

# Technical Annex: methods used for exploring the decision making of Immigration Officers – a research study examining non-EEA passenger stops and refusals at UK ports

Kandy Woodfield  
Liz Spencer  
Robin Legard  
Allen Anie  
Carolyn Ndofor-Tah  
Lauren Herlitz

# Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Developing the interview tools</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Sampling and recruitment for the qualitative interviews</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. Conducting the interviews</b>	<b>4</b>
Use of vignettes	4
Race of interviewer effect	4
Fieldwork	5
<b>5. Data analysis method</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6. The nature of qualitative data</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Appendix A: Screening script and questionnaire</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Appendix B: Topic guide</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix C: Landing card vignettes</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>24</b>

# 1 Introduction

This report is an accompaniment to *Exploring the decision making of Immigration Officers – a research study examining non-EEA passenger stops and refusals at UK ports* (Woodfield *et al.*, 2006). The study was in two parts.

1. Qualitative research to explore the process by which Immigration Officers decide whether or not to hold passengers with non-EEA passports for further questioning. As the research progressed, it also provided some evidence on decisions about whether to grant entry. A particular issue was to clarify the role of the passenger's ethnicity in these decisions.
2. A quantitative feasibility study to explore the potential for monitoring the ethnicity of arriving passengers and understanding the reasons for any variations in stopping rates for passengers from different ethnic groups.

The research presented a number of practical and conceptual challenges, not least because there has been very little systematic research in this field. Equally challenging was the fact that the research sought to unpack a complex process by which IOs take decisions about arriving passengers.

This report describes in more detail the qualitative methods used (the quantitative methods are included as an appendix to the research report), the key difficulties encountered and how these were overcome. It explores the process used to develop the design of the research, including: a planning and familiarisation period; the development of interview tools (including an interview topic guide and landing card vignettes), the purposive sample design and recruitment strategy; and finally the method of data analysis.

The research aimed to identify the trigger factors that lead IOs to stop certain passengers, examine the way in which a passenger's credibility is assessed and map factors that affect decisions. These objectives presented a number of practical and conceptual challenges, not least because there has been very little systematic research in this field. Equally challenging was the fact that the research sought to unpack a decision-making process by which IOs take decisions about arriving passengers and are required to refer to senior colleagues only when they wish to pursue further questioning or refuse a passenger entry.

Given this challenge, using any single approach to the research design was unlikely to reveal the complexity of the subject area under discussion so the team needed to plan a multifaceted strategy, which would use a number of different tools to try and get underneath the surface of the issue.

Depth interviews were chosen as an appropriate principal data collection tool because they are particularly well suited to research that requires an understanding of complex systems, processes or experiences. They offer the depth of focus necessary and the opportunity for clarification, which provides for a detailed understanding of individuals' thought processes and attitudes. Researchers conducted 50 depth interviews with IOs and Chief IOs working at two airport terminals (Heathrow Terminal 1 and Gatwick South) between May and July 2005. The two terminals were chosen because both receive a range of international flights from across the world and their arriving passengers represent a broad range of ethnicities.

## 2 Developing the interview tools

Planning involved extensive briefings at the two ports and training/briefing of team members, followed by a period of familiarisation that included reading relevant background materials, observations of the non-EEA control desk and strategic interviews with key stakeholders.

The team undertook the equivalent of three days of observation at the two terminals, sitting with IOs on the non-EEA control desk and observing: the entry process and protocols; IOs in conversation with CIOs and fellow IOs; and airside surveillance teams (teams who meet high-risk flights to scan for potential immigration breaches). The team also met forgery detection and child protection officers. Field notes recorded issues relating to the physical environment, interactions between IOs and passengers, the stopping and questioning process, the characteristics of stopped passengers such as ethnicity, nationality, other aspects of appearance, age, gender, and interactions between IOs and between IOs and CIOs. The observations allowed the team to learn more about the culture of the two terminals and the context and process within which control desk decisions are taken, which was a significant aid in designing later research instruments for use with IOs.

Strategic interviews were conducted with key policy makers and project sponsors, including the Independent Race Monitor, representatives of Border Control, Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND) policy and IND training, Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC) and representatives of the Immigration Service Union and Public and Commercial Service Union. These interviews ensured that the team was fully conversant with the issues underlying the decision to carry out the research and the associated sensitivities. The interviews covered their involvement in (if any) and knowledge about the design of the research programme, views and opinions about the proposed research design, insights into the IO decision making process, views about the coverage and quality of IO training and in-job support, opinions about the role of authorisations, operational pressures and individual attitudes in IO decisions when landing or refusing passengers at Border Control. Transcripts of the interviews were circulated amongst the NatCen research team and interview summaries provided to IRSS for team learning.

