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1. Overview

This report presents the findings of research focusing on the experiences of migrant workers. In particular it explores what motivates people to come to the UK, what affects people’s decisions to stay or leave, and how these change over time, as well as looking at what migrants perceive their contribution to be to the UK. The research was commissioned by Migrant Workers North West in May 2009 and conducted by researchers from the Salford Housing & Urban Studies Unit (SHUSU) at the University of Salford and Merseyside Social Inclusion Observatory (MSIO) at the University of Liverpool. The research was greatly aided by a researcher from the Slovak community.

1.1 Background to the research

In recent years, there has been an increasing focus on the migration of people to the UK, particularly from Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries. Political and media debate has focused on the number of people who have arrived in the UK, the impact this has had on indigenous workers, as well as the impact on public services. There has also been an interest in the contribution of migrant workers, particularly in terms of the economic contribution they make.

A number of studies have been carried out across the UK which look at the experiences and needs of migrant workers. Many of these have developed from a recognition that public bodies need to understand the composition and needs of their local population in order to be able to plan and deliver services effectively. These studies have focused on issues such as employment, accommodation, skills and qualifications and community cohesion. However, they have also looked, albeit briefly, at reasons for coming to the UK and people’s future intentions with regards to staying here, returning to their home country or perhaps moving to another country. The majority of these studies have primarily adopted a survey approach and, although providing very useful information on a range of issues, there is a lack of more in-depth information relating to people’s experiences.

In addition, Government Select Committee Reports and other policy think tanks, such as the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) have highlighted the contributions that migrant workers make to the UK economy. There is a lack of information, however, on how these broader evaluations correlate or contrast with the views of migrants themselves.

---

1 The Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia (commonly referred to as the A8 countries); Bulgaria and Romania (commonly referred to as the A2 countries).
1.2 Aims of the research

This research therefore had two main aims:

1. Understanding the motivations of migrant workers moving to and from the UK
2. Exploring what migrant workers perceive they contribute to the UK and how they feel they will contribute in the future

Motivations

What is often highlighted in research with migrant workers is that people are unsure of their future intentions, with the decision-making process being influenced by a range of factors (economic, general experiences, social networks, etc.). Consequently, the research – through drawing upon a local case study (Liverpool, UK) - initially attempts to provide a more in-depth understanding of migrants’ motivations and intentions, how and why these may change over time, and the implications that arise for public policy and the delivery of services. In particular, a focus is placed on:

- those whose intentions have changed over time as they have gained greater rights and responsibilities and increased 'individual agency';
- the extent to which individuals have brought families/dependants to the UK and how this has affected their motivations;
- any skills or employment issues (particularly in relation to skills match/mismatch) and how this has affected their motivations;
- the affect of people’s overall experiences (accommodation, relationships, public services, benefit eligibility) on their motivations;
- the extent to which the relaxation of labour market restrictions in other EU countries impacts upon their intentions; and
- the relative position of 'origin' economies compared to the UK economy and the impact this may have upon motivations.

Contributions

The second strand of the research focuses on migrant’s perceptions of both their current and future contributions and the extent to which their own views are consistent or diverge from that presented by the Government and other organizations at the national level. In particular, an emphasis is placed on:

- Financial contributions, including patterns of saving / expenditure;
• Labour market contributions, including how they are helping to fill vacancies and meet the needs of employers, their impact on the productivity of employers, and any changes in their level or type of contribution over time; and

• Contribution to ‘community life’, including the activities that they are involved in and future intentions to contribute.
2. Literature Review

This chapter provides a brief overview of what is currently known about the motivations and contributions of migrant workers, drawing on a selection of research that has been carried out across the UK.

2.1 Motivations

A key factor that has influenced CEE economic migration patterns to the UK has been the European Commission (EC) Accession Treaty (2003). Within this Treaty it was agreed, by both the original EU-15 member states and CEE countries, that for a maximum period of seven years (the ‘transitional arrangements’) the EU-15 would be able to continue to regulate access to their labour markets (i.e. apply a work permit system) instead of allowing the free movement of workers. The reasoning behind such a position was the uncertainty over the impact of migrant workers on labour markets, particular occupations or specific regions, as well as access to social benefits.

