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Summary

This report gathers together the data collected Support for Asylum Seekers in Ireland (SASI) survey. This first wave of data collection was carried out from 9 January through 5 April 2013. The aims of the survey were to gain an overview of the field of asylum support and to address the following research questions:

- What effects has the recession had on the field?
- To what extent do asylum seekers participate in the field?
- What types of organisations tend to work together?

To those ends, the survey included questions about the attributes of participating organisations as well as questions about their working relationships with other organisations. Those organisations that are non-profit, non-statutory and name asylum seekers as among their main beneficiaries were invited to participate. In total, 50 eligible organisations took part in the survey.

Key findings of the survey include:

- **Over half** (60%) of responding organisations are **based in County Dublin**. At the time of the study, 40% of all direct provision residents lived in Munster, while only 24% of respondents are located there.
- The field is **young and changing**. Twenty-one (42%) organisations were established after the turn of the millennium. Seven organisations were established in the last three years (2009 – 2012), while participants named six organisations that had closed down in that period.
- The most common source of funding in the field is **state funding** (from local, national or EU levels).
- The effects of the recession described by organisations are varied, but the most commonly cited difficulties are **decreased funding** and **increased workload**.
- **Asylum seekers and former asylum seekers are active in field**, especially in volunteer capacities. Approximately one-fourth (25.38%) of all reported cases of volunteerism in the field are confirmed asylum seekers or former asylum seekers, and 42% of respondents reported the presence of one or more asylum seekers or former asylum seekers on their voluntary board / managing committee.
- Despite the heavily Dublin-centred distribution of organisations, the field is **well connected** via collaboration relationships and shared affiliations.

A secondary goal of this survey was an online database of organisations that support asylum seekers, which is now available at sasi.ie/directory. To date, 67 organisations have opted to appear in the directory. Registration for the directory is still open and available on the website.
Introduction

Asylum Seekers in Ireland

Asylum seekers are a small but vulnerable population in the Republic of Ireland. As they await the decision on their application for refugee status, asylum seekers are dispersed throughout the country in the direct provision system, in which accommodation, board, and all medical and social welfare services are provided by the State and coordinated by the Reception and Integration Agency (RIA) (RIA 2010). As of the end of March 2013, there were 5,458 asylum seekers in direct provision, or .10% of the population as of the 2011 census (RIA 2013). The average duration of a resident’s stay is currently 3 years and 8 months, and 433 residents have been in direct provision for over 7 years (RIA 2013).

Per the Refugee Act 1996, asylum seekers are barred from employment while their status is under review. In the meantime, they receive a weekly supplementary welfare allowance of €19.10 per adult / €9.60 per child (FLAC 2009). 'The net effect of these measures... has been to effectively guarantee the social exclusion of asylum seekers in Ireland' (O’Mahony 2003: 135). The stress, boredom and poverty associated with long-term residence in direct provision pose risks of institutionalisation and dependency, de-skilling, depression and exacerbation of PTSD (O’Mahony 2003; FLAC 2009; Moreo and Lentin 2010).

The Field of Asylum Support

Across the country, non-profit organisations work to help asylum seekers mitigate the effects of this exclusion by providing a range of support, services, and information. These organisations work to fill in the service gaps, advocate on asylum seekers’ behalf, and strive to shape the policies that affect asylum seekers’ day-to-day lives. Organisational support for asylum seekers is particularly important in a country like Ireland, where the asylum population is small and relatively new (MacFarlane et al. 2009). Previous studies have highlighted how difficult information can be for asylum seekers and frontline service providers to find and how important non-profits are to its transmission (AkiDwa 2010, MacFarlane et al. 2009).

The field of asylum support has been weathering the challenges of the recession much like the rest of the country. The on-going cuts to State funding and decreasing donations combined with the impending winding down of the two major philanthropic funders of the field (Atlantic Philanthropies and the One Foundation) all pose serious challenges to much of the work of supporting asylum seekers. In addition, public sentiment toward migrant communities has been seen to change for the worse since 2008 (McGinnity et al. 2013).
Despite these challenges, 2013 has been an active year for the field of asylum support. Within the three months of the survey alone, there was a lot of activity in the field. There was a major high court decision challenging the then current process for evaluating subsidiary protection claims, which INIS is still in the process of updating (Conlan 2013). The release of the final report on the Magdalene Laundries by Martin McAleese and a letter to the Irish Times by a doctor who works in Direct Provision Centres both galvanised the national discussion on institutionalisation generally and direct provision in particular (McDonald 2013; Hourihane 2013; O’Brien 2013; Giller 2013). A report published jointly by Barnardos and the HSE highlighted the advances and concerns in the care of separated children (Ní Raghallaigh 2013). Meanwhile, around the country, NGOs, community groups and other collectives kept up with the day-to-day work of supporting asylum seekers that rarely features in the news.

As evidenced by this small list of activities, collaborations, partnerships and informal relationships are critical to the work in the field. Whether they are necessitated by the inherently complex nature of asylum-related issues, by the demands of funding applications (Prospectus 2008; Feldman 2007) or by the need to strengthen voices by combining them (Yanacopulos 2005), these relationships shape the work that is done and the issues that are raised. This report aims to take stock of the field of non-profit asylum support and begin to unpack the nature of those relationships.

**The Research**

This survey was part of a two-step project: first, to gain a quantitative overview of the field. Second, to interview participants and unpack the relationships that sustain the field. What makes organisations work together? What do organisations look for in collaborators? The survey served to fulfil the first goal, creating a map of the field and gathering important data on the participating organisations. This report aims to fill the current gap in knowledge about the Irish asylum support sector (Cotter 2004; Gill et al. 2012). The target population of the survey was all non-profit, non-statutory organisations that name asylum seekers as among their main beneficiaries.
Table 1: Organisation Eligibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asylum Seekers as Main Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Non-Statutory</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, the survey garnered 89 responses, 50 of which met the eligibility criteria. None of the respondents were for-profit organisations. However, 12 organisations described themselves as statutory (i.e. having been established specifically to deliver government services or programmes (Mullen et al. 2012)), and 32 did not consider asylum seekers to be among their main beneficiaries (either because they make a significant proportion of total beneficiaries or because the organisation runs programmes that specifically target asylum seekers). While these organisations also contribute to the field of asylum support, they will not be under consideration in this report.