### 3 Sampling and recruitment for the qualitative interviews

The sample for the qualitative component was designed to ensure that a broad cross-section of IOs could be interviewed in order to provide a robust evidential base. Qualitative research seeks to identify, and provide explanations for, attitudes or behaviours, rather than quantify their extent in the population; therefore it needs a particular approach to sample design. It is neither necessary nor desirable for qualitative samples to be as large as survey samples or to be statistically representative. Instead, they are purposively selected to encompass key characteristics of the target population(s). Sampling criteria for this study included: age, sex, ethnicity and length of service. A further consideration was that the sample should include representation of CIOs, who have the final decision-making power in respect of refusals.

Border Control was unable to pass details of individual IOs to the research team because of data protection regulations. This meant the team could not make direct contact with, and did not have detailed information about, individual IOs (such as length of service, age or ethnicity). As a result the team needed to develop a process for IOs to opt out of the study, and then to screen the potential IO sample at both terminals to ensure that the achieved sample was sufficiently diverse to make for a robust evidence base. All IOs at both terminals were sent a letter from Border Control explaining the research and were given a two-week period to 'opt out' if they did not wish to participate. At this point only 16 IOs chose this option. A screening questionnaire was completed and those meeting the sample matrix requirements were invited to take part (see Appendix A for screening script and questionnaire). IOs were able to opt out of participation at any point in the process.

The achieved sample looked somewhat different to that anticipated at the outset (see Table 3.1), with a greater number of older and longer-serving officers at one of the terminals and a narrower range of ethnic groups than intended. As far as can be gleaned from management information, this distribution reflects the composition of staff at both terminals (the number of IOs from minority ethnic groups were over sampled in the target quota) and the team found no patterns in participation or refusal to suggest that non-White or newer officers were less inclined to participate.

**Table 3.1: Target and achieved sample**

	<i>Gatwick South</i>		<i>Heathrow Terminal 1</i>	
	<i>Target</i>	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Achieved</i>
<i>Total</i>	25	26	25	24
<i>Gender</i>				
Male	12-13	15	12-13	12
Female	12-13	11	12-13	12
<i>Rank</i>				
IO	22	22	22	21
CIO	3	3	3	3
Her Majesty's Inspector	0	1	0	0
<i>Service length</i>				
Under 2 years	7-9	4	7-9	11
Over 2 years	7-9	6	7-9	7
Over 4 years	7-9	16	7-9	6
<i>Ethnic group</i>				
White	12-13	24	12-13	17
Asian	3-4	1	3-4	6
Black (African/Caribbean/other)	3-4	0	3-4	1
Other	3-4	1	3-4	0
<i>Age</i>				
Under 30	7-9	4	7-9	11
30-40	7-9	5	7-9	4
41- 65	7-9	17	7-9	9

## 4 Conducting the interviews

Previous literature has documented how exploring issues such as discrimination and prejudice can lead participants to be fearful and anxious (see for example, Renzetti and Lee, 1993). In this study, the team anticipated that participants might be concerned that their participation could lead to them being labelled as racist or discriminatory. Institutionally, participants might also have been anxious that the research would attack the standards and quality of Border Control officers. As a result, great care was taken in developing research instruments that would minimise these fears, including carrying out a pilot stage of interviews with IOs, which allowed the tools to be refined.

### Use of vignettes

The research team devised an approach to allow participants to articulate how they navigate a complex cognitive decision-making process, and to feel able to express their personal views about race and ethnicity. It was critical that researchers were able to get below the surface of this decision-making process and to encourage participants to discuss the factors underpinning decisions rather than citing more abstract principles. As a result the team suggested making use of some form of vignette or case-based approach to ensure that IOs had a tangible case or scenario around which they could discuss the varying importance of different factors and judgements. The original intention was to make use of some form of photographic or video vignettes, which would show a range of passengers arriving at an airport. IOs would then be asked to discuss why they would have stopped certain passengers and not others. The team had hoped to be able to make use of actual footage of arriving passengers either from CCTV or training materials already used by IND trainers.