Of the EU-15, the UK, along with Ireland and Sweden were the only countries that decided to fully open their labour markets to CEE workers (from 1 May 2004). This created significant ‘diversion effects’ in the post-enlargement flows of CEE migrant workers, with UK Worker Registration Scheme (WRS) figures highlighting that 989,085 applications were made between 1 May 2004 and 31 March 2009 by CEE migrants, of which 949,145 were approved. These figures need to be set against the initial UK government expectations of around 20,000 CEE economic migrant workers arriving per annum, leading to an increasing emphasis on ‘managing’ migration.

A review of the existing literature reveals that other than ‘accessibility issues’, a key motivating factor for CEE migrants arriving in the UK has been – at least until the recent economic downturn – ‘economic’. Hence, individuals have migrated based on the perception of the availability of employment (through active recruitment processes for specific occupations) and higher wages than in their home country, where there may be more limited work opportunities. With the UK in recession, however, it is argued that ‘re-migration’ – return or onward migration by non-British

---

nationals – is now increasing. Whilst it is suggested that the latter is clearly driven by economic factors, there is an assumption that migrants act as rational economic decision-makers. But this does not necessarily account for the variety of individual circumstances and other non-economic factors which influence motivations to migrate to, from and within countries such as the UK.

Recent research conducted across three cities in England has shown that a key reason for migrants choosing to move to such areas was based upon the presence of family or friends living there. Having access to those of a similar migrant background in the form of local, informal and formal networks was seen to be very important for certain migrant newcomers. Utilisation of these networks, it is contended, functions to counteract the multiple disadvantages they frequently experience such as poor availability of advice and information. Therefore, it is suggested that strong networks are likely to enhance the opportunities and prosperity of new migrants.

Greater educational and career opportunities either now or in the future have also been cited as motivating ‘pull’ factors for CEE migrants to move to the UK, along with a low and differentiated tax system, and efforts to create a more entrepreneurial culture.

Yet, taking a more individualistic approach, research has found that motivations can vary greatly according to the person and this can be dependent upon age, family ties, experiences and profession. Younger workers, for example, have been viewed as being more likely to migrate for shorter periods, to experience new environments and broaden their horizons, to learn and develop their English and to earn money to return home with or to move on elsewhere. Politically, the ability to escape racism and discrimination and to provide a safer environment for their children has also acted as a ‘push’ factor to migrate for certain Roma families.

Once in the UK, negative experiences and/or disillusionment with poor wages/working conditions in the UK, along with perceptions of increasing numbers of job vacancies and rising wages being available in CEE migrants’ host country have been cited as factors impacting on decisions of migrants to return home. However,

it has been highlighted that a perceived ‘embarrassment’ of returning home as a ‘failure’ has led some migrants to ‘hang on’, even when they were without paid employment\textsuperscript{19}.

With reference to rates of pay, it can be noted that wage disparities are now not as stark as they were in 2004, particularly in Poland, where the Polish Zloty has strengthened against sterling by 40\% between March 2004 and July 2008 (compared to 21\% against the Euro over the same period)\textsuperscript{20}. Coupled to this, efforts have also been made to encourage CEE migrants who have moved abroad – including those to the UK – to return home in order to fill labour shortages and boost productivity levels. The Polish parliament, for example, has recently abolished a tax law that meant that previously workers had to pay taxes on money earned abroad, whilst the Polish city of Wroclaw has been actively targeting Polish migrants in London in a campaign to attract them to return to Wroclaw\textsuperscript{21}.

It has been suggested, therefore, that in overall terms, many CEE migrants were keeping well informed about the economy within their home country and were willing to make decisions at fairly short notice as to whether they moved or not\textsuperscript{22}. Such decisions have been related to a fall in recent WRS approvals for CEE migrant workers in the UK, which declined by over a third between March 2008 and March 2009\textsuperscript{23}, and it has recently been estimated that as many as 500,000 CEE migrant workers may now have left the UK\textsuperscript{24}.

2.2 Contributions

Most analyses have promoted an economic discourse in terms of the contributions made by CEE migrants to the UK, with arguments that such individuals bring with them a number of positive benefits for employers, namely (i) a good work ethic; (ii) reliability; (iii) a willingness to work long and/or anti-social hours; and (iv