---

1 All percentages are of the total number of respondents (50), not of the number of respondents who answered any particular question. In the relationships section, percentages refer to the total number of eligible organisations (55).
An Overview of the Field

One of the first aims of this project was to come to grips with the basic demographics of the field. Where are the organisations? How long have they been around? Who’s working for them? And how have they been affected by the recession? In brief, the non-profits that support asylum seekers are spread throughout the country, although over half are in County Dublin. Most of them have been established since the turn of the millennium. They are overwhelmingly staffed by volunteers, and the effects of the recession are as varied as the types of organisations in the field.

Location

Over half (28) of responding organisations were based in County Dublin. In descending order, respondents were located in Leinster (60%), Munster (24%), Connacht (14%) and Ulster (2%). Only organisations located within the Republic of Ireland were included in this study.

Table 2: Organisations by Province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Number of Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leinster</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munster</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connacht</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those organisations that did not provide information on their location, their county was identified through a web search and imputed into the data.
This distribution of support does not reflect the high number of asylum seekers resident in direct provision centres in Munster at the time of the survey. As shown in Table 3, 40% of all direct provision residents are in Munster, while Leinster is populated by 39% of RIA residents, while Connacht has 17% and Ulster has 4%.

Table 3: RIA Residents by Province Source: (RIA 2013)

Instead, the distribution of organisations that support asylum seekers reflects that of all non-profits found in O’Donohue et al.’s 2004 survey of the field, in which Leinster (50.7%), Munster (28.2%), Connacht (15.3%) and Ulster (6%). This mismatch between the numbers of organisations and beneficiaries in Dublin might be due to resources and infrastructure already available from the non-profits that pre-date the field of asylum support.

One final point worth noting is that there are four direct provision centres in towns around the country from which no organisation responded and no organisation was named as a collaboration partner. Given the limitations on transport and communications imposed on asylum seekers by their low financial support and the often isolated locations of direct provision centres, it is important that support be accessible. There are possible alternative explanations for the apparent gaps. Organisations from relatively near, larger localities might reach out to those centres; statutory organisations might provide the bulk of the support; or local non-profits simply might not have chosen to participate in the survey. However, the lack any indication of coverage in any survey responses does raise concerns about possible gaps in support around the country.

**A Field in Flux**

Two sections of the survey allowed for an analysis of growth and decline in the field. The first was a series of questions about organisations that used to collaborate with responding organisations, and the second was a question about the year respondents began their work.
When asked about past co-collaborators that have left the field in the past three years, participants named 17 different organisations, 7 of which were identified as having closed down. Six of these would have been eligible to participate in the survey (i.e. were non-profit and non-statutory).

Six organisations that were named as having left the field are still in operation. In two instances a relevant programme and post were respectively cut due to a lack of funding. In one instance, the named organisation was an eligible participant of the survey, which suggests disagreement in the field over what constitutes support for asylum seekers.

The field is shifting, but not necessarily in decline. Three participating organisations identified themselves as having been constituted out of mergers. The evaluations on the effects of mergers in previous research are mixed. They have been described as a rationalisation of resources and services (Macmillan et al. 2013), a way to manage uncertainty (Yanacopulos 2005) or a site of potential co-optation (Lentin 2012) leading to loses in capacities, staff and inter-organisational contacts. In all three cases, mergers represent a proactive strategy to prolong the life of an organisation in the face of adversity.

Despite the belt-tightening of the recession, seven organisations identified themselves as having been established in the last three years (2009 – 2012). While there is not enough information to evaluate the comparability of the new organisations with those that have left the field, it is worth noting that one more new organisation was established than the number of potentially eligible organisations named as having shut down.

The field is also young, with 21 organisations (42%) established after the year 2000. The two years with the largest number of new organisations established were 2000 (5 organisations) and 2006 (4 organisations). The relative youth of the field reflects the relatively recent nature of asylum support as a major social issue. Ireland did not begin receiving significant numbers of asylum applications until the late 1990's, when the growing economy and an increase in affordable travel put Ireland on the in-migration map (Loyal 2011).
Who gives support?

One of the key aspects of a non-profit organisation is that it is ‘voluntary to some meaningful extent’ (Salamon and Anheier 1992: 1), so it is perhaps unsurprising that the field of non-profit asylum support is made up of more than twice as many cases of volunteerism (800) as of paid employment (347).

Paid Staff

In total, 45 organisations answered the staffing questions. About one third of respondents (32%) reported having no employees. Another third (34%) reported fewer than ten employees. This is a much higher level of paid employment than that of the wider non-profit sector, where more than half (55%) of all organisations had no employees in 2012 (Mullen et al. 2012).

Table 5: Total Number of Employees per Organisation (in 10s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Number of Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over half of the responding organisations (52%) have no full-time paid employees. The average number of full-time paid employees is 2, the highest number is 15. The average number of part-time paid employees per organisation is 3. The highest number of part-time paid employees reported was 25. Twenty-three organisations reported employees recruited through FÁS, CE or other schemes. The average number of scheme employees was 2.38.
The average number of total employees per organisation is 8. This is roughly in line with the findings of a recent overview of the Irish non-profit sector, which found that almost two thirds of all non-profits (61.4%) have 9 or fewer employees (The Wheel 2012).

**Volunteers**

Volunteerism garnered much higher numbers in the survey. Forty-three organisations reported on their volunteers (excluding board / managing committee members). The average amount of volunteers is 19, with only 9 organisations (18%) reporting no volunteers, and the highest number of volunteers at any one organisation over 250. Thirteen organisations report having volunteer interns on staff.
Overall, there are 800 cases of volunteering reported in the field. The actual number of individual volunteers is likely to be lower, as some volunteers will give their time to more than one organisation. Furthermore, one organisation highlighted the fact that activists do not necessarily fit into the categories of staff or volunteers, highlighting the difficulty of quantifying the many ways to participate in the support for asylum seekers.

**Management**

Over four-fifths of all organisations (82%) reported having voluntary boards / managing committees, ranging in size from 2 to 28 members. The average number of members was 8, and 6 was the most commonly reported number (by 10 organisations).