It became apparent during the strategic interviews that for legal reasons relating to data protection it would be impossible to use actual footage of arriving passengers. Also, there was no existing training film footage available that the team could use and operational constraints would have prevented the team from filming arriving passengers (with their consent) who displayed a sufficient range of diversity in relation to nationality, ethnicity and appearance. Furthermore, several strategic informants advised that IOs might be uncomfortable with using film during the interview and possibly suspicious about its role.

Instead the team developed a series of example landing cards, complete with photographs, designed to be used in conjunction with the topic guide (see Appendix B for topic guide and Appendix C for landing card vignettes). The landing card vignettes were based on discussions and materials provided by one of the strategic informants with responsibility for IO training. The guidance encouraged the interviewer to ask a range of questions including:

- what they would try to establish if they were to land this passenger;
- what questions they would ask;
- what concerns might lead to issuing an IS81 form to signal that further questioning was required;
- what they would be looking for in further enquiries or baggage search.

The interviewers would vary the circumstances of the passenger to try to establish the pivotal factors in IO decision making.

Not all IOs engaged with or required the use of stimulus materials. The vignettes proved to be a useful tool where IOs had had limited control desk experience (for example, because of being on leave or having other roles which limit their time on the control desk). They were also useful where IOs found it difficult to describe a recent case. As a result, the team decided to alter the guide and make the discussion of a recent case the main stimulus tool, using the landing card vignette only where discussion of recent cases did not yield rich data. Interviewers were trained to enable participants to talk at length and in depth about thought processes that are usually not explicitly or verbally expressed.

### Race of interviewer effect

Consideration was also given to 'race of interviewer effect' – the phenomenon whereby the race or ethnicity of the interviewer affects the answers given by the respondent when the

questions had explicit racial content or referred to socially desirable/undesirable attitudes or behaviours (Campbell, 1981; Schaeffer, 1980). However, skilled interviewers and effective data collection tools were used to offset this potential problem (Ritchie and Lewis, 2004).

## Fieldwork

The team conducted an initial ten interviews at the two terminals to test and develop the topic guide, interview strategies and stimulus tools. The final topic guide is shown in Appendix B. The first ten interviews were not technically a pilot stage, as the interviews form part of the main sample for analysis. Nevertheless this early intensive fieldwork allowed the team to refine the approach and ensure that interviews were producing the richness and complexity aimed for. Researchers working in pairs carried out the early interviews. This was important for sharing early learning, ensuring consistency in fieldwork approaches, supporting less experienced researchers and allowing the time to discuss fieldwork strategies and topic guides in situ.

Interviews, conducted by researchers from either the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) or Immigration Research and Statistics Service (IRSS) team, were carried out in a private office in the terminal building and lasted for approximately an hour and a half. They were tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim.

## 5 Data analysis method

The data from the study were comprehensively and systematically analysed using 'Framework'. Framework is a qualitative analysis method, developed at NatCen, which uses a thematic approach to classify and interpret qualitative research data using a series of thematic charts or matrices, each of which relates to a different thematic issue. Data are summarised into the appropriate cells with the context retained and its location in the transcript noted, allowing the analyst to return to a transcript to explore a point in more detail or to extract text for verbatim quotation. The charts allow the full pattern of an individual's attitudes and behaviour to be reviewed. They also display the range of views or behaviours described by participants, and allow the accounts of different participants, or groups of participants, to be compared and contrasted. The method of analysis allowed the research team to draw comparisons between the experiences of IOs and CIOs, and between IOs and CIOs of different lengths of service and with different personal backgrounds.

The themes used to structure the analysis were drawn directly from the accounts of IOs and CIOs, rather than *a priori* concepts or themes which the research team expected to find in the dataset.



## 6 The nature of qualitative data

The fact that this is a qualitative project has implications for the kind of evidence presented. In each of the chapters reporting the findings, a set of themes is introduced and then the attitudes, behaviours and experiences described by IOs and CIOs in relation to these themes are compared and contrasted. To bring these themes to life, and to give the reader some insight into the nature of the data, descriptions of situations encountered by officers who took part in the study or illustrative material in the form of verbatim quotations are provided. There are no numbers or indications of incidence because of the aims of qualitative research (to identify and explain rather than quantify), and because of the way qualitative research is carried out (sampling is purposive rather than probabilistic; interviewing is flexible and responsive rather than standardised), see Spencer *et al.*, (2003). Equally, statistical comparisons between groups are not possible.

