable to house women with NRPF (ibid.). Of the seven participants not housed in refuges, five had tried to get a place at a refuge, but were turned away because they had NRPF. Two women were staying with friends and two others in privately rented accommodation. Three participants had no option, but to continue living at their abuser’s house.

Safety

Participants were asked if they had felt safe since leaving the relationship. In line with Saheli’s (2008) findings, the four women that were housed in refuges reported feeling safe.

Yeah I feel safe here... There are cameras everywhere. By the time he’s on the door, the police will be here in 5 minutes (Respondent 4)

Of the seven participants not housed in refuges, five said they did not feel safe fearing discovery and/or further violence on the part of their former abuser.

She doesn’t feel safe because he’s got quite many friends so if he wants to hurt her, he will just speak to his colleagues and they will do it... she doesn’t live at the same place, but it’s very close to the place that she lived.11 (Respondent 8)

Security of tenure

Another key theme in relation to the respondents’ current accommodation was how long they would be able to stay there. Only one participant was confident that she could remain in her accommodation long-term. The two women who were staying with friends faced greatest insecurity regarding accommodation.

11 This interview was mediated by a translator.
My friend agreed to keep me because he knew I am waiting for the decision from the Home Office but it didn’t happen... up to now I’m still waiting and I’m not welcome to my friend because it’s now more than one month I am still living there. (Respondent 6)

Financial hardship

A pervasive theme in the participants’ narratives was financial hardship and deprivation. In the UK, the most commonly-used definition of poverty is a household income that is less than 60% of the median household income for the year in question (MacInnes, Kenway & Parekh, 2009). In 2007/2008 (the latest year for which data is available), this was £115 a week for a single adult with no dependent children and £195 for a lone parent with two children under 14. These sums of money are measured after income tax, council tax and housing costs have been deducted (ibid.).

Three participants, all with at least one dependent child, were being supported by Social Services or Women’s Aid and were living in refuges on £50 a week. The fourth participant housed in a refuge received £8 a week from Social Services to cover living costs for her and her child. One woman with two children received £50 a week from the Red Cross. Another woman with two children lived on £125 a week from the Social Services in privately rented accommodation, so incurred costs such as electricity which the women housed in refuges did not have to pay. All six of these women were living well below the poverty threshold.

As regards the five other participants who did not give exact figures of income, three were working, one of them supplementing her income from freelance hairdressing by having sex with a man on a regular basis in exchange for money. One participant was still financially dependent on her abuser and another depended on her mother sending her money. All the participants spoke about not being able to buy basic things like winter clothes for their children, medicine or even enough milk to last for the week.

They give me £50 a week and that is not enough with two babies...the only money you have is for food to keep you- I can’t even go buy clothes for myself (Respondent 4)

Pathways out of the relationship

Deciding to leave the relationship is very difficult for women who survive domestic violence (Dobash & Dobash, 1992), and women with NRPF not only have to grapple with the decision to do so, but are also “constrained by the lack of accommodation and funds in the short term,
and the threat of deportation in the longer term” (Saheli, 2008, p. 47). Despite such constraints, this study indicates that women with NRPF do try to access the support they need to leave the violent relationship.

**Seeking accommodation and financial support**

It was clear from the participants’ narratives that the support all of these women were looking for was safe accommodation and financial support.

> The support I was looking for was an accommodation basically. For my safety and for the children... And there was a particular time he wasn’t providing food for the children, and I sought their help as well, in terms of finance or providing for the children as well they couldn’t. (Respondent 10)

**Lack of knowledge of the UK ‘system’**

None of the women in this study knew what sort of support they could access when they first considered leaving their abuser.

> I didn’t know who could help. All I knew was that I married, must stay there and I can’t go to work. (Respondent 4)

**Language barrier**

Another theme in the participants’ narratives of initial attempts to get support was facing a language barrier when contacting services. Four participants spoke about experiencing this obstacle.

> She was trying to find support in Polish because her English is not good enough... she didn’t contact Women’s Aid because of language barrier.12 (Respondent 8)

**Variable and inconsistent service responses**

As access to participants was facilitated by their contact with Women’s Aid, all of the participants had managed to access some form of support, even if this was just in the form of advice from Women’s Aid. It was clear from the women’s narratives about leaving the abusive relationship that service provision and service responses were variable and inconsistent. No women had experienced a straightforward trajectory of contacting services and receiving the support they needed. Five women in this study had returned to their abuser at least once before being able to leave permanently due to lack of service provision for

---

12 This interview was facilitated by a translator.
women with NRPF. All of the participants had made multiple contacts with a variety of services including the Social Services, the Police, Women’s Aid, their health visitor or GP in their attempts to get help.