**Asylum Participation**

Participation by asylum seekers and former asylum seekers in a non-profit can provide access for beneficiaries into the dialogue about the processes and policies that circumscribes their lives (Cullen 2009). Volunteerism is an indicator of positive “citizenship” (Putnam 2000) that can assist integration and mitigate the effects of enforced unemployment for asylum seekers (Feldman et al. 2005). By working *with* beneficiaries, rather than working *for* them, non-profits can tread the fine line of highlighting asylum seekers’ needs while empowering them as active participants in their own fate (Hardy and Phillips 1999; Donoghue 2003). Previous research has questioned whether this participation is always genuinely empowering (Feldman 2007; AkiDwa 2010), but those questions are beyond the remit of this study.

To gauge this participation, organisations were asked to report the number of known asylum seekers and former asylum seekers that make up their paid staff, volunteer base and voluntary board / managing committee. The *Refugee Act 1996* prohibits the disclosure of an asylum seeker’s status as such, which means organisations might not be aware of asylum seekers and former asylum seekers in their organisation.

**Table 8: Number of Asylum Seekers / Former Asylum Seekers on Staff per Organisation**

```
None  1  2  2  2  0  1
30  8  2  2  0  1
```
Most organisations (30) had no asylum seekers or former asylum seekers on their payroll. The highest number reported was 6, and the average is less than one (.71). The Refugee Act 1996 also prohibits current asylum seekers from engaging in paid employment while they await the decision on their status.

In contrast, there are 203 reported cases of asylum seekers or former asylum seekers volunteering with at least 26 of the organisations in the field. The average number of asylum seekers volunteering with a participating organisation is 5. The highest number of asylum seeker volunteers reported by any one organisation is 50. Just over one fourth of all reported cases of volunteerism in the field are confirmed asylum seekers or former asylum seekers. This number does not represent the total number of asylum seekers volunteering with non-profits in Ireland, as many may choose to give their time to other fields.

Table 9: Number of Asylum Seekers / Former Asylum Seekers Volunteering per Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Asylum Seekers / Former Asylum Seekers</th>
<th>Number of Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the field of asylum support, volunteerism among asylum seekers and former asylum seekers is found predominantly in those organisations that support new communities (63.05%). The remaining one-third are organisations that either support the wider population (30.05%) or did not report on target beneficiaries.
Finally, there are 64 cases of asylum seekers reported to be sitting on the voluntary boards / managing committees of 21 organisations (42%). The highest number of asylum seekers on a single board is 6, and the average number is 2.

In total, over four-fifths of respondent organisations (82%) report participation by asylum seekers or former asylum seekers in some capacity – be it as paid staff, volunteer support or as a member of the voluntary board/management committee. This high percentage of participation gives cause for cautious optimism for the participation of beneficiaries in the civic activities that impact their experience of and place in Irish society.
The work at hand

The work of supporting asylum seekers comes in many different forms, and responding organisations’ descriptions of their target beneficiaries and their main activities highlight the diversity of the field.

Target beneficiaries

Forty-six organisations reported on their target beneficiaries. Only 3 support asylum seekers specifically, with 15 also supporting refugees, 13 supporting migrants generally, and 15 reporting “Other”.

Of those that specified “Other” as their main beneficiaries, all but one indicated that they provide a service to the general population and support asylum seekers to the extent that they require that support – e.g. supporting survivors of sexual violence. The one exception reported supporting both asylum seekers and the community via integration activities.

Table 12: Organisations by Beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Number of Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only Asylum Seekers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees and Asylum Seekers</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants Generally</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of asylum seekers who were direct beneficiaries of the responding organisations last year ranged from 3 to 3540, with an average of 207. With 44 organisations reporting, nearly half (48%) reported 50 or fewer asylum seeker beneficiaries. In total, these organisations reported 9,112 cases of asylum seeker support in the past year. An individual asylum seeker will receive support from more than one organisation because of the diverse needs of an individual asylum seeker and because of the movement of asylum seekers between direct provision centres (AkiDwa 2010; FLAC 2009; Arnold 2012). This is why the number is nearly twice the number of asylum seekers reported by RIA to be living in Direct Provision.
Organisations were also asked whether they offered services targeted to specific sub-groups of asylum seekers, and 34 participants named particular populations. Table 14 shows the distribution of targeted populations. Women, aged-out minors and children and young people were the three most commonly named groups.

Other targeted groups named by participants included new asylum applicants, deportees, people living with HIV and women affected by prostitution and sexual trafficking.
Support Activities

The field of asylum support covers a wide range of activities, spanning 9 of the 11 non-profit classifications delineated by the Comparative Non-profit Sector Project at Johns Hopkins University (Salamon and Anheier 1992): culture and recreation; education and research; health; social services; environment; social & community development, housing, employment & training; law, advocacy, politics; philanthropic intermediaries and voluntarism promotion; and religion. The survey asked respondents about a series of activities frequently cited in work supporting asylum seekers.

A total of 43 organisations indicated their main activities. Information services, integration support and cultural events were the most commonly named activities. Other activities specified by the organisations themselves included: homework and education support, volunteering opportunities, and training for staff and volunteers that support asylum seekers. The distribution can be seen on Table 15.

Support for asylum seekers in Ireland comes from a wide range of organisations – from their differing target beneficiaries to the distribution of activities across organisations. The supports vary not only over the field, but also within organisations. In fact, the average number of activities reported per organisation is 7, which would suggest that individual organisations resist classification (for example, as campaign leaders or service providers) and raises the question of whether there is room for a more streamlined coordination of support activities.
Finances and the Recession

Respondents were asked to name their main sources of funding in rank order. In total, 40 respondents provided information on their sources of income. Despite the steep decline in funding from the Irish government since 2008 (Prospectus 2008), state funding (including health board grants, national lottery, EU funding, etc.) was by far the most frequently quoted largest source of income, with 38% of respondents naming it as their top ranked financial contributor.

![Table 16: Largest Sources of Income](image)

State income was also the most frequently named source overall (26 organisations in total). Individual donations (24 organisations) and other organisations (such as foundations, philanthropic organisations and other NGOs) (18 organisations) came next in line.

