Migration Plans and Strategies of Recent Polish Migrants to England and Wales: Do They Have Any and How Do They Change?

Stephen Drinkwater and Michał P. Garapich

www.norface-migration.org

Migration Plans and Strategies of Recent Polish Migrants to England and Wales: Do They Have Any and How Do They Change?

Stephen Drinkwater

WISERD, CMPR and Department of Economics, Swansea University
IZA, Bonn
CReAM, UCL

Michał P. Garapich

CRONEM, University of Roehampton
CMPR, Swansea University

November 2013

Abstract: Debates have persisted about the character of the large East-West population flows that followed the accession of Poland and other Central and Eastern European states to the EU in 2004. Some of the key discussions surround the extent to which the mobility has been temporal and hence how likely these migrants are to settle permanently or to stay for long periods in host countries. This paper further enhances the understanding of such issues mainly through examining survey data on 700 Polish nationals in seven English and Welsh towns and cities, and supplemented by an analysis of qualitative information obtained from the respondents. Three categories of migrants are initially identified on the basis of their intentions of stay in the UK. Multinomial logit models are then estimated to examine the characteristics of individuals in each category to establish the factors that influence migration strategies and changes in plans. The results indicate that although standard socio-economic characteristics tend to be insignificant, migration strategies and changes in intentions are affected by the migrant's view of whether their job matches their expectations, the time of entry into the UK and remittances. Analysis of the qualitative information provides a complementary perspective and re-inforces some of the key findings in relation to the factors determining changes in the anticipated length of stay.

1. Introduction

The United Kingdom (UK) has increasingly become a country of high immigration over the past two decades. According to Census data, the immigrant population in England and Wales has risen from 3.6 million in 1991, to 4.6 million in 2001 and to 7.5 million in 2011, with immigrants accounting for 13.4% of the total population in the latest Census compared to 7.2% in the one which took place twenty years earlier. As a result of these large population changes, there has been much debate regarding the opposing forces of the economic benefits of immigration against the increased strain imposed on public services and local infrastructure. For example, the House of Lords Economic Affairs Committee conducted a wide ranging inquiry into the economic impact of immigration in the UK (House of Lords, 2008) and this and other related studies have attracted widespread media attention. Immigration has therefore become one of the most important and contentious political issues, especially given public opinion and the strength of feeling amongst certain sections of the population. The importance of immigration to the public appeared to reach a peak between late 2007 and early 2008 when immigration flows from Central and Eastern Europe were at their highest. In particular, over 40% of those polled as part of IPSOS/Mori's Monthly Issues Index considered race and immigration amongst the most important issues facing Britain at that time. This made it the top-ranked issue with the British public before being replaced by concerns over the economy, following the onset of the Great Recession.

The immigration that accompanied European Union (EU) enlargement in May 2004 produced the largest single inflow of migrants to the UK in its history (Bauere *et al.*, 2007). However, the nature of migration that took place is considered to be different to that of previous migration waves. In particular, rather than migrating long-term or permanently to the UK, many of the migrants had moved on a temporary basis and only initially intended to stay in the UK for a short period of time. In this paper, we further investigate this process by focusing on the migration intentions and strategies of recent Polish migrants to England and Wales, who were by far the largest group of migrants from accession countries. Moreover, increased migration flows from Central and Eastern Europe after 2004 and from Bulgaria and Romania since 2007, following from the two most recent enlargements of the EU, have led to a significant rise in intra-European migration and this has had an impact from a wider

perspective. The resulting changes in rights associated with the freedom of movement, employment (although with temporary restrictions in some cases) and settlement, have led millions of citizens from these new member states to seek better opportunities in pre-enlargement member states. Although flows have slowed down since the end of 2007, in part due to the economic downturn experienced by countries such the UK (Findlay and McCollum, 2011), it has been argued that EU enlargement resulted in the biggest demographic change in Europe since the devastation and flux experienced at the end of the Second World War (Favell, 2008), with the UK at the centre of that movement (Kaczmarczyk and Okólski, 2008; Drinkwater *et al.*, 2009). With such demographic change, it is not surprising that academics have paid close attention to these migration flows and the literature has developed considerably since 2004 - covering a wide range of aspects associated with migration but it has also left some unanswered questions.

Given improved data available on migration to the UK and other countries, we now have a good understanding of many issues associated with the stocks and flows of migrants from Poland and other accession countries, including at disaggregated geographical levels. Fairly detailed information is also available on the characteristics of migrants and it has been established that recent Polish migrants to the UK have mainly been young, relatively highly educated and have found employment but this has generally been in low wage sectors (Drinkwater *et al.*, 2009). We also know that there has been a high level of return migration since many migrants moved on a circular, temporary or seasonal basis. For example, estimates by Pollard *et al.* (2008) indicate that around a half of post-enlargement migrants from the new member states had either returned to their home countries or have moved to other member states between 2004 and 2007. This appears to be consistent with information from the 2011 Census and the National Insurance Numbers Issued to Overseas Nationals (NINo) database since around 900,000 Polish nationals entered England and Wales between 2002 and 2011 according to NINo data, whereas according to the Census, the population of Polish born people increased by around 525,000. However, far less is known about how these patterns have emerged and the factors that underlie the migrant's decision on how long to stay and if this changes over time in the host country. These are the issues that will be examined in this paper.

There have been some previous attempts to understand and label these processes and this has led to the introduction of concepts such as liquid migration (Engbersen *et al.*, 2010),

intentional unpredictability (Eade *et al.*, 2007), migratory drift (Thompson, 2010) and deliberate indeterminacy (Moriarty *et al.*, 2010). However, our aim in this paper to undertake a far more detailed investigation of these patterns and processes by adopting a mixed methods approach based on the analysis of survey data, both from quantitative and qualitative perspectives. In doing so, we attempt to provide a more nuanced understanding of some of the key issues relating to mobility decisions in comparison to previous studies by taking into account both the migrants' own actions as well as their perceptions about the process.