Given the focus of the research on non-EEA arrivals at two international airport terminals, it is important to note that findings from this sample of 50 IOs and CIOs cannot necessarily be assumed to reflect *all* the practices and views of Border Control staff across the UK. In particular it is difficult to know whether or not there would be additional views and experiences amongst IOs working at smaller entry ports, or those primarily focusing on sea, rather than air, passengers. The study does, however, provide a rich picture of the process of decision making at two airport terminals with a mixed profile of arriving flights, from which Border Control may be able to draw some wider inferences.

## Appendix A: Screening script and questionnaire

## **Recruitment protocols**

### **1. Composition of the initial sample**

We need to recruit 10 IOs (5 at Heathrow and 5 at Gatwick) to try out our interview approaches with. The ideal sample for these ten interviews is shown below. If you are making appointments you should record the characteristics of the IO recruited into the table below by ticking the appropriate boxes:

	<i>Gatwick</i> (5)	<i>Heathrow</i> (5)
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	2-3 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	2-3 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Female	2-3 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	2-3 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Service length</i>		
Under 2 years	2-3 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	2-3 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Over 2 years	2-3 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	2-3 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Ethnic group</i>		
White	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Asian	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Black (African/Caribbean)	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Other	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Age</i>		
Under 30	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
30-40	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
41- 65	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

### **2. Recruitment protocols**

**Step 1** – IO given option to opt out from sample frame by HO/Border Control letter

**Step 2** – Sample passed to NatCen

**Step 3** – Contact IOs by telephone (*see attached screener*) undertake screening interview and (*where appropriate*) make appointment

**Step 4** – Send confirmation letter of appointment

### Screener for telephone recruitment

INSERT IO ID NUMBER   
(i.e. IOG01)

DATE OF CALL .....

TIME OF CALL .....

INITIALS OF PERSON MAKING CALL .....

USE THIS SPACE TO RECORD DETAILS OF CALLS WHERE NO REPLY

1. Hello can I speak to XX...
2. Hello my name is XX I am calling from the National Centre for Social Research. We are conducting some research for the Home Office which you should have received a letter about recently.
3. **IF NOT RECEIVED:** recap over details of qualitative research: We have been asked by the Home Office and the Independent Race Monitor to explore how IOs make decisions about arriving passengers at the control. The main aim is to hear from IOs themselves about their role at the non EEA/EU border control and to understand what it is like to make decisions about people's entry into the UK. We're interested in understanding the range of factors that IOs have to balance when making decisions and the ways in which guidance, intelligence and your working environment influence the decisions you make. There are no right or wrong answers; we are keen to hear what you have to say and to understand the job from your perspective.
4. **FOR ALL:** We could arrange to visit you during working hours at your port or to come to you at your home. The interview would take about an hour and a half. The interview would be very informal, completely confidential and at time that suits you. The team is made up of researchers from an independent research organisation and researchers from the Immigration Research & Statistics Service. It is important to stress that nothing you say will in any way affect your job or be reported back to your managers.
5. Are you still interested in taking part? **YES/NO** (circle)  
If no (gently) ask for reasons why and record here

**If yes:** *that's great can I ask you a few questions as we need to make sure the people who take part reflect the range of different people who work in the Immigration Service and we are not able to interview everyone.*

6. **ENTER GENDER**

- Male
- Female

7. *Can I just check your age .....*

**ENTER AGE**

- Under 30
- 30 – 40
- 41– 65

8. *And how long have you been working as an IO ? .....*

**ENTER LENGTH OF SERVICE**

- Under 2 years
- Over 2 years

9. *And finally can I just check which of the following ethnic groups you would describe yourself as:*

**ENTER ETHNICITY**

- White
- Asian
- Black (African/Caribbean)
- Other  **WRITE IN** .....