As will be shown in the following section, the source of an organisation’s income can have an impact on its experience of the recession.
Qualitative Results

Respondents were also invited to comment qualitatively on the effects the recession is having on their organisation. Overall, the responses resonated with recent findings in both Ireland and the UK, which highlighted the double demands of the recession: increased demand for services paired with a reduction of financial support (Harvey 2012; The Wheel 2012; Macmillan et al. 2013). In their case studies of UK non-profits, Macmillan et al. (2013) emphasise that the diversity of organisational forms means that experiences of the recession will vary, as can also be seen below.

Table 17: All Sources of Income Named

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisations</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Donations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Cited Recession Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recession Effect</th>
<th>Number of Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Challenges</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Workload</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Cuts</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Cuts</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Concerns</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following issues were raised:

- **Decreased funding**: Leading to pay cuts, cuts in staff numbers and staff pay, service cuts, increased reliance on volunteers. One organisation was set to wind down services with an already scheduled closing date.

The cuts in staff and increased reliance on volunteers were also reflected in survey responses. Only 7 organisations saw an increase in staff over the last three years, while 13 saw a decrease. In contrast, 17 organisations saw their volunteer numbers increase, and only 7 organisations saw a decrease in volunteer numbers.

![Table 19: Changes in Staffing over the Last 3 Years](image)

The increase in volunteer numbers is roughly similar to the results found in a survey of the entire non-profit field conducted one year prior to this study (The Wheel 2012), however the decrease in paid staff is more pronounced in the asylum support field. This discrepancy could be due to research timing; the country was one year deeper into the recession when this study was conducted. Alternatively, it could potentially be attributed to the uneven distribution of cuts to budgets of government departments that traditionally fund the community and voluntary sector. In his study of the community, Brian Harvey (2012) found that the Office of the Minister for Integration saw a 63% cut in budget in the years 2008-2011.
### Table 20: Changes in Staffing in Asylum Support Organisations and the Wider Non-profit Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of asylum support</th>
<th>Paid Staff (Source: The Wheel 2012)</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of asylum support</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire field of non-profits</td>
<td>28.50%</td>
<td>19.80%</td>
<td>40.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Increased workload:** The increased workload comes mainly from an increase in demand for services, as well as changes in required services including: a rise in homelessness, drug and alcohol abuse, relationship/marriage break up, and changing local perceptions to immigration. The Wheel (2012) also reports increased demand across 63.5% of the wider non-profit field. One organisation noted that the increasing focus on fundraising and evaluation has added to their workload, a finding that is also echoed in Harvey’s (2012) study of the community sector. According to one organisation, this increase in workload combined with the decrease in funds means that organisations ‘...are working harder and being more creative with the resources that we do have.’

- **Concerns about sustainability of the organisation and/or its work:** Reasons given include project-based funding and a lack of guarantee of future funding, regardless of whether sources are public or private. One organisation wrote that the recession ‘undermines confidence of [the] organisation to continue its work in the future and maintain long-term planning and vision for our aims and objectives.’ Notably, even two of the organisations which did not see any change yet cited these concerns.

- Increased **transport costs** and difficulty obtaining **space** for work / activities

- Five organisations noted that they saw **no change** due to the recession. All of these organisations rely on alternative sources of income to State or NGO funding, such as individual donations, membership dues, scratch cards or corporate sponsorship. Additionally, they are all located within the capital city, which potentially affords a higher degree of support infrastructure given the preponderance of other non-profits in the area.

While the recession poses very serious challenges, the field is remarkably resilient due to the resourcefulness and creative responses by individual organisations. None of the strategies necessary to weather the decline in funding are without their costs, but by relying on volunteers and alternate streams of income, and by streamlining their activities, organisations are largely staying afloat so far and persevering in the work of supporting Ireland’s asylum seeking population.
**Relationships**

While there is no single official network that includes all of the organisations that support asylum seekers in Ireland, social network analysis can be used to visualise and understand the relationships that connect the relevant organisations. Social network analysis is an analytical tool that measures and models relationships in order to reveal underlying structures of relationships that are not always apparent in everyday life. The network diagrams used in the discussion below are visualisations of the relationships named by participating organisations. They model the collaborative and affiliation relationships within the field of support for asylum seekers in Ireland. They do not reflect either the geographic distribution the totality of relationships.

The underlying assumption of social network analysis is that individual attributes are not enough to understand organisations; because organisations are interdependent, the structure of relationships is also necessary to come to grips with a field (Borgatti et al. 2009; Wassermann and Faust 1994). These relationships can be used to transmit information, innovations, values and resources and provide an informal web of support (Powell 1990; Fuhse 2009). The structure of relationships can have an impact on the distribution and movement of these resources through the field, impacting the outcomes of organisations’ efforts (Lin 2008). In their work on transnational advocacy networks, Keck and Sikkink note that when networks aim towards a shared goal, they ‘operate best when they are dense, with many actors, strong connections among groups in the network, and reliable information flow’ (Keck and Sikkink 1998: 28).

**Overview**

In the survey, organisations were asked to name up to three collaborators for two types of work – providing information and services and seeking to change policy. The aim was to find out how two factors impact the development of working relationships: geographical location and degree of asylum seeker participation.

Out of a possible 300 relationships (six for each of the fifty participating organisations), participants listed 194 (or 64.67%). Some organisations did not name any collaborators, and more likely than not, many organisations have far more collaboration relationships than this survey could measure.

In this analysis, both types of collaboration will be considered together and understood to create a single network. Because collaboration implies a mutual relationship, each pair of organisations has only one tie between them, even if they name each other. Also, pairs with both service and policy ties will be understood to have a single relationship for the purposes of this discussion. In other words, even if two organisations
name each other for both kinds of work (that is, a total of four links), they will be considered to have a single working relationship in this analysis.³

![Figure 1: Organisations Coloured by County](image)

Many organisations named co-collaborators who would not have been eligible to participate in the survey. For the time being, we’ll leave those organisations aside and just discuss those non-profit, non-statutory organisations that name asylum seekers as among their main beneficiaries. In total, we’ll be looking at our 50 participants, as well as 5 known non-respondents with 65 relationships under consideration.

Over two thirds (69.09%) of all organisations are connected to each other in the largest component which includes 38 organisations. The average number of relationships per organisation is 2.364. Ten organisations are islands in the field, i.e. are not connected to any other eligible non-profits via collaborative relationships.