2. Related Literature

Research on intra-EU population movements has expanded dramatically in recent years, particularly following the large-scale migration from Central and Eastern Europe following EU enlargement in 2004. In addition to examining the impact on host countries, in relation to their labour markets and social services, researchers have increasingly become interested in the processes underlying these movements. Recent migration flows from new EU member states, especially to the UK and Ireland, have become well-used case studies through which to investigate these processes because of the extent of the population flows to these countries. It can be argued that these large populations movements were the result of policy decisions - since migrants from new member states were essentially only initially able to move to the UK, Ireland and Sweden without any restrictions - although this has also been facilitated by the relatively short distances and good communications channels. Previous research using the Labour Force Survey (LFS), such as by Drinkwater *et al.* (2009) as well as from more detailed interviews (Eade *et al.*, 2007), identify how the migration system between Poland and the UK has developed and also highlights the links between pre-accession and post-accession flows in the context of labour markets, migratory social networks and also the educational backgrounds of migrants. This theme has attracted further interest, particularly because of the disparity between educational levels and labour market outcomes (Trevena, 2011; Pollard *et al.*, 2008; Currie, 2007). Such a mismatch has often been regarded as a problem for future settlement as well as a sign of the inflexibility of the Polish higher education system (Grabowska-Lusinska and Okólski, 2008). Another strand of research has focused on the formation, continuation and evolution of migratory networks among Polish migrants (Ryan *et al.*, 2009; White, 2011). Here it

is argued that the role of families and migration within a family unit is a dominant factor behind Polish migrants' tendency to stay permanently.

Although mobility has been addressed to a certain extent in some of the above studies, it has not generally been their central focus. Eade *et al.* (2007) do specifically examine the issue of mobility and proposed a typology of migrants on the seasonal/circular-permanent migrant spectrum, providing data on the advantages and disadvantages of these strategies for individual migrants and their households. Other scholars have also debated the extent to which families, labour market outcomes, specific locality, social class and satisfaction contribute to migration decision making and the willingness to stay (Burrell, 2009; Galasińska and Kozłowska, 2009; White, 2011; McGhee *et al.,* 2012). These are also relevant factors in the more general literature on circular and temporal migration. In a comprehensive review on circular migration and development, Agunias (2006) highlights the multiplicity of factors that affect the extent to which migrants remain temporarily or permanently in countries of origin and these range from institutional, political and economic considerations to issues of diaspora politics and migrants' agency. Despite this, questions regarding the character of Polish migration to the UK have often been posed in public and academic debates, with studies pointing to the epistemological problems with the very question since migratory paths are never given but develop over time and can change due to unexpected circumstances in the lives of the migrants. Some scholars argue, however, that it is much more likely that the majority of migrants will settle for long periods or permanently. Iglicka (2008), in a comparative study of Polish migrants to US and UK, acknowledges this fact by noting that migrants' age means that they are likely to form families in the receiving country and hence establish roots there. Similarly, White (2011) in a study of Polish migrants to the UK notes that 'families do not return', confirming some previous findings by Ryan *et al.* (2009).

Some recent qualitative studies suggest that mobility is often seen by migrants as a resource giving them an opportunity to match their experience, geographical location and work depending on the life stage that they are currently in. Botterill (2011) notes the symbolic importance for young people to remain mobile and be responsive to incoming opportunities. Similarly, Eade *et al.* (2007) introduce the term 'intentional unpredictability' to explain why a high proportion of the Polish migrants that were interviewed did not fix their migration within specific timeframe, creating an obvious dilemma for scholars attempting to match intentions

with migration outcomes. Other studies have used related concepts to describe such a phenomenon including 'liquid migration' (Engbersen *et al.*, 2010), 'migratory drift' (Thompson, 2010) and 'deliberate indeterminacy' (Moriarty *et al.*, 2010). It therefore seems that scholars have attempted to conceptually define a phenomena which is deliberately uncontained by the migrants themselves, since theirs is a strategy of keeping their options open and their migratory trajectory 'liquid' and 'flowing'. In essence, all of these studies agree that this strategy reflects the highly deregulated and flexible conditions of mutually reinforcing structures of European labour markets, welfare regimes, educational opportunities and life chances.

These migration patterns also relate to a literature in economics on migration intentions and decisions regarding how long to stay in the host country. Dustmann and Weiss (2007) discuss several reasons for return migration from an economic perspective including a greater preference for consuming and higher purchasing power in the home country. They also suggest that human capital and savings accumulated in the host country can be used to boost labour market prospects in the home country. Dustmann (2003) examines factors that influence the optimal duration of stay in the destination country and return migration, especially wage differentials. Burda (1995) introduces the concept of the option value of migration. This is based on the idea that potential migrants don't always make definite decisions but may instead choose to keep their options open, especially in order to gather more information. This theory was initially applied in relation to the initial decision to migrate, especially given uncertainty over wage differentials, but was extended by O'Connell (1997) to incorporate uncertainties in the origin and destination areas more generally. Econometric evidence in support of this theory is provided using data on migration intentions from East to West Germany by Burda *et al.* (1998) and on ethnic Germans in Russia and Kazakstan by Locher (2001). The theory can also be applied to decisions regarding return migration (Burda *et al.*, 1998).

Clearly, the issue of migration strategies can be approached from several angles and the above studies have started to do this. However, further and more detailed analysis is required to pinpoint and contextualize specific migration strategies related to gender, family, remittances, employment and welfare considerations. In particular, the picture of migration from Poland to the UK is in this respect rather partial without considering different locational settings and taking account of the numerous factors that can influence migration intentions and strategies. This paper therefore attempts to take the debate forward by offering a new

comparative perspective by coupling an examination of the quantitative responses to a survey with some qualitative analysis.

3. Data and Methods

In order to fill some of the aforementioned gaps in our understanding of migration processes, and to provide a multidimensional picture of recent Polish migrants in England and Wales, a survey was carried out in August and September 2010. The survey took place using proportional quota sampling methods in seven different locations, covering large urban centres as well as smaller towns with a diverse history of migration from Poland. The locations – London, Southampton, Oxford, Manchester, Crewe, Llanelli and Cardiff – were chosen to represent a mixture of old and new migration hubs, as well as comprising a combination of larger and smaller urban centres.[1] The choice of sampling strategy was based upon theoretical, methodological and practical considerations. In particular, proportional quota sampling was chosen due to the relative demographic homogeneity of recent Polish migrants to the UK, as indicated in sources such as the NINo database, Worker Registration Scheme (WRS), Annual Population Survey (APS) and LFS. Quotas were obtained on the basis of three factors - age, gender and time of arrival - in each of the seven locations. Prior to the data collection, an extensive web-mapping exercise was also undertaken in each location in order to identify the best entry points into the communities. These included popular public places where Polish migrants gather, workplaces with large concentrations of Polish workers, communal accommodation, shops, bars, restaurants, churches, community clubs, crèches, shopping malls and parks – in short, possible locations where Polish migrants could potentially gather. Polish local social networking sites were also extensively browsed in order to establish contact with potential interviewees and gain local knowledge on the geographical distribution of Polish migrants in each location.