I tried all the possible ways to leave the house. I called Brazilian Consulate, they said, “we can repatriate you, but we can’t repatriate the baby even though he’s a Brazilian citizen as well because it has many things involved, he’s a British citizen, you need a permission from the father or permission from the court”, but they couldn’t give me accommodation. I called the refuge, they said they couldn’t take me because I didn’t have the public funds. I called Shelter, the same answer. I had friends, but not friends that could give me long-term accommodation. And I had no money and so I was totally reliant on him and I was trapped!... I see myself in a situation where I become destitute, homeless, I was being abused, beaten up and I just couldn’t do anything... because I had a big stamp on my passport saying not entitled to public funds I just couldn’t get away. (Respondent 7)

I’ve been to the Social Services... They said they could not help because I had no recourse to public fund, the Women’s Aid could not help. Two years ago in 2008, I’ve been to [name of city] Local Authority with the kids when he was physically abusive to me, they couldn’t help because I have no recourse to public funds. So, everybody turned me down... In every case he has been violent to me the Police have been involved. Six times last year, the Police was in the property. No, nothing, I can’t be moved from the house because I have no recourse to public funds. (Respondent 10)

Social Service responses were shown to be particularly variable. For instance, two women interviewed through Peterborough Women’s Aid were not able to get any support from Social Services whereas in Harlow, Social Services were funding refuge spaces for two of the participants of this study. Staff at all four Women’s Aid centres spoke about having to ‘fight’ with Social Services to get them to support women with NRPF escaping violence.

Re-victimisation

Gill & Sharma (2006) emphasise that a number of women and children continue to be re-victimised with threats of deportation and separation from their children when they approach the agencies meant to help them. According to Imkaan (2008), such threats echo those that women have been subjected to by their abuser, and agencies reinforcing these threats can be profoundly disempowering. For instance, two participants had been explicitly told not to pressure Social Services for help as this might result in their children being taken away from them.

When I came to the refuge they told me that if I keep pressuring the Social Services to help me they would tell me “Well, you can’t take care of your children” so they would take the children from me. (Respondent 1)

Two participants had been threatened with deportation when they contacted statutory services for help.
I ended up calling for help, I went to the police and told them that I’m an illegal immigrant, and they said go back home (Respondent 11)

Future prospects

Same life

Even though these women are the ‘tip of the iceberg’ in that they have managed to access some support, it was clear from the interviews that many of the challenges they faced when they were in the relationship had not been resolved.

I’m not scared like with my husband, but I’m still having stress... when I was living with my husband I didn’t have money, I was stressed asking my husband’s money, and now I left my husband, but I don’t still have money, I don’t still have my place... I still have same life. (Respondent 6)

An uncertain future

All of the women talked about the uncertainty they felt with regard to their future. The effects of domestic violence, living in a new country, the absence of informal sources of support, the risk of further violence or deportation, and not knowing how they would be able to pay for accommodation and living costs all added to these anxieties about their future.

I have no idea what comes next, I have no idea how long time I gonna be in here (cries), I have no idea what gonna happen with my baby. If somebody will take him away from me or not. I just, totally devastated, this man just ruined my life. (Respondent 7)
Discussion

It’s a shame that we’ve got to the end of a long Labour government and they’ve not addressed this. Since 1997 this country has been transformed in terms of how it deals with domestic violence. But this is a huge omission because we’re not talking about a lot of women, but we are talking about the most vulnerable women. (Women’s Aid worker)

In this section, the key issues that need to be addressed in relation to the circumstances and experiences of the women that were the subjects of this study will be discussed. Policy and service provision recommendations arising from these issues will then be presented. The main conclusions that can be drawn from this study will be outlined and directions for future research suggested.

This study clearly illustrates that the no recourse to public funding (NRPF) requirement represents a fundamental omission in the government’s commitment to tackling domestic violence, leaving vulnerable women in desperate situations. For the women in this study, “abuse and immigration interact in a vicious circle” (Gill & Sharma, 2006, p.191) and their plight cannot be understood or addressed by reference to ‘immigration’ and ‘domestic violence’ as separate matters of public policy. Furthermore, the experience of women with NRPF “indicates the problems in the working of a gender neutral law where in reality, the experience of violence is gendered” (Saheli, 2008, p.39). MacKinnon (2004) compellingly argues that if the law does not work for women, it does not work.