³ In her study on NGO coalitions Yanacopulos (2005) found that collaboration on advocacy work was easier for organisations than on programme work. This survey garnered more service-based relationships (117) than policy-based relationships (77). This could be due to the particularly individual-based needs of asylum support, or because respondents were asked about service-based relationships first. Participant fatigue is a known issue with network surveys.
An important feature of this field is the role of hubs – or highly connected organisations. As can be seen in Figure 2 below, three quarters of the eligible organisations (indicated by the top of the box) have three or fewer relationships with one another. In fact, almost one-third (31.82%) have one or fewer relationships. This means that there are a few outliers that are dragging up the average. The three organisations with the most ties have 19, 10 and 8 relationships within the field respectively. As these are collaborative relationships, it can be inferred that these outlier organisations have resources (whether skills, funds, reputation or other assets) which make them particularly attractive collaboration partners. While collaboration is not overtly a tie over which resources and ideas transmit, it is safe to assume that these hubs are also doing important work of maintaining the connectivity of the field in the course of these collaborative relationships. In other words, outlier is a misnomer in this case – these hubs are at the centre of the field. In fact, just by removing these three organisations from the field breaks up the largest component so that the total number of components in the field nearly doubles from 13 to 25.

![Figure 2: Number of Relationships per Organisation (Box Plot)](image)

**Location**

Evidence from pre-survey observations indicated that there might be a divide between organisations located in Dublin and those in the rest of the country. However, the data suggests that organisations outside of Dublin are largely connected to their counterparts in and around the capital, albeit not always directly.

There are county-based “communities” within the field, but they are largely included in the main component. In fact, there are more than twice as many Dublin-based islands and mini-components (8) as there are non-Dublin-based (4).
As shown in Figure 1, of the 11 counties represented by eligible organisations\(^4\), 8 have organisations that are connected to this large component. The blue organisations are based in County Dublin. Other counties are not labelled in order to protect the anonymity of participating organisations.

In total, over half of the nodes (29 out of 55 or 52.7\%) are inside Dublin. Of the 65 relationships in the field, 26 are between Dublin-based organisations (40\%) and 21 are between non-Dublin organisations (32.31\%). Almost two-thirds (42 relationships or 64.62\%) of all relationships are *intra*-county relationships.

Nonetheless, nearly one-third of all collaboration relationships link Dublin and non-Dublin organisations (27.69\%).

**Asylum Seeker Participation**

As discussed above, participation of asylum seekers in the non-profits that support them is an important indicator of the extent to which asylum seekers participate in the activities and discussions that shape their day-to-day lives. There is no agreed upon indicator of beneficiary leadership of an organisation, so for this discussion we take the presence of asylum seekers or former asylum seekers either on paid staff or on the voluntary board / managing committee as an indicator.

\(^4\) Participants were asked to list the location of their named collaboration partners. When those partners did not participate in the survey themselves, their county of operation was imputed from these reports.
Figure 3 below shows those organisations with confirmed participation of asylum seekers or former asylum seekers in either paid staff or on their voluntary board / managing committee in blue (47.27%). Green organisations are either non-respondents or they did not report knowledge of asylum seekers or former asylum seekers in those positions (52.73%).

Almost half of all relationships (44.62%) are between organisations with confirmed asylum seeker leadership and those without. This indicates that not only are asylum seekers and former asylum seekers active in the field, but those organisations with such beneficiary participation are well integrated in the field. Over one-quarter of the relationships (26.15%) are among relationships with confirmed asylum seeker leadership. Slightly more (29.23%) are among those organisations without confirmed leadership.

The ten organisations without any ties to other organisations are split evenly between those with and without confirmed beneficiary leadership.

Taking into account those organisations that have volunteers who are confirmed asylum seekers and former asylum seekers as well as in staff or board positions (which accounts for 69.09% of all eligible organisations), only 6 relationships exclude those organisations with asylum seeker participation.
Affiliations

Collaboration is only one of many ways for an organisation to link up with other. Affiliations in umbrella organisations also provide opportunities to develop relationships with similarly oriented organisations. Umbrella organisations host events and distribute newsletters that bring organisations in touch with one another. While these relationships might not be as strong as collaboration ties, such shared affiliations also can be an indicator of shared goals and values (de Nooy, Mrvar, and Batagelj 2011).

Table 22: Organisations per Umbrella Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Number of Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AkiDwa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti Racism Network Ireland</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Platform</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Anti-Poverty Network</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Network Against Racism</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration Centre</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Communities Partnership</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Alliance Against Racism</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Forum on Direct Provision</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wheel</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 47 organisations that provided information on their memberships to umbrella organisations, 40 organisations named affiliations. Twelve organisations listed membership to only one organisation. The average number of affiliations per organisation is 3. Nine organisations named umbrella organisations other than those listed in the survey, which included international organisations, religious bodies, local community and integration forums, and alliances and networks related to the specific programme work of organisations.
When organisations are linked together via their affiliations, the resulting network is far denser than the collaboration network. This is because there is no limit to the number of relationships in the field. The average number of relationships per organisation in this network map is 17.68.

**Table 23: Number of Affiliations per Organisation**

![Bar chart showing the number of affiliations per organisation.](image)

**Figure 4: Organisations Connected via Affiliations**

![Network diagram showing connections between organisations.](image)
As Figure 4 illustrates, most organisations are in the large component (76%). Twelve organisations (24%) are islands, i.e. not connected to any other organisation via affiliation (including the 3 organisations that did not answer the question). Half of the islands are in county Dublin. Of those twelve, only five are islands in the previous maps, which means they do not have links to other non-profits in the field through either affiliations or collaboration. Finally, only three organisations are islands when all nominated co-collaborators are taken into account, regardless of eligibility for this study (see Figure 5 below). In other words, only three participants did not name any links at all.

What this means is that the network that is built out of collaboration and affiliation links includes nearly the entire field. The network is indeed dense and well connected.

Views from the Field

In addition to naming their co-collaborators and affiliations, participating organisations were invited to comment on their work with other organisations. The responses reflected a wide range of experiences.

- The most frequently given response was that organisations wanted to emphasise that they had more relationships than those they were given the opportunity to name. Four organisations emphasised that they worked with more NGOs. Six organisations stressed their relationships with statutory organisations.