Although it has its drawbacks, there are good reasons why sampling using a proportional quota method is appropriate in the context of recent Polish migration to the UK. These include that the amount of Polish migrants in each location makes it relatively easy to obtain a suitable sample. In addition, information about their main characteristics are also available through a

---

[1] In order to clarify the final wording and sequencing of questions, a pilot survey was carried out in two locations (London and Southampton).

range of datasets. We mainly used NINo data to construct the quotas but these were augmented and refined by LFS, APS and WRS data. As a result, when combined together, these sources offer a detailed picture of the population of Polish migrants in terms of their demographic characteristics.[2] Our survey also indicates that the proportion of Polish migrants registering for a NINo is high – with over 90% of respondents reporting that they had registered. Furthermore, there are no privacy concerns associated with identifying Poles as a stygmatised group and a history of surveys that have been undertaken indicates that the group cannot be described as 'hidden'. This means that survey methods such as Respondent Driven Sampling are not required, especially given that applying this approach is not free from problems (Broadhead, 2008). Therefore, we believe our data provides us with a representative sample of recent Polish migrants to the UK.[3]

As mentioned previously, our main focus relates to conceptualizing migration strategies and patterns with special reference to the temporal aspect of the migration experience. In other words, what factors shape Polish migrants' decisions to extend or limit their stay in the UK? Informed by previous studies (Iglicka, 2008; Grabowska-Lusinska and Okólski, 2009; Eade *et al.,* 2007), we aim to establish the main factors behind decisions on: initial migration choices; the possibility of return; plans for the future and changes in migratory and settling intentions.[4] In order to gather this information a wide selection of questions were asked on issues such as past migration, employment, earnings, satisfaction with earnings, non-financial benefits from living in the UK, remittances, influence of social security structures and family. The majority of respondents had lived in the UK for at least one year. In particular, 41% had been in the UK between 3 and 5 years, 30% between 1 and 3 years, 18% between 3 and 12 months and 11% for 3 months or less. It was the first period of residence in the UK for 85% of respondents, with 10% having lived in the UK on one previous occasion and 5% on two or more previous occasions. In addition, the survey data has been complemented by qualitative information

---

[2] The NINo database should provide the most accurate estimate of Polish migrant workers entering the UK for the first time. Although the database is likely to contain the majority of Polish migrant workers to the UK over this period, it will also under-estimate total migration flows from the Poland to the UK since it does not capture some of the dependents and spouses who have accompanied the migrant workers. See Harris *et al.* (2012) for further discussion of NINo data in relation to migration from Poland.

[3] Drinkwater and Garapich (2011) provide more background information to the survey and discuss the data set in more detail.

[4] We do not, however, attempt to examine why Polish migrants choose particular locations (Bauere *et al.,* 2007) or issues associated with migrant place-making (Gill, 2010) and housing (McGhee *et al.*, 2013) in this paper.

from fieldwork reports as well as responses given to open-ended questions which were recorded in *verbatim* on the questionnaire. This allowed respondents to provide a level of depth to their answers, especially with regards to their migration strategies and decisions. As a result, the analysis of qualitative, as well as quantitative, data should provide additional depth to our understanding of the underlying processes.

In the next section, we firstly aim to categorize different types of migrants amongst recent arrivals from Poland to the UK. This is done through the responses to questions in the survey on intentions to stay on arrival and at the time of interview. The following section then examines which factors are associated with the different types of migrants. These characteristics are initially identified by applying statistical techniques to the quantitative data and this is followed by an analysis of the qualitative responses that were also obtained during the data collection. This particularly relates to the open-ended question on the reasons for altering migration intentions. As a result, our aim is to use a mixed methods approach to establish the key factors that affect a change in an individual's migration plans.

4.   Developing a Typology of Recent Polish Migrants to the UK

We examine two questions in order to identify different types of migrants: one on the intended length of stay in the UK on arrival and another on for how much longer that the respondent is now planning to stay. The responses to these questions are reported in Table 1. The table shows that the most common response was "Don't Know", which was the response given by 32% to the question regarding intentions on arrival and by 44% with respect to their future plans. Only 11% indicated that they intended to stay permanently when asked with regards to intentions on arrival, compared to 18% at the time of interview. A high proportion of respondents also reported that they intended to stay only for a very short period when they arrived in the UK, with 13% indicating that they only intended to stay for less than 3 months on arrival and 21% for between 3 and 12 months. The percentages reporting short intended periods of future stays are much lower at the time of interview, with only around 15% intending to stay for an additional year or less.

Responses to these two questions have been combined in order to construct a set of migrant groupings. These are shown in Table 2 alongside the respondent's length of residence in the UK. The two largest groupings are migrants reporting that they had the same intended

length of stay at the time of arrival and at the time of the interview and those who reported that they didn't know either when they arrived or when they were interviewed. Collectively, these two categories account for over half of the respondents. The next largest category contains migrants who knew how long they wanted to stay on arrival but did not know when they were interviewed, closely followed by those migrants who stated that they intended to stay for a longer period of time when interviewed compared to when they arrived. The remaining two categories (didn't know on arrival but did know when interviewed and those expressing a shorter intended stay at the time of interview compared to on arrival) account for around 12% of the sample. The patterns of responses for those who have resided in the UK for 1-3 or 3-5 years are very similar, whereas there are some differences for more recent migrants. This is especially true of migrants who have been in the UK for less than 3 months, of whom 60% had not changed their plans regarding how long they intend to stay. This compared to just over 30% of those who have lived in the UK for between 3 and 12 months and around 20% of those who had lived in the UK for more than a year. Polish migrants who had lived in the UK for 3-12 months were by far the most likely to be in the category indicating that they did not know how long they were going to stay on arrival and when interviewed.

Table 1: Intended Length of Stay on Arrival and Future Intended Length of Stay at Interview (in percentages)

	Intention on Arrival	How much longer
Less than 3 months	13.1	6.4
Between 3 months and a year	20.9	9.1
Between 1 and 3 years	10.4	7.1
Between 3 and 5 years	4.7	4.4
More than 5 years	8.1	10.3
Permanently	10.7	18.3
Don't know	32.0	44.3
N	700	

As a result of the information provided within Table 2, the following typology of recent Polish migrants to the UK has been constructed. The first group relates to individuals who have the same plans on arrival to when they were interviewed. We term these migrants "*The Planners*" and this group accounts for just over a quarter of the recent Polish migrants in the sample. The next group, who account for a slightly lower proportion of the sample, are those who are

unsure about their intended duration of stay both on arrival and when interviewed – a group that we label "*The Undecided*". The final group are those migrants who stated that they had a different intended duration of stay on arrival compared to when they were interviewed. This group accounts for just under half of the sample and are referred to as "*The Changers*".