**10. Check against sample frame**

11. **IF NOT REQUIRED:** *Thank you so much for sparing the time, I am afraid that we will not be able to interview you... OR*

12. **IF REQUIRED:** *Thank you can we arrange a time for a member of the team to come and interview you?*

**Record details of the appointment, checking where IO would prefer to be interviewed and taking alternative contact numbers:**

## Appendix B: Topic guide

**P.6123 Immigration Officers' Decision Making  
Topic Guide – Version 7  
09/04/05**

**Key objectives of the research are to:**

- Explore the factors affecting IOs' decisions on processing arriving passengers
- Identify the trigger factors which lead IOs to hold certain passengers for further questioning
- Examine the interaction between trigger factors in determining whether a passenger is held for further questioning or not, *and to*
- Map other contextual factors which affect IO's decisions about holding passengers for further questioning

**Introductions and background**

"Hello, thank you so much for agreeing to take part. I'm [own name and name of observer if relevant] from a research team that includes researchers from the National Centre for Social Research - an independent organisation, and from the Immigration Research and Statistics Service in IND.

We have been asked by the Home Office [and the Independent Race Monitor] to explore how Immigration Officers make decisions about arriving passengers at the control desk [non EU/EEA], the factors they take into account when deciding whether or not to hold a passenger for further questioning, and how they implement the instructions and guidance given.

There are no right or wrong answers and I am interested in hearing all your views. Anything you tell me will be treated in the strictest confidence. It will not be possible to identify any individual in the research report.

As I really want to hear about your work and your views, it would be very difficult to make notes at the same time as listening to you and asking questions. Would you mind if I tape-recorded the interview – it is purely for my benefit, for note-taking purposes?

The interview will last between about one and one and a half hours. Is there anything you would like to ask me before we begin? Are you happy to continue?"

**1. Personal background and role (BRIEF WARM UP ONLY)**

- **How long they have been an IO**
- **What they were doing before they joined the IS**
- **How they became an IO**
  - What features of the job appealed to them
- **Qualifications required to become an IO**
  - Own situation regarding entry
  - Whether they speak any foreign languages
- **What sorts of work they have done since they have been an IO**

## 2. Role of the IO and the control process

- **What are the main stages/things they do when dealing with arriving passengers**
  - In what order these happen
  - Any questions they usually ask and why
  - What sorts of things they are watching out for
- **Under what circumstances their decision to land the passenger is very straightforward**

a) *WOULD NOW LIKE THEM TO THINK OF A RECENT CASE WHICH WAS NOT STRAIGHTFORWARD AND WHICH LED TO FURTHER QUESTIONING AND THE ISSUING OF AN IS81.*

- **Details of the case**
  - Nationality
  - Purpose of visit
  - Visa or non-visa national
- **What alerted them/what factors made them decide further questioning might be required**
- **What kinds of questions they asked and why**
  - What they were trying to establish
  - How they weighed up the evidence
- **Relative importance of the following in weighing up the evidence**
  - Finances
  - Occupation
  - Home/domestic circumstances
  - Immigration history
- **What procedures they followed, and why**
  - Stage at which CIO involved
  - Stage at which IS81 issued
- **What was the outcome of the case and why**
- **What if circumstances were different ..... (details to be selected in light of case being discussed)**
  - Purpose of visit
  - Financial situation
  - Occupation
  - Home/domestic circumstances
  - Immigration history
  - Nationality
  - Visa or non-visa national
  - Other factors relevant to case (eg sponsor story, knowledge of Britain etc)

b) *IF NOT ENOUGH RECALL OR DETAIL INTRODUCE **ONE** OF THE VIGNETTES. SEE SEPARATE SHEET FOR QUESTIONS*



### 3. The decision making process: assessing credibility

a) Thinking more widely about how they go about assessing credibility.. they have mentioned a number of factors already ....

- How they weigh up different factors/pros and cons
- Whether they consider certain factors more important than others – which?
- What if.....

<p><b>Flight is considered high risk</b></p> <p>Passenger is visa or non-visa national</p> <p><b>Passenger is a high-risk national</b></p> <p><b>Passenger is nervous</b></p> <p><b>Passenger is dressed in a particular way (eg which does not fit purpose of entry)</b></p>	<p><b>ASK</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ How this affects their line of questioning/do they usually ask more questions</li> <li>➤ What they are looking for/trying to establish</li> </ul>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Do they take account of differences between different cultures – how?