- Three organisations expressed dissatisfaction with the links between organisations. Two organisations stressed ‘poor cooperation’ between organisations. Another noted that, ‘It is sometimes difficult to access other organisations as so many are based in Dublin. There is a dearth of information and support to grass roots NGOs operating in the provinces. This of course includes funding and other resources.’

- In contrast, two organisations from outside Dublin described strong local coordination of support. This echoes findings of previous case studies in both Ireland and Scotland, where frontline service providers highlight their reliance on local contacts for support in community-based responses to the needs of asylum seekers (Pieper et al. 2009; Faughnan et al. 2002; MacFarlane et al. 2009; Delaney and McGee 2001). Another non-Dublin organisation wrote that ‘the links with other organisations are vital in terms of both service provision and seeking policy change.’

- Three organisations noted a division of labour in the field, underscoring the diversity of work being done. On the other hand, one organisation noted confusion in the field as to who is doing what. Another organisation perceived a gap in the field: ‘I think that there are multiple organisations that tend to work together to support asylum seekers in conjunctive and diverse ways. … But it would have been better to see more organisations helping asylum seekers to be granted asylum as for many
of them they do not know their rights in this matter.’ Finally, another organisation called for more dialogue between ethnic minority groups and the State, echoing findings of previous research (Feldman 2007; Prospectus 2008).

- Two organisations expressed concern about other organisations letting funding impact the direction of their programme work. Notably, no one mentioned the collaboration requirements attached to many funding applications (Feldman 2007; Prospectus 2008).

- Finally, the recession featured in respondents’ perceptions of the field. One organisation commented that it is difficult to maintain links when economic hardship has led to ‘a lack of staff to maintain engagement and funds to cover travel expenses.’ Another organisation highlighted the plight of small organisations that were forced to close or ‘are being maintained on a shoestring with a skeleton staff and volunteers.’ The same organisation noted that mergers result in the loss of contacts built up by the original organisations.

  ‘However,’ that organisation continues, ‘it is not all negative as some of the NGOs working in this sector have actually rebuilt themselves and are back to being leaders in the field.’ Another organisation notes that ‘great working relationships have elicited creative responses to address the reduction in resources.’

These responses indicate an underlying positive orientation toward collaboration within the field. While there is some dissatisfaction among respondents as to the nature of present relationships, all of the comments operate on the assumption that collaboration is not only positive, but also necessary for the work at hand.
Conclusions

The results of this survey of support for asylum seekers in Ireland depict a lively, proactive field of organisations that is inclined toward collaborative relationships. While much of the field is based in County Dublin, and the distribution of participant organisations does not extend to all parts of the country that have direct provision centres, inter-organisational relationships promote the on-going support of asylum seekers in Ireland. Likewise, the challenges of the recession are serious concerns, but they are being met through creative responses within and among organisations. With participation by asylum seekers or former asylum seekers at over four-fifths of the field, there is an opportunity for real dialogue between beneficiaries and those that support them – whether they are non-profit and non-statutory or not.

The persistence of war, political upheaval and environmental emergencies mean that Ireland’s responsibility to asylum seekers is an enduring one. Non-profit organisations play an important role in meeting the basic needs of asylum seekers, providing avenues for integration and cultural expression, and providing a platform for their voices in the national and governmental discussions about the policies and processes that shape their lives. The field faces a range of challenges: decreasing financial support, the geographical span of the direct provision centres, the perennial standstill of the Immigrants’ Residence and Protection Bill’s progress through the Dáil, increasing negative attitudes towards immigrants in Ireland, and declining numbers of asylum applications, to name a few. However, there is evidence that progress, though often incremental, is on-going. In the past few weeks alone, the Irish Ombudsman and a Northern Irish High Court justice have publicly condemned the current direct provision system (O’Reilly 2013; Finn 2013), the Irish High Court will soon be hearing a challenge to the constitutionality of the Direct Provision system (Mac Cormaic 2013), and the Dublin Convention has seen introductions of greater transparency and clarified rules and responsibilities in its latest instantiation (PILA 2013).

Daily support and systemic change both require a range of resources, skills and strategies in addition to sustained communication and collaboration. The data from this 2013 survey suggest diversity, inclusiveness and a willingness to reach out to one another, despite the challenges that can arise in collaborative relationships. More research is necessary to unpack these relationships – their successes and their stumbling blocks – to understand what cooperation means in the field of non-profit support for asylum seekers in Ireland.
Next Steps

Non-profit organisations do not operate in a world populated only by other non-profits. Rather, they must negotiate the many different kinds of stakeholders – including statutory and private organisations as well as key individuals – engaged with their area of interest (Macmillan et al. 2013; Zimmer 2010). Many participants named co-collaborators that would have been ineligible to participate in the survey – whether because they are statutory, for profit, no longer in existence, or they do not consider asylum seekers to be among their main beneficiaries. When these organisations are taken into account, the field grows from 55 to 107 organisations.

It is no surprise that the work of supporting asylum seekers involves a variety of organisations. However, it does mean that it is impossible to truly understand the relationships between the non-profit, non-statutory organisations without looking at the wider social reality in which they are embedded (Granovetter 1985).

This report is only the first step in the work of understanding how non-profits support Ireland’s asylum seekers. The next stage will involve going onsite to interview participants at case study organisations. These interviews will help provide a more detailed view of the context that shapes the relationships between organisations, including the values, goals and other relationships that come into consideration.
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Appendix 1: Methods

The survey was conducted online using the software at unipark.de. A list of potential participants was created by compiling the organisations listed in the following lists:

- Integration Centre: List of affiliates
- New Communities Partnership: List of members
- Irish Refugee Council: Integration Mapping Project
- Dublin Library: Find Your Way: A Guide to Key Services in Dublin City Centre
- Irish Missionary Union: Interfaith, Intercultural Map
- Immigrant Council of Ireland: Directory of Migrant Led Organisations
- All-Ireland Churches Consultative Meeting on Racism: Directory of Migrant-Led Churches & Chaplaincies
- 2012 Revenue List of Charities
- Trinity Immigration Initiative: Migrant Networks Project Map

Organisations were included if they were in the same town as a direct provision centre and their name and/or web presence indicated that they provide services relevant to asylum seekers or if their name indicated alliance with a people from countries that typically send asylum seekers to Ireland. Participants were also recruited at events in the field. In addition, four organisations notified us that they had forwarded on the details of the survey to their mailing lists.