Table 2: Migration Intentions on Arrival and at Time of Interview by Duration of Residence in the UK (column percentages)

	<3 months	3-12 Months	1-3 years	3-5 years	All
Don't know on arrival and at time of interview	21.8	35.7	24.1	22.9	25.4
Don't know on arrival but know at time of interview	2.6	1.6	8.0	8.8	6.6
Know on arrival but don't know at time of interview	1.3	13.5	23.1	22.9	18.9
Longer intended stay than on arrival	7.7	11.1	17.0	20.4	16.3
Shorter intended stay than on arrival	6.4	7.1	8.5	2.5	5.6
No change in intended length of stay	60.3	31.0	19.3	22.5	27.3
N	78	126	212	284	700

In the next section, statistical models are estimated in order to establish the characteristics of migrants with the highest probability of fitting into each of these categories. In addition to presenting further statistical findings, information from the qualitative responses captured as part of the survey will also be examined in Section 6 in order to provide a deeper understanding of these processes underlying migration strategies, particularly in terms of those factors influencing changes in migration plans.

5. Statistical Analysis of Migrant Type

The first part of the statistical analysis relates to an examination of the influences on migrant type, according to the definitions discussed in the previous section. Given the unordered and categorical nature of the dependent variable, multinomial logit models are estimated. Table 3 reports marginal effects and standard errors from a multinomial logit model of migrant type that has been initially estimated just using some key socio-economic characteristics. These are gender, age, location, qualifications, marital status, dependent children and employment

status. Estimates are reported for two of the migrant categories (the *Undecided* and the *Changers*) compared to the base group of the *Planners*. Therefore, the estimates should be interpreted in relation to the *Planners*.

Table 3: Multinomial Logit Estimates of Socio-Economic Influences on Migrant Type

	Mean	The Undecided		The Changers	
		Marg. Effect	St. Error	Marg. Effect	St. Error
Male	0.540	0.046	0.035	0.008	0.035
Aged 25-34	0.397	0.040	0.042	0.023	0.040
Aged 35-44	0.108	0.137*	0.076	-0.050	0.059
Aged 45 and over	0.093	-0.037	0.073	-0.036	0.070
Oxford	0.145	0.035	0.071	0.061	0.073
Cardiff	0.142	0.107	0.076	0.007	0.071
Llanelli	0.145	0.114	0.080	0.089	0.083
Crewe	0.145	-0.032	0.066	0.143*	0.082
Manchester	0.142	-0.007	0.070	0.093	0.077
Southampton	0.143	0.050	0.074	0.151*	0.081
Secondary Qualification	0.517	0.072*	0.043	-0.090**	0.044
Undergraduate Qualification	0.123	0.056	0.072	-0.063	0.054
Post-Graduate Qualification	0.118	0.004	0.071	-0.007	0.061
Moderate English skills	0.410	-0.033	0.047	-0.010	0.055
Good English skills	0.394	-0.132***	0.049	0.069	0.060
Married	0.293	0.000	0.053	0.014	0.052
Cohabitating	0.289	-0.012	0.044	0.063	0.046
Divorced/Widowed/Separated	0.063	-0.033	0.080	0.068	0.091
Dependent children in the UK	0.234	-0.093**	0.041	0.049	0.049
Dependent children in Poland	0.023	-0.071	0.090	0.134	0.140
Employed	0.864	-0.067	0.055	0.114***	0.042
Pseudo R-squared			0.04		
N			685		

Notes: Reference categories are female, aged 16-24, lives in London, left school at 15/vocational qualification, poor English, single, no children and not-employed. * indicates significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level and *** at the 1% level using two-tailed tests. Table reports marginal effects at sample means and heteroscedasticity-consistent standard errors.

Table 3 indicates that only a few of the socio-economic characteristics have a significant impact on determining migrant type. For example, there are no significant effects for gender and only relatively small differences for location, age groups and qualifications. Some significant results include that migrants aged 35-44 are more likely than those aged 16-24 to be in the

Undecided category at the 10% level, whilst migrants with secondary qualifications have a lower probability of being *Changers* at the 5% level of significance. Migrants with children in the UK are significantly less likely to be in the *Undecided* category. This appears to lend support to the importance of family considerations in migration strategies (White, 2011). However, neither of the marital status dummies are significant.[5] Language is an important determinant since those stating that they had a high level of proficiency in the English language were significantly less likely to be found in the *Undecided* category.[6] Those in employment are significantly more likely to have changed their plans, with more than an 11 percentage point difference in the probability of being a *Changer* observed between being employed and not employed.

The influence of migration related variables is reported in Table 4, alongside the socio-economic characteristics that were included in Table 3. The size and significance levels of the estimates for the socio-economic characteristics is not really affected by the addition of the migration variables, with Polish migrants aged 35-44, with secondary qualifications, good English and dependent children in the UK remaining significant influences on being *Undecided* with respect to migration plans at the 10% level or lower. For the *Changers* category, the significant variables are living in Crewe or Southampton, possessing a secondary qualification and being employed. Migrants who send remittances (regularly) are far more likely to have definite migration plans since this group has a 10 percentage point lower probability of being in the *Undecided* category compared to migrants who do not send money abroad, an effect which is significant at around the 1% level. This provides support for the view of Piore (1979) that many transnational migrants start as target earners. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the most recent arrivals in the UK are the least likely to report that their migration plans had changed compared to what they were on arrival. The difference in the probability of having changed migration plans compared to migrants who have been in the UK for 3-5 years was 23 and 15 percentage points for Polish migrants residing in the UK for less than 3 months and for 3-12 months respectively. The dummy variables capturing whether the migrant had previously lived in the UK or abroad are not significantly different from zero.

---

[5] The influence of the family variables is similar when different measures are used. These include having a partner in the UK or Poland and the number of children.

[6] The language variables were derived from a single question asking respondents to state their English language skills on a 1 to 10 scale, where 1 was no ability and 10 was fluent. Three dummy variables were then constructed from this information: poor English (1-3 on the self-reporting scale), moderate English (4-6 on the scale) and good English (7-10 on the scale).