*B) WITH REGARD TO THE TYPES OF BREACHES THEY ENCOUNTER SHOW CARD*

<p><b>Overstaying</b></p> <p><b>Illegal working (including prostitution for example)</b></p> <p><b>Criminal activity (including drugs)</b></p> <p><b>Hospital treatment</b></p> <p><b>Marriage (without a visa)</b></p> <p><b>Traffic in minors</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Any other types of breaches - not listed</b></li> <li>• <b>What sorts of things might alert them to a potential breach</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ To what extent they can judge when these might occur: how and why (with examples)</li> <li>➤ What factors take in to account when assessing</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Whether any patterns or trends eg (age, sex, nationality)</b></li> </ul>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Overall, how much flexibility they have in weighing up the evidence
- Extent to which they might give people the benefit of the doubt
  - How this might vary between different kinds of passenger and why
- Apart from passenger's circumstances, extent to which anything else affects the process of handling passengers at control
  - Staffing level
  - Size of queue
  - Targets
  - Requests from other services eg. Customs and Excise

#### **4. Learning the IO role**

- **How did they learn what to take into account in order to assess credibility**
- **How important they think an IO's experience is**
  - Extent to which IOs develop 'an instinct'
- **Their views on value of any training / mentoring received:**
  - Weighing up evidence/establishing credibility
  - Dealing with the international public/diversity/race equality

#### **5. Guidance and support around decisions**

- **What kind of instructions / 'information from other sources' does an IO have to take into account**
  - Importance of different sources/where does information come from

*PROBE TO SEE IF AWARE OF DIFFERENT KINDS OF INSTRUCTIONS – eg AUTHORIZATIONS AS DISTINCT FROM LOCAL PORT INITIATIVES / BRIEFINGS*

- **How guidance and instructions are communicated**
  - What are the main ways/for different kinds of guidance or instructions
  - How easy/difficult they find keeping abreast of guidance etc
- **How guidance/instructions affect their questioning and decision making process**
  - Extent to which they think they are consistent in implementation
- **How they adapt to changes in guidance and instructions**
  - How changes (removal from risk list) affect treatment of passenger
  - How easy for them to adapt
- **Importance of advice from colleagues**
  - From other IOs
  - At what stage they ask CIO's advice/opinion
  - How they resolve any differences of opinion between IO and CIO
  - Their awareness of colleagues' views/any peer pressure
  - Whether they see any evidence of IO attitudes changing over time

#### **6. The wider context**

- **Their views on the role of Border control vis-à-vis other services/agencies**
- **Extent to which they are aware of/affected by wider debates about immigration (e.g. in the media)**
  - How this might affect the decision making process
- **Finally, their suggestions and thoughts about**
  - How their job could be made easier/more effective
  - Things which would help them to feel more confident in their decision making

*CHECK WHETHER ANY COMMENTS/ISSUES WOULD LIKE TO RAISE BEFORE ENDING*

THANK PARTICIPANT FOR THEIR TIME, REASSURE AGAIN ABOUT CONFIDENTIALITY AND ANONYMITY

## Appendix C: Landing card vignettes

**LANDING CARD**  
Immigration Act 1971



Please complete clearly in **BLOCK CAPITALS** Por favour completar claramente en **MAYUSCULAS**  
Veuillez remplir lisiblement en **LETTRES MAJUSCULES** Bitte deutlich in **DRUCKHCHRIFT** ausfüllen

**Family name**  
Nom de famille  
Apellidom  
Familiennamen  
MANERO

**Forenames**  
Prénom  
Nombre(s) de Pila  
Vornamen  
**TONY**

**Sex** M  
Sexe  
Sexo  
Geschlecht  
(M, F)

**Date of Birth** Day Month Year  
Date de naissance  
Fecha de nacimiento  
Geburtsdatum  
1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 7

**Place of birth**  
Lieu de naissance  
Lugar de nacimiento  
Geburtsort  
SAO PAULO

**Nationality**  
Nationalité  
Nacionalidad  
Staatsangehörigke  
BRAZILIAN

**Occupation**  
Profession  
Profesión  
Beruf  
GLASS WORKER

**Address in United Kingdom** ..... BELLS HOTEL  
Adresse au Royaume Uni  
Dirección en el Reino Unido  
Adresse im Vereinigten Königreich  
..... EALING LONDON

**Signature**  
Firma  
Unterschrift  
T.Manero

**AXH 24 570**

*For Official use/reserve usage official/Para uso official/Nur für den Dienstgebrauch*

CAT  -16  CODE  NAT  POL



### VIGNETTE A: BRAZILIAN MALE

- What would they be trying to establish if they were to land this passenger
- What questions would they ask
- What concerns might lead to issuing of IS81
- What would they be looking for in further enquiries / baggage search

<u>Name</u>	Tony Manero	WHAT IF.....
Sex	Male	
Age	28	
Nationality	Brazilian (non-visa national)	White American/Indian
Place of birth	Sao Paulo	
Origin of flight	Lisbon	
Any problems with documentation	No	
Purpose of entry	Visit Camilla Brunerie (met over internet)	Just coming on holiday
Proposed length of stay	3 weeks	
Appearance/manner	Confident, speaks good English	Less confident
Where staying	In Bells Hotel in Ealing	Staying with Camilla
Sponsor	Camilla Bruniere	Different story/not contactable
Ticket situation	Open return	Single ticket/dated return
Money	\$120, no credit card	More money, a credit card
Occupation	Glass worker	An accountant/recently lost his job
Circumstances back home	Single, no children	Married/children
Immigration history	Not been to Britain before	Visited UK before

**LANDING CARD**  
Immigration Act 1971



*Please complete clearly in BLOCK CAPITALS Por favour completar claramente en MAYUSCULAS  
Veuillez remplir lisiblement en LETTRES MAJUSCULES Bitte deutlich in DRUCKHCHRIFT ausfüllen*

**Family name**  
Nom de famille  
Apellidom  
Familiennamen  
ALLAHAN

**Forenames**  
Prénom  
Nombre(s) de Pila  
Vornamen  
**DEEPAK**

**Sex** F  
Sexe  
Sexo  
Geschlecht  
(M, F)

**Date of Birth**  
Date de naissance  
Fecha de nacimiento  
Geburtsdatum  
Day Month Year  
2 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 4

**Place of birth**  
Lieu de naissance  
Lugar de nacimiento  
Geburtsort  
HYDERABAD  
ANDHRA PRADESH

**Nationality**  
Nationalité  
Nacionalidad  
Staatsangehörigkeit  
INDIAN

**Occupation**  
Profession  
Profesión  
Beruf  
NOT WORKING -  
MOTHER

**Address in United Kingdom**  
Adresse au Royaume Uni  
Dirección en el Reino Unido  
Adresse im Vereinigten Königreich  
.....**WITH SISTER - SUNITA**  
.....  
.....**BRADFORD**  
.....  
.....

**Signature**  
Firma  
Unterschrift  
Deepak Allahan

**AXH 24 570**

*For Official use/reserve usage official/Para uso oficial/Nur für den Dienstgebrauch*

CAT  -16  CODE  NAT  POL



**VIGNETTE B: INDIAN FEMALE**

- What would they be trying to establish if they were to land this passenger
- What questions would they ask
- What concerns might lead to issuing of IS81
- What would they be looking for in further enquiries / baggage search

<b>Name</b>	<b>Deepak Allahan (accompanied by 2 children aged 2 and 4)</b>	<b>WHAT IF..... Did not have children with her</b>
<b>Sex</b>	<b>Female</b>	
<b>Age</b>	<b>21</b>	
<b>Nationality</b>	<b>Indian (visa national)</b>	<b>Other nationality (eg white South African)</b>
<b>Place of birth</b>	<b>Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh</b>	
<b>Origin of flight</b>	<b>Chennai</b>	
<b>Any problems with documentation</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Purpose of entry</b>	<b>Visit her sister Sunita in Bradford</b>	
<b>Proposed length of stay</b>	<b>Not sure</b>	
<b>Appearance / manner</b>	<b>Nervous and emotional, poor English</b>	<b>More confident/better English</b>
<b>Where staying</b>	<b>With sister Sunita in Bradford</b>	<b>Staying in a hotel</b>
<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Sister</b>	<b>Confirms story, staying for a month after death of husband</b>
<b>Ticket situation</b>	<b>Single ticket</b>	<b>Open return/dated return</b>
<b>Money</b>	<b>£50 , no credit card</b>	<b>More money, a credit card</b>
<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Not working , a mother</b>	<b>A call centre operator</b>
<b>Circumstances back home</b>	<b>Widowed, children aged 2 and 4</b>	<b>Not widowed, sister says fleeing domestic violence</b>
<b>Immigration history</b>	<b>Not been to Britain before</b>	<b>Visited UK before</b>

**LANDING CARD**  
**Immigration Act 1971**



*Please complete clearly in BLOCK CAPITALS Por favour completar claramente en MAYUSCULAS  
Veuillez remplir lisiblement en LETTRES MAJUSCULES Bitte deutlich in DRUCKHCHRIFT ausfüllen*

**Family name**  
Nom de famille  
Apellidom  
Familiennamen  
**RAPHAEL**

**Forenames**  
Prénom  
Nombre(s) de Pila  
Vornamen  
**SALLY**

**Sex** F  
Sexe  
Sexo  
Geschlecht  
(M, F)

**Date of Birth**  
Date de naissance  
Fecha de nacimiento  
Geburtsdatum  
Day Month Year  
**1 9 0 5 7 4**

**Place of birth**  
Lieu de naissance  
Lugar de nacimiento  
Geburtsort  
**SAN FRANCISCO**

**Nationality**  
Nationalité  
Nacionalidad  
Staatsangehörige  
**AMERICAN**

**Occupation**  
Profession  
Profesión  
Beruf  
**STUDENT**

**Address in United Kingdom**  
Adresse au Royaume Uni  
Dirección en el Reino Unido  
Adresse im Vereinigten Königreich  
**29 PARK GREEN**  
**DULWICH LONDON**

**Signature**  
Firma  
Unterschrift  
**Sally Raphael**

**AXH 24 570**

*For Official use/reserve usage official/Para uso official/Nur für den Dienstgebrauch*

CAT  -16  CODE  NAT  POL





**VIGNETTE C: AMERICAN FEMALE**

- What would they be trying to establish if they were to land this passenger
- What questions would they ask
- What concerns might lead to issuing of IS81
- What would they be looking for in further enquiries / baggage search

<b>Name</b>	<b>Sally Raphael</b>	<b>WHAT IF.....</b>
<b>Sex</b>	<b>Female</b>	
<b>Age</b>	<b>31</b>	
<b>Nationality</b>	<b>American (non-visa national)</b>	<b>Malaysian</b>
<b>Place of birth</b>	<b>San Francisco</b>	
<b>Origin of flight</b>	<b>Copenhagen (has been travelling in Denmark)</b>	
<b>Any problems with documentation</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Purpose of entry</b>	<b>Visiting friends she met whilst travelling</b>	<b>A holiday on her own</b>
<b>Proposed length of stay</b>	<b>Not certain</b>	<b>4 weeks</b>
<b>Appearance/manner</b>	<b>Confident, casually dressed with backpack</b>	
<b>Where staying</b>	<b>Staying with friends in Dulwich</b>	<b>Staying in a hotel/no definite plans of where to stay or visit</b>
<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Jenny Brown, friend in Dulwich</b>	<b>Different story/not contactable</b>
<b>Ticket situation</b>	<b>Open return</b>	<b>Dated return</b>
<b>Money</b>	<b>\$200 and credit card</b>	<b>More money</b>
<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Student</b>	<b>A waitress</b>
<b>Circumstances back home</b>	<b>Single, no children</b>	<b>Married/children/no fixed abode in US</b>
<b>Immigration history</b>	<b>Not been to Britain before</b>	<b>Had been to Britain before, staying longer each time/had been denied residency in Denmark</b>

## References

**Campbell, B. A.** (1981) *Race-of-interviewer effect among southern adolescents*. Public Opinion Quarterly, 45, pp 231-235.

**Renzetti, C. and Lee, R.** (1993) *Researching sensitive topics*. London: Sage.

**Ritchie, J. and Lewis, J.** (Eds) (2004) *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: Sage.

**Schaeffer, N. C.** (1980) *Evaluating race-of-interviewer effects in a national survey*. Sociological methods and research, 8, pp. 400-419.

**Spencer, L., Ritchie, J., Lewis, J. and Dillon, L.** (2003) *Quality in qualitative evaluation: a framework for assessing research evidence*. Cabinet Office.

**Woodfield, K., Spencer, L., Purdon, S., Pascale, J., Legard, R., Anie, A., Ndofor-Tah, C., Mouden, J. and Brennan, F.** (2006) *Exploring the decision making of Immigration Officers – a research study examining non-EEA passenger stops and refusals at UK ports*. Home Office Research Series.

Produced by the Research Development and Statistics Directorate, Home Office

This document is available only in Adobe Portable Document Format (**PDF**) through the RDS website

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds>

Email: [public.enquiries@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:public.enquiries@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk)

ISBN: 978 1 84726 142 7

© Crown copyright 2007