In total, 535 organisations were contacted directly by the researcher via email, phone or Facebook. The net was cast deliberately wide as it is often unclear to what extent organisations focus their work on asylum seekers. In addition, some organisations were invited to participate even though they are statutory, in the event they would be interested in appearing in the directory. A seed list of 14 organisations known to work with asylum seekers as their main beneficiaries were contacted initially via telephone. Any organisation that was named as a collaborator by a responding organisation was also contacted via telephone to encourage response.

Because there was no definitive list of population members (or sampling frame), the survey was open for any organisation that filled the eligibility criteria (non-profit, non-statutory, and naming asylum seekers as a main beneficiary) to complete. Without an initial sampling frame, it is impossible to generalise to those organisations that did not participate. However, the wide list of initial contacts did help to alleviate the bias normally associated with the snowball sampling method, as evidenced by the existence of isolated organisations and sub-groups on the network maps.

The resulting collection of data from 50 eligible organisations roughly matches the size of the field found in the 2008 Prospectus overview of the new communities sector, which identified 37 local and regional organisations focussed on refugee and asylum issues and a further 13 nationwide organisations (not all of which focus on asylum seekers) (Prospectus 2008).
Appendix 2: Survey

Opt-In and Filtering

Would you like to participate in this study?*

Please answer yes or no. Please note that even if your organisation chooses not to complete this questionnaire, other organisations might name yours as a contact. You can indicate that you would prefer for your organisation to be left out of the data analysis altogether by choosing “No”.

☐ Yes
☐ No

Name of Organisation*: ________________________________

Is your organisation non-profit?*

☐ Yes
☐ No

Is your organisation non-statutory / non-governmental?*

If your organisation has been established specifically to deliver government services or programmes, then you should answer “No” to this question.

☐ Yes
☐ No

Would you say that asylum seekers are among your organisation's main beneficiaries?*

If asylum seekers make up a significant proportion of your beneficiaries or some of your activities are targeted specifically for asylum seekers, then you should answer “Yes” to this question.

☐ Yes
☐ No

Section 1: Working Relationships

In the following section you will be asked questions about the organisations you communicate and work with. This section is extremely important for the study, because the answers you give here will help build a picture of the important relationships between the organisations that support Ireland’s asylum seekers.

First, you will be asked how many organisations you work with: in your work providing information and services and in your campaign work. For each kind of work, you will be asked for some information on up to three of these organisations. You’ll also be asked about organisations you have worked with that are now gone from the field. This is to see how changes in society, such as the economy and the declining number of asylum seekers, are affecting the asylum support community.

It’s okay to name the same organisation for both kinds of work. If you do, you only need to fill in the details about that organisation the first time you mention it.

Client Work

How many non-profit organisations does your organisation collaborate with when providing information and/or services to asylum seekers?*

☐ None
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3 or more
Which non-profit organisation(s) does your organisation collaborate with most often when providing information and/or services to asylum seekers?*

*Please name up to three organisations in order, beginning with the one you work with the most. If you chose “0” above, please enter N/A.

1. __________________________
2. __________________________
3. __________________________

Which county is (1 / 2 / 3) in? 
Please choose a county from the drop-down list. If the organisation has more than one office, please choose the county of the office you most often deal with. If the organisation is not in the Republic of Ireland, please choose “Other” and specify its location.

To the best of your knowledge, does (1 / 2 / 3) have asylum seekers or former asylum seekers on its staff? 
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don’t know

To the best of your knowledge, which of the following best describe the work of (1 / 2 / 3)?

*Please choose all that apply.
☐ Providing services or information
☐ Seeking to change policy
☐ Support group or residents’ committee
☐ Other (Please specify): __________________________

**Campaign Work**

How many non-profit organisations does your organisation collaborate with when working to change policy relating to asylum seekers?*

☐ None
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3 or more

Which non-profit organisation(s) does your organisation collaborate with most often when working to change policy relating to asylum seekers?*

*Please name up to three organisations in order, beginning with the one you work with the most. If you chose “0” above, please enter N/A.

1. __________________________
2. __________________________
3. __________________________

Which county is (1 / 2 / 3) in? 
Please choose a county from the drop-down list. If the organisation has more than one office, please choose the county of the office you most often deal with. If the organisation is not in the Republic of Ireland, please choose “Other” and specify its location.

To the best of your knowledge, does (1 / 2 / 3) have asylum seekers or former asylum seekers on its staff? 
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don’t know

To the best of your knowledge, which of the following best describe the work of (1 / 2 / 3)?

*Please choose all that apply.
☐ Providing services or information
☐ Seeking to change policy
☐ Support group or residents’ committee
☐ Other (Please specify): __________________________
**Past Links**
How many non-profit organisations that have left the field in the past three years had you worked with on asylum-related matter?*
Please consider both information / service provision and policy work in your answer.

- None
- 1
- 2
- 3 or more

Which non-profit organisation(s) that left the field in the past three years did your organisation collaborate with most often?*
Please name up to three organisations in order, beginning with the one you work with the most. If you chose “0” above, please enter N/A.

1. __________________________
2. __________________________
3. __________________________

Which county was (1 / 2 / 3) in?
Please choose a county from the drop-down list. If the organisation had more than one office, please choose the county of the office you most often dealt with. If the organisation was not in the Republic of Ireland, please choose “Other” and specify its location.

To the best of your knowledge, did (1 / 2 / 3) have asylum seekers or former asylum seekers on its staff?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

To the best of your knowledge, which of the following would have described the work of (1 / 2 / 3)?
Please choose all that apply.
- Providing services or information
- Seeking to change policy
- Support group or residents’ committee
- Other (Please specify): __________________________

To the best of your knowledge, what happened to (1 / 2 / 3)?
- It closed down.
- It no longer works with asylum seekers.
- It merged with another organisation (please enter the name of the new organisation): __________________________.
- Other (please specify): __________________________.

**Network Comments**
This is the end of Section 1. If there are any comments you would like to add about your work with other organisations, please feel free to do so here.
Section 2: About Your Organisation

The following section includes questions about the nature and size of your organisation. Your answers are important to paint an accurate picture of the different kinds of groups that support Ireland’s asylum seekers. Some of the questions come from a 2005 study on non-profits (Donoghue et al. 2006). This is so that we can see how the field has changed over time.