Table 4: Multinomial Logit Estimates of Socio-Economic Influences and Migration Variables on Migrant Type

	Mean	The Undecided		Changers	
		Marg. Effect	St. Err.	Marg. Effect	St. Err.
Demographic Characteristics					
Male	0.542	0.053	0.036	0.007	0.035
Aged 25-34	0.398	0.036	0.045	0.018	0.040
Aged 35-44	0.107	0.136*	0.080	-0.032	0.059
Aged 45 and over	0.095	-0.041	0.073	-0.042	0.067
Oxford	0.144	0.039	0.072	0.058	0.071
Cardiff	0.141	0.118	0.077	0.003	0.068
Llanelli	0.147	0.118	0.082	0.096	0.081
Crewe	0.141	-0.021	0.070	0.156*	0.083
Manchester	0.142	-0.006	0.071	0.084	0.074
Southampton	0.144	0.069	0.076	0.134*	0.078
Secondary Qualification	0.516	0.088**	0.044	-0.066	0.043
Undergraduate Qualification	0.123	0.073	0.074	-0.047	0.054
Post-Graduate Qualification	0.119	0.004	0.075	-0.011	0.058
Moderate English skills	0.407	-0.037	0.050	-0.058	0.055
Good English skills	0.398	-0.140***	0.052	0.001	0.062
Married	0.297	0.014	0.054	-0.016	0.048
Cohabitating	0.288	-0.003	0.046	0.038	0.045
Divorced/Separated	0.055	-0.037	0.087	0.020	0.086
Dependent children in UK	0.231	-0.095**	0.044	0.023	0.046
Dependent children in Poland	0.024	-0.050	0.104	0.162	0.139
Employed	0.869	-0.064	0.061	0.115***	0.042
Migration Variables					
<3 months in UK	0.099	-0.053	0.058	-0.231***	0.031
3-12 months in the UK	0.185	0.075	0.055	-0.152***	0.037
1-3 years in the UK	0.303	0.024	0.044	0.006	0.038
Previously lived in UK	0.144	-0.001	0.049	0.013	0.054
Previously lived abroad	0.295	0.034	0.042	0.008	0.038
Sends remittances	0.466	-0.105***	0.038	-0.034	0.034
Pseudo R-squared			0.077		
N			674		

Notes: Reference categories are female, aged 16-24, lives in London, left school at 15/vocational qualification, poor English, single, no children, not-employed, lived in the UK for 3-5 years, not lived abroad previously and does not send remittances. * indicates significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level and *** at the 1% level using two-tailed tests. Table reports marginal effects at sample means and heteroscedasticity-consistent standard errors.

Table 5 reports estimates from a multinomial logit model which also includes job-related variables. Since these variables are only applicable to those in employment, this has the effect of reducing the number of observations used in the regression by around 23%. The estimates for the job-related factors are shown together with those for the migration related variables, with the single remittances dummy having been replaced with three indicators for the amount sent abroad in the last year to establish whether the level of remittances has an impact on migration type. The specification that has been estimated also includes the socio-economic variables included in Tables 3 and 4 but these estimates are not reported in the table.[7] The estimates for the migration variables are generally similar to those contained in Table 4, although migrants who have lived in the UK for 3-12 months or 1-3 years are now significantly more likely to be in the *Undecided* category compared to migrants who have been in the UK for between 3 and 5 years, suggesting some correlation with the employment relations variables that have been included.

The three remittance dummies indicate that those migrants who sent more than £1000 in remittances in the last year were far less likely to be in the *Undecided* category. The effect was slightly larger for migrants sending more than £3000 a year than those sending between £1000 and £3000. This again suggests that migrants who have a target amount of income to send to their friends and family are more likely to hold definite migration plans and that this effect increases with the amount sent. In terms of the job-related variables, migrants whose job does not match their expectations are far more likely to be in the *Undecided* category compared to migrants whose jobs did. Migrants who are unsure about whether their job matched their expectations are also more likely to be in the *Undecided* category, with this effect significant at around the 5% level. Individuals in this group are also significantly less likely to report a change in their migration plans, as are those migrants indicating that their job did not match their qualifications. Current earnings only appear to have a very small influence on determining migrant type.[8]

---

[7] There are no important differences to note in the estimates for the socio-economic characteristics in comparison to those reported in Tables 3 and 4, although the employed dummy has been removed because of the inclusion of the job-related factors in Table 5.

[8] These variables are also insignificant when the remittances controls are excluded.

Table 5: Multinomial Logit Estimates of Socio-Economic Influences and Migration Variables on Migrant Type

	Mean	The Undecided		Changers	
		M.E.	St. Err.	M.E.	St. Err.
Migration Variables					
<3 months in UK	0.081	-0.011	0.084	-0.241***	0.034
3-12 months in the UK	0.194	0.194***	0.071	-0.174***	0.044
1-3 years in the UK	0.305	0.131**	0.055	0.045	0.046
Previously lived in UK	0.148	-0.056	0.049	-0.043	0.059
Previously lived abroad	0.311	0.044	0.049	-0.046	0.042
Sent <£1k last year	0.188	-0.051	0.050	-0.028	0.051
Sent £1k-£3k last year	0.173	-0.117**	0.047	-0.052	0.053
Sent >£3k last year	0.123	-0.125***	0.047	-0.058	0.058
Job Related Variables					
Earns £1000-£1400 a month	0.342	-0.004	0.051	0.002	0.052
Earns >£1400 a month	0.186	0.022	0.067	-0.023	0.058
Earnings don't match expectations	0.478	0.114**	0.046	-0.040	0.043
Unsure if earnings match	0.073	0.178*	0.103	-0.183***	0.045
Job not appropriate for qualifications	0.626	0.022	0.047	-0.157***	0.048
Unsure if appropriate qualifications	0.060	0.052	0.100	-0.108*	0.065
Pseudo R-squared			0.126		
N			521		

Notes: Reference categories are lived in the UK for 3-5 years, not lived abroad previously, does not send remittances, earns less than £1000 a month, earnings match expectations and job matches qualifications. Controls for gender, age, location, English language skills, marital status and children have also been included in the models but these estimates are not reported in the table. * indicates significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level and *** at the 1% level using two-tailed tests. Table reports marginal effects at sample means and heteroscedasticity-consistent standard errors.

6. Changes in Migration Plans and its Determinants

As indicated in Table 2, almost a half of the recent Polish migrants in the sample could be labelled as *Changers.* This category includes those migrants who had altered their plans from either knowing how long to stay on arrival to not knowing when interviewed or vice versa. The former group accounted for almost three-quarters of this type of changer, while the remainder was composed of those who did not know how long they would stay on arrival but knew when interviewed. In addition to this type of *Changer*, some of the migrants who had definite migration plans on arrival have also changed their plans. This group consists of around 22% of the sample, around three-quarters of whom stated that they intended to stay for longer than

they thought on arrival and a quarter with a shorter intended duration of stay in comparison to their original plans. Further information on those who have changed their migration plans is provided by Table 6, which reports four categories: *Now Know*; *Now Unsure*; *Longer Stayers* and *Shorter Stayers*. The table also shows for how much longer those in the *Now Know* and *Longer Stayers* categories intend to stay in the future and for how long those in the *Now Unsure* and *Shorter Stayers* categories intended to stay on arrival.

The table indicates that over 40% of migrants who *Now Know* how long they intend to stay and the *Longer Stayers* plan to remain in the UK permanently and around a further 20% for five or more years. A relatively small percentage in the *Now Know* category intend to stay only a short time in the UK, with less than 5% intending to stay for less than 3 months. Almost two-thirds of migrants who are *Now Unsure* about how much longer they intend to stay in the UK initially planned to be in the UK for less than a year. The fairly small number of migrants in the *Shorter Stayer* category are fairly evenly distributed according to their initial length of stay plans, although the lowest percentages are observed in the more than 5 years and permanent migration categories.

Table 6: Categories of Changers and Migration Plans (in percentages)

	Intended Future Length of Stay		Intended Length of Stay on Arrival	
	Now Know	Longer Stayers	Now Unsure	Shorter Stayers
Less than 3 months	4.4	_	19.7	_
Between 3 months and a year	17.4	12.3	43.2	25.6
Between 1 and 3 years	8.7	14.9	18.2	20.5
Between 3 and 5 years	8.7	8.8	4.6	23.1
More than 5 years	19.6	21.1	8.3	12.8
Permanently	41.3	43.0	6.1	17.8
N	46	114	132	39

Table 7 reports how socio-economic, migration and job-related characteristics affect the probability of being in the different categories of *Changers*. Remittances are again found to be important determinants, with those sending higher amounts of money abroad significantly more likely to be *Longer Stayers* (in comparison to those who have become *now unsure* about their future migration plans). Other characteristics also exert a positive influence on being observed in this category including the possession of a secondary qualification and if the

respondent's job did not match their qualifications – which appears to be a counter-intuitive effect, although it may indicate more subjective reasons behind a sense of mismatch between employment and qualifications In contrast, migrants who have been in the UK between 1 and 3 years and respondents aged 35 and over are significantly less likely to be in this category.[9]

Less qualified migrants exhibit a significantly higher probability of being in the *Now Know* category, suggesting that those with lower levels of education who were unsure about their length of stay on arrival have now formed clearer migration plans. However an important factor, as pointed out by Okólski and Grabowska-Lusińska (2008), is that the type of education matters. In the case of Poland, the surplus of educated migrants were often people with degrees in non-technical professions, such as social sciences, marketing, business studies and administration. Migrants indicating that their earnings did not match their expectations also have a significantly higher probability of being in the *Now Know* category. Whilst migrants who had been in the UK between 3 and 12 months are significantly less likely to be observed in this category. Migrants indicating that their earnings did not match their expectations or were unsure if this was the case are more likely to be found in the *Shorter Stayer* category, which again fits in with the concept of typical target earners, who are willing to work on a short term basis for accumulating capital abroad in order to spend in their locality of origin (Massey *et al.*, 1994). Negative influences on the probability of being observed in this category are found for migrants with an undergraduate qualification, individuals who are cohabiting and those who have dependent children living in Poland. This latter effect may again seem counter-intuitive but could reflect the need to stay longer in order to maintain a more guaranteed stream of income. Location, English language ability and current level of earnings do not have a significant effect on any of the categories of *Changers*.

---

[9] The male dummy is also significant at the 10% level, which is the only significant gender effect in any of the models that have been estimated.

Table 7: Multinomial Logit Estimates for Changes in Migration Plans

	Now Know		Longer Stayer		Shorter Stayer	
	M.E.	St. Err.	M.E.	St. Err.	M.E	St. Err.
Demographic Characteristics						
Male	-0.024	0.033	-0.150*	0.082	-0.011	0.026
Aged 25-34	0.085*	0.051	-0.105	0.093	0.043	0.029
Aged 35-44	0.107	0.134	-0.277***	0.101	-0.033	0.023
Aged 45+	0.089	0.117	-0.269***	0.103	0.072	0.116
Oxford	0.066	0.105	-0.008	0.148	0.018	0.061
Cardiff	0.101	0.108	0.011	0.147	0.074	0.105
Llanelli	0.177	0.149	-0.042	0.144	0.106	0.112
Crewe	0.086	0.097	-0.148	0.132	0.074	0.109
Manchester	0.087	0.102	-0.100	0.126	0.000	0.046
Southampton	0.079	0.120	-0.152	0.116	0.002	0.057
Secondary Qualification	-0.120**	0.050	0.231**	0.112	-0.002	0.029
Undergraduate Qualification	-0.105***	0.037	0.227	0.164	-0.057**	0.025
Post-Graduate Qualification	-0.077***	0.029	0.155	0.174	-0.023	0.031
Moderate English skills	0.068	0.096	-0.062	0.140	0.040	0.052
Good English skills	0.091	0.100	-0.064	0.149	0.104	0.064
Married	-0.051	0.038	-0.021	0.120	0.002	0.033
Cohabitating	0.043	0.048	-0.122	0.092	-0.059**	0.025
Divorced/Separated	0.018	0.077	0.156	0.209	-0.033	0.024
Dependent children in UK	-0.025	0.041	0.121	0.101	-0.012	0.028
Dependent children in Poland	0.518*	0.295	-0.172	0.222	-0.038**	0.019
Migration Variables						
< 3 months in UK	-0.014	0.065	0.023	0.275	0.416	0.313
3-12 months in the UK	-0.102***	0.033	-0.116	0.120	0.344**	0.147
1-3 years in the UK	-0.004	0.030	-0.209***	0.076	0.113*	0.060
Previously lived in UK	0.042	0.078	-0.089	0.106	0.019	0.039
Previously lived abroad	0.037	0.033	0.100	0.089	-0.001	0.023
Sent <£1k last year	-0.007	0.043	0.198*	0.105	-0.041*	0.024
Sent £1k-£3k last year	-0.022	0.037	0.148	0.124	0.019	0.039
Sent >£3k last year	-0.009	0.045	0.337***	0.105	0.038	0.049
Job Related Variables						
Earns £1000-£1400 a month	0.055	0.045	0.120	0.089	0.021	0.028
Earns >£1400 a month	0.083	0.076	0.152	0.117	0.050	0.046
Earnings don't match expectations	0.062***	0.032	-0.060	0.081	0.091***	0.036
Unsure if earnings match	-0.042	0.048	0.101	0.151	0.367***	0.141
Job not appropriate for qualifications	-0.057	0.038	0.211***	0.082	0.025	0.023
Unsure if appropriate qualifications	0.033	0.103	0.059	0.187	-0.027	0.038
Pseudo R-squared			0.239			
N			259			

Notes: Base group is *Now Unsure* about future migration plans. Reference categories are female, aged 16-24, lives in London, left school at 15/vocational qualification, single, no children, lived in the UK for 3-5 years, not lived abroad previously, does not send remittances, earns less than £1000 a month, earnings match expectations and job matches qualifications. * indicates significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level and *** at the 1% level using two-tailed tests. Area dummies have also been included but are not significant. Table reports marginal effects at sample means and heteroscedasticity-consistent standard errors.

The qualitative responses re-inforce the quantitative analysis and enable us to identify some key factors in causing migration plans to change. Broadly speaking, respondents gave a substantive, subjective rationale for remaining with clear reference to financial gains. These included a Polish female responding *"It's easier to live here; work; money, the state helps and my family is here"* (F; 45+; Llanelli) or simply *"Work and money"* (M; 25-34; Manchester).[10] However, these financial reasons are also sometimes combined with non-financial considerations, reminding us that particular motivations are often clustered and include both material as non-material concerns as in the case of these comments: *"Work and friends"* (F; 16-24; Cardiff); *"I learned the language, got a job, friends and family here and the money is better"* (F; 25-34; Cardiff); *"Better living conditions; social assistance (benefits)"* (M; 35-44; Manchester) or simply *"Got married here"* (F; 25-34; Southampton).

Financial gains, however, were sometimes contrasted with a lack of any other advantages of living in the UK, which demonstrates an uneasy and dynamic decision making process that requires an equilibrium between monetary rewards and social, emotional and personal loss. For example, some respondents commented that *"Apart from money, there is nothing I like here"* (M, 45+, Llanelli); *"The only positive thing here is the money"* (M, 16-24, Cardiff).

Interestingly, the overarching notion of standard of living, or as other scholars have termed "normalcy" (Galasińska and Kozłowska, 2009), has now quite frequently entered the vocabulary of migrants, as in the case of the following comments. "*I've got a job; got enough to live, better standard of living here*" (F; 45+; Manchester); "*It is much more tolerant here; and no discrimination, better standard of living; it's peaceful here in Cardiff*" (F, 25-34; Cardiff); *"It is better here because of the money and it is better to educate children here"* (F, 35-44, Cardiff); "*Easier to live… just in case I can always go back*" (F, 45+, Llanelli); *"Nothing changes in Poland, so nothing to go back to"* (M, 25-34, Cardiff).

---

[10] The information in parentheses after each quote relates to the respondent's gender, age category and location.

The survey also asked respondents to indicate the extent to which the support provided by the welfare state played a role in decision making and settlement.[11] Given the sensitive nature of the question, we may expect some misreporting, however it is important to note that some respondents commented on the more generous nature of the welfare state in the UK. Some examples of the views that were expressed include: *"I support myself and children from social benefits; this is impossible in Poland"* (F, 35-44, Manchester); *"We're helped by the state a lot here" (M, 35-44, Manchester); "There is no help in Poland at all"* (M, 25-34, Southampton). Neither do some migrants lose sight of the potential benefits from consuming earnings in the UK over a relatively short period and then in Poland in the long run. These views can also extend right up until retirement: *"I try to fix my pension here and there [in Poland]"* (F, 45+, London); *"It makes sense to save for a pension here to live in Poland when I'm old"* (M, 45+, Llanelli).

The views expressed by the respondents appear to be constantly considered from a dual reference perspective i.e. in comparison to the situation in Poland. This is the case with the National Health Service for example, whose services are applauded for their low or zero costs, but are compared negatively when it comes to quality, time, access to doctors etc. While the picture is mixed, it appears that overall Polish migrants regard the welfare state, and the state in general, as being relatively friendly towards them, by offering a helping hand and especially rewarding families. This in turn provides an additional incentive to remain in the UK for a longer period. This view, formed out of a comparative perspective, seems evident from the qualitative responses emanating from the survey.

7. Conclusions

We have used a mixed methods approach in this paper to examine the migration plans and strategies of recent Polish migrants to the UK and the factors that can cause plans to change. Our statistical analysis indicates that many of these migrants are unsure about how long they will stay on arrival, many of whom continue to maintain such an attitude after having spent some time in the UK. In contrast, others who had been unsure on arrival then form definite plans and vice versa. This is consistent with the open-endedness of the migration project, which

---

[11] Variables capturing the importance of social benefits and pensions were not significant factors when added to the multinomial logit regressions.

has been couched in terms of being liquid, undetermined and unpredictable, thereby influencing and forming part of a particular modern 'transnational reflexivity' or 'transnational type consciousness' (Vertovec, 2009). We find that financial issues are key determinants of an individual's migration plans, especially remittances - both in terms of whether they are sent and the amount sent. In addition to the monetary side, there is likely to be a significant social and cultural role for remittances as transnational links that connect families (Batnitzky *et al.*, 2012). This implies that links back home (pensions, housing and family) are maintained 'just in case', which is also evident from the qualitative responses. Migrants whose earnings meet with expectations are also more likely to have definite migration plans. Standard socio-economic characteristics tend to be less important, as does the level of earnings.

Both the statistical and qualitative analysis highlight the importance of financial aspects and the role of expectations on changes in plans. In addition, the qualitative evidence emphasizes a constant comparative perspective, in other words a dual reference strategy. Remittances, especially sending larger amounts, are important in lengthening and earnings not meeting expectations in shortening migration plans. Money and work are the most commonly stated reasons given for changes in migration plans, with some migrants indicating that there was little else keeping them in the UK other than the money. Lifestyle is also important and family issues to a lesser extent, although respondents sometimes stated that their migration plans were influenced by a combination of financial and non-financial considerations. The ease of living in the UK also appears to be assisted by the safety net provided by the welfare state.

Despite using a mixed methods approach to further enhance our understanding of the processes associated with contemporary forms of migration within an expanded EU, we feel that there is scope to gain further insights into the processes underlying these important and constantly evolving population movements. In particular, our study took place over a relatively short period (August-September 2010), at a time when the UK was starting to recover from the financial crisis. Therefore, given the importance of financial considerations, it would be interesting to establish exactly how general economic conditions in the home and host countries influence the formation and updating of migrants' plans and strategies. This would best be achieved with longitudinal information on migrants but comparisons at different points of the economic cycle may also be able to shed some further light on this issue.

References

Agunias D. (2006), "From a zero-sum to a win-win scenario? Literature review on circular migration", Migration Policy Institute, Washington DC.

Bauere, V., Densham, P., Millar, J. and Salt, J. (2007), "Migrants from Central and Eastern Europe: Local geographies", *Population Trends*, **129**, 7-19.

Batnitzky, A., McDowell, L. and Dyer, S. (2012), "Remittances and the maintenance of dual social worlds: The Transnational Working Lives of Migrants in Greater London", *International Migration*, **50**, 140-156.

Botterill, K. (2011), "Mobility and immobility in the European Union: Experiences of young Polish people living in the UK", *Studia Migracyjne-Przegląd Polonijny*, **139**, 47-70.

Broadhead, R. (2008), "Notes on a cautionary (tall) tale about Respondent-Driven Sampling: A critique of Scott's ethnography", *International Journal of Drug Policy*, **19**, 235-237.

Burda, M. C. (1995), "Migration and the option value of waiting", *Economic and Social Review*, **27**, 1-19.

Burda, M. C., Härdle, W., Müller, M. and Werwatz, W. (1998), "Semiparametric analysis of German east-west migration intentions: Facts and theory", *Journal of Applied Econometrics,* **13**, 525-541.

Burrell, K. (2009), "Migration to the UK from Poland: Continuity and change in east-west European mobility," in K. Burrell (ed*.) Polish Migration to the UK in the 'New' European Union After 2004*, Ashgate, Farnham.

Currie, S. (2007), "De-skilled and devalued: The labour market experience of Polish migrants in the UK following EU enlargement", *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, **23**, 83-116.

Drinkwater, S., Eade, J. and Garapich, M. (2009), "Poles apart? EU enlargement and the labour market outcomes of immigrants in the UK", *International Migration*, **47**, 161-190.

Drinkwater, S. and Garapich, M. (2011), "The TEMPO survey of Polish migrants in England and Wales", WISERD Data Resource 004.

Dustmann, C. (2003), "Return migration, wage differentials and the optimal migration duration", *European Economic Review*, **47**, 353-369.

Dustmann, C. and Weiss, Y. (2007), "Return migration: Theory and empirical evidence from the UK", *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, **45**, 236-256.

Eade, J. Drinkwater S. and Garapich M. (2007), *Class and Ethnicity: Polish Migrant Workers in London*, End of Award Research Report, ESRC, Swindon.

Engbersen, G., Snel, E., and de Boom, J. (2010), "A 'van full of Poles': Liquid migration from Central and Eastern Europe" in R. Black, G. Engbersen, M. Okólski and C. Pantiru (eds), *EU Enlargement and Labour Migration from Central and Eastern Europe*, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.

Favell A. (2008), "The new face of east-west migration in Europe", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, **34**, 701-716.

Findlay, A. and McCollom, D. (2011), "Trends in A8 migration to the UK during the recession", *Population Trends*, **145**, 73-85.

Galasińska, A. and Kozłowska, O. (2009), "Discourses of a 'normal life' among post-accession migrants from Poland to Britain" in K. Burrell (ed.), *Polish Migration in the UK in the 'New' European Union*, Ashgate, Farnham.

Gill, N. (2010), "Pathologies of migrant place-making: the case of Polish migrants to the UK", *Environment and Planning A*, **42**, 1157-1173.

Grabowska-Lusińska, I. and Okólski, M. (2009), "Emigracja ostatnia?", *Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar*, Warsaw.

Harris, C., Moran, D. and Bryson, J. R. (2012), "EU accession migration: National insurance number allocations and the geographies of Polish labour immigration to the UK", *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie,* **103***, 209-221*.

House of Lords (2008), *The Economic Impact of Immigration, Select Committee of Economic Affairs*, First Report of Session 2007-8, The Stationary Office Limited, London.

Iglicka, K. (2008), "Kontrasty migracyjne Polski", *Wymiar transatlantycki, Wydawnictwo Scholar*.

Irek M. (2011), "The myth of 'weak ties' and the ghost of the Polish peasant: Informal networks of Polish post-transition migrants in the UK and Germany", COMPAS Working Paper No. 87.

Kaczmarczyk, P. and Okólski, M. (2008). "Demographic and labour-market impacts of migration on Poland", *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, **24**, 599-624.

Locher, L. (2001), "Testing for the option value of migration", IZA Discussion Paper, No. 405.

Massey, D. S., Goldring, L. and Durand, J. (1994), "Continuities in transnational migration: An analysis of nineteen Mexican communities", *American Journal of Sociology*, **99**, 1492-1533.

McGhee, D., Heath, S. and Trevena, P. (2012), "Dignity, happiness and being able to live a 'normal life' in the UK - An examination of post-accession Polish migrants' transnational autobiographical fields", *Social Identities*, **18**, 711-727.

McGhee, D., Heath, S. and Trevena, P. (2013), "Post-accession Polish migrants - their experiences of living in 'low-demand' social housing areas in Glasgow", *Environment and Planning A*, **45**, 329-343.

Moriarty, E., Wickham, J., Salomonska, J., Krings, T. and Bobek, A. (2010), "Putting Work Back in Mobilities: Migrant Careers and Aspirations", Paper presented at the 'New Migrations, New Challenges' Conference, Trinity College Dublin, July 2010.

O'Connell, P. G. J. (1997), "Migration under uncertainty: 'Try your luck' or 'wait and see'", *Journal of Regional Science*, **37**, 331-47.

Pollard, N., Lattore, M. and Sriskandarajah, D. (2008), *Floodgates or Turnstiles? Post-EU Enlargement Migration Flows to (and from) the UK*, Institute for Public Policy Research, London.

Ryan, L., Sales, R., Tiki, M. and Siara, B. (2009), "Family strategies of transnational migration: Recent Polish migrants in London", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, **35**, 61-77.

Piore, M. J. (1979), *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor in Industrial Societies*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Svasek M. (2009), "Shared history? Polish migrant experiences and the politics of display in Northern Ireland" in K. Burrell (ed.) *Polish Migration to the UK in the 'New' European Union.* Ashgate, Farnham.

Thompson, A. (2010), "Migratory drift: Why temporary migrants stay", mimeo, University of Glamorgan.

Vertovec, S. (2009), *Transnationalism*, Routledge, London.

White A. (2011), *Polish Families and Migration Since EU Accession,* Policy Press, Bristol.