According to international human rights law, the government must ensure that restrictions put in place on the grounds of nationality do not violate fundamental human rights such as the right to life (CERD, 2004). This study shows that women with insecure immigration status subjected to domestic violence face incessant violations of their basic human rights, first through the abuse they suffer and then by being denied access to services essential for protection from violence and destitution. The moment following her decision to leave her violent partner is one of the most dangerous times for an abused woman (Women’s Aid, 2009). From the interviews it was clear that women with NRPF escaping violence need access to safe accommodation, financial support and specialist advice to allow them to flee their abuser and create safe lives for themselves and their children.

A key finding in this study was that service provision and service responses to this vulnerable group of women were inconsistent and variable. All the participants had to make multiple
contacts with a variety of service providers before being able to access support. In the absence of binding guidelines, Local Authority responses were shown to be particularly inconsistent and Women’s Aid staff expressed frustration at having to ‘fight’ (often unsuccessfully) with Social Services about funding women with NRPF. It is surely not justifiable that, having managed to flee from an abusive relationship, women’s ability to live a life free of homelessness and destitution is dependent on which Local Authority they approach (Saheli, 2008).

Access to safe accommodation can quite literally be a question of life or death – five women spoke about fearing for their lives during the abusive relationship. Meyersfeld (2010) refers to non-profit women’s refuges as the “most important actors in providing help, support and protection to women who survive violence” (p.186) even though statutory services bear the ultimate responsibility. Women not able to access a refuge space are not only denied safe accommodation, it is also more difficult for them to receive specialist support such as help with Indefinite Leave to Remain applications. Five participants in this study had attempted to access a refuge space, but had been turned down because they had NRPF. These women said they did not feel safe, fearing further violence from their partner.

The financial deprivation experienced by the women that participated in this study was also attributable to the NRPF policy that denied them access to essential welfare benefits. All of the participants who gave specific income figures were living well below the poverty threshold. Participants spoke about struggling to meet basic needs such as adequate food, warm clothing and medicine for themselves and their children.

Gill and Sharma (2006) argue that there is a tension between the humanitarian aim of the government to protect those suffering from domestic violence and the political need to appear tough on illegal immigration. One way to justify the discrimination resulting from the NRPF rule may be to say that restrictions on access to benefits act as a deterrent to immigrants entering the UK who may place a burden on the economy or pose a threat to public safety (Amnesty International & SBS, 2008). However, most of these women are already legally in the UK. Moreover, it cannot be legitimately argued that women risk their lives in abusive relationships in order to access housing or benefits and that it is easy to give a false history of domestic violence to experts (ibid.). Amnesty International and Southall Black Sisters (2008)
argue that as making vital protection and support accessible to women with insecure immigration status cannot be deemed beyond the financial means of the government, it falls within the government’s duty to act with due diligence to protect, respect and fulfil the rights of all people within its jurisdiction (ibid.).

It is important to note that none of the participants in this study benefited from the government pilot, which aimed to fund women eligible to apply for Indefinite Leave to Remain (ILR) under the Domestic Violence Rule while they submitted ILR applications. One participant fitted the criteria, and her support worker did not know why she was not benefiting from it. Others had left the relationship before the introduction of the pilot or were not on spousal visas so were ineligible. Even if the pilot is developed into a permanent channel for women on spousal visas to access support while they regularise their status, the situation for those on other visas or those classed as overstayers will remain desperate. Furthermore, what will happen to women who have been in ‘limbo’ for years? Four women in this study had had an insecure immigration status for more than five years, in one case for ten years.

Apart from restrictions with regard to housing and financial support, a further obstacle to accessing support for women with NRPF that needs urgent attention is the potential language barrier. In the case of four participants, their limited English was a direct barrier to accessing information about the support available. Linked to this is a potential lack of awareness regarding service provision and the law. According to Meyersfeld (2010), states are responsible for making women aware of what their rights and remedies are. None of the women in this study knew what sort of support they could access when they first considered leaving their abuser. Furthermore, while they were still in the relationship, the women’s lack of awareness of the ‘system’ in the UK was exploited as a form of abuse in multiple cases.

This study also suggests that the treatment of ‘overstayers’ needs to be re-evaluated. It is important to understand the circumstances under which immigrant women become ‘overstayers’ (Gill & Sharma, 2006), particularly that not renewing her visa may be a form of abuse by the perpetrator. As the policy stands, women classed as ‘overstayers’ cannot report abuse and access support without fear of immediate deportation.

_Death is better than living like an illegal immigrant, with no public funds, with children as well experiencing all these psychological problems. Death is even better, it’s an option._ (Respondent 11)
**Recommendations**

> Even if she’s here as a tourist, if she is being beaten or battered or raped by her partner, she can have somewhere safe that she can escape to... What do we expect them to do, return to him? It’s almost like condoning some sense of ownership that men have over women. *(Women’s Aid worker)*

This study highlights a need for many changes, including long-term changes in policy and others that can be implemented immediately.

1. **Policy recommendations**

1.1 To guarantee women with insecure immigration status escaping domestic violence access to safe accommodation, specialist services and financial support by exempting women fleeing violence from the NRPF requirement.

1.2 To extend the Domestic Violence Rule to all women with NRPF suffering domestic violence.

1.3 To extend the government pilot to all women with NRPF, while the permanent solution of exempting women fleeing violence from the NRPF requirement is considered.

1.4 To reconsider the current treatment of ‘overstayers’, as the failure to renew her visa can be part of the abuse tactics of the perpetrator.

2. **Improving service provision**

2.1 To develop national guidelines on Social Service obligations to women with NRPF.

2.2 To house women with NRPF fleeing violence in refuges where they have access to specialist support.

2.3 To publicise provisions available to women with NRPF so they can leave abusive relationships. Information on support needs to be available in different languages to avoid women staying in abusive relationships due to language barriers.
Conclusions

You don’t feel important. You don’t feel as if your children are important. Almost as if you’re not a human being... you feel like you are something, not somebody. (Respondent 4)

The NRPF policy enables double standards to be employed in the state response to domestic violence – women who are resident in the UK are permitted access to protection and support while those with insecure immigration status are not (Saheli, 2008). Despite campaigning by women’s groups and government awareness of the plight of female survivors of domestic violence with NRPF, the women in this study faced multiple obstacles in accessing support and, as in earlier studies, service responses were found to be variable and inconsistent. As long as women with insecure immigration status are not able to access support to the same level as citizens when fleeing violence, the goal of immigration control retains precedence over safety for women. Ife (2008) reminds us that by defining something as a human right we are claiming that it has priority over other claims of right. Regardless of competing views on how citizens and non-citizens should be differentiated in terms of access to resources, the human right to life and to freedom from torture, or cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment must supersede. To uphold these human rights, women with insecure immigration status fleeing violence must have access to emergency accommodation and essential financial support while they regularise their status. Domestic violence is not a ‘soft’ social issue that must take a back seat to ‘more pressing’ economic and political issues (Koh, 2010) – it involves a fundamental human rights violation from which all women should be free.

Future research

There is an urgent need for nation-wide research documenting the number and circumstances of women affected by domestic violence and NRPF to gauge the extent of this problem. Representative samples are needed to enable comparisons of, for instance, the responses of different Local Authorities and the experiences of different ‘categories’ of women with NRPF. Furthermore, cross-national comparative studies of the treatment of women with uncertain immigration status who are fleeing domestic violence would enable the UK state response to be contextualised and reformed in light of better practices in other countries.
The effect is- because you don’t have recourse to public fund, so it’s not only affecting me today and the children tomorrow, but the society tomorrow who will also get the impact of what has been neglected today. So I believe strongly, that irrespective of your immigration status, women should be helped, lives should be saved, children should be saved. (Respondent 10)
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### Appendix

#### Participant Profile Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Number of dependent children in UK</th>
<th>Reason for coming to the UK</th>
<th>Length of stay in the UK</th>
<th>Immigration status</th>
<th>Accommodation at time of interview</th>
<th>Source of income at time of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>To study</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Overstayer</td>
<td>Privately rented accommodation</td>
<td>Disability allowance for child, working freelance, sleeping with a man regularly in exchange for money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Married a UK citizen</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Overstayer</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>£50 a week from Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2 (also pregnant)</td>
<td>Asylum seeker, to study</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Overstayer</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>£50 a week from Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Married a UK citizen</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Applying for Indefinite Leave to Remain (ILR)</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>£50 a week from Women’s Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Married a UK citizen</td>
<td>2.5 years</td>
<td>Spousal visa</td>
<td>Abuser’s house</td>
<td>Financial support from mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>2 (also pregnant)</td>
<td>Asylum seeker</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Asylum application pending</td>
<td>At a friend’s house</td>
<td>£50 a week from the Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Married a UK citizen</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>ILR application pending</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>£8 a week from Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Wife of economic migrant</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>EU citizen so can remain indefinitely, but can only access benefits if working</td>
<td>Friend’s house</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wife of economic migrant</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>EU citizen so can remain indefinitely, but can only access benefits if working</td>
<td>Abuser’s house</td>
<td>Employment, child tax credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wife of work permit holder</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Discretionary Leave to Remain</td>
<td>Abuser’s house</td>
<td>Abuser’s money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>To study</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>Overstayer</td>
<td>Social Service funded accommodation</td>
<td>£125 a week from Social Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>