Organisation Size
Please indicate the following for your Ireland-based offices(s) (where relevant):

- Number of full-time paid employees: ____________________________
- Number of part-time paid employees: ____________________________
- Number of FÁS / CE / Other scheme employees: ____________________________

In the past 3 years, has the number of employees in your organisation…
Please choose one.
- Increased
- Decreased
- Stayed the same
- Not applicable

How many of your employees are asylum seekers or former asylum seekers (please estimate if necessary)*: ____________________________

Please indicate the following for your Ireland-based offices(s) (where relevant):

- Number of volunteers (do not include voluntary board / committee members): ____________________________
- Of these, how many are interns: ____________________________
- How many of your volunteers are asylum seekers or former asylum seekers (please estimate if necessary): ____________________________
- Number of people on your organisation’s voluntary board of directors / management committee: ____________________________
- How many people on your voluntary board / management committee are asylum seekers or former asylum seekers (please estimate if necessary): ____________________________

In the past 3 years, has the number of volunteers (excluding voluntary board / committee members) in your organisation…
Please choose one.
- Increased
- Decreased
- Stayed the same
- Not applicable

Many organisations have members. Sometimes members are individuals (for example in a support group or a church) and sometimes members can be organisations (for example in campaign or umbrella organisations). Please indicate the number of members in your organisation (where relevant):

- Number of members who are individuals: ____________________________
- Number of members that are voluntary organisations: ____________________________
- Number of members that are public sector organisations: ____________________________
- Number of members that are for-profit organisations: ____________________________
**Beneficiaries**
Which of the following BEST describes your organisation’s main beneficiaries?

- Only asylum seekers
- Refugees and asylum seekers
- Migrants generally
- Other (e.g. general population, people with disabilities, etc. Please specify):
  
Please indicate the number of ASYLUM SEEKERS who were direct beneficiaries of your organisation over the last year.

**Mergers and Affiliations**
Which umbrella organisations does your organisation belong to?
*Please choose all that apply.*

- AkiDwa
- Anti Racism Network Ireland
- Community Platform
- European Anti-Poverty Network
- European Network Against Racism
- Integration Centre
- New Communities Partnership
- NGO Alliance Against Racism
- NGO Forum on Direct Provision
- The Wheel
- Other (please specify):

In the past 3 years, has your organisation merged with another organisation?

- Yes (please name the organisation(s) you merged with):
- No

**Finance & The Recession**
Please rank the following income sources in order of their financial contribution to your organisation in your financial year 2012:

- State (including State or health board grants, national lottery, EU funding, etc.)
- Foundation / Philanthropic / Other NGO Support
- Individual support (e.g. individual donations, public fundraising campaigns)
- Corporate donations
- Fees, charges, sales, etc.
- Membership dues
- Other

If the current recession has affected the work of your organisation, please comment briefly on the changes below.
Directory Details

The following section asks for a few more details about your organisation. These questions are valuable for both the study and for The Directory of Support for Asylum Seekers in Ireland. Please note that all identifying information will be stored separately from other survey answers. At the end of the survey, you will be able to choose which information to include in the directory.

Please indicate the following for your organisation:

- Alternative name or abbreviation for your organisations (if applicable):
  ______________________________
- Previous name of organisation (if applicable): ____________________________
- Address Line 1: ____________________________
- Address Line 2: ____________________________
- Address Line 3: ____________________________
- City / Town (and postal code for Dublin): ____________________________
- County: ____________________________
- Telephone: ____________________________
- Fax: ____________________________
- Email: ____________________________
- Web address: ____________________________
- Facebook address: ____________________________
- Twitter name: ____________________________
- In what year did your organisation begin?: ____________________________

Please indicate whether you are answering the questions for:

Please choose one.

☐ Your organisation only
☐ All branches of your organisation

Please outline the main activities of your organisation as you would like them to appear in The Directory of Support for Asylum Seekers in Ireland:

If you prefer not to include your organisation in The Directory, or if you do not wish to have a paragraph describing your work in The Directory, you may leave this question blank.

Please indicate any groups that your organisation offers targeted services for:

Please tick all that apply.

☐ Aged out minors (separated children who have turned 18)
☐ Children and young people
☐ Elderly
☐ LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender asylum seekers)
☐ Lone parents
☐ Men
☐ People with disabilities
☐ Separated children
☐ Women
☐ Other (please specify): ____________________________
Does your organisation specifically offer support to asylum seekers of a particular faith?
- Yes (please specify): ____________________________
- No

Does your organisation specifically offer support to asylum seekers from a particular country or continent?
- Yes (please specify): ____________________________
- No

Please tick the box for each of the following activities that describes the work of your organisation.*
(If you choose to participate in The Directory of Support for Asylum Seekers in Ireland, this information will also help users to search for your organisation.)
- Advocacy
- Arts
- Asylum Application Assistance
- Campaign Work
- Cultural Events
- Information Services
- Integration
- Language Lessons
- Legal Services
- Mental Health Services
- Outreach
- Policy Work
- Protesting
- Recreation
- Religious Services
- Research
- Residents’ Committee
- Sport
- Support Group
- Training for Asylum Seekers
- Welfare Assistance
- Other (please specify): ____________________________

Please indicate the details about your organisation that you would like to be included in The Directory of Support for Asylum Seekers in Ireland:* Please tick all that apply.
- Include everything listed
- Organisation Name
- Organisation Address
- Telephone Number
- Fax Number
- Email Address (of organisation)
- Website
- Social Media Addresses
- Main Activities
- Target Population
- Geographical Remit
- None of the above
Thank You

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study! Please provide your contact information in case we need to follow up on any of your answers.

- Name: ____________________________
- Email: ____________________________

Opt Out

We respect your wish not to participate in the study. Please provide your contact information so that we can be sure to remove your organisation from the project.

- Contact name: ____________________________
- Contact email: ____________________________

If you don’t mind, it would be really helpful if you indicated why you decided not to participate:

*Please choose all that apply.*
- [ ] My organisation doesn’t work with asylum seekers.
- [ ] I no longer work with this organisation.
- [ ] I think you’ve got the wrong email address.
- [ ] I have privacy concerns regarding this project.
- [ ] I don’t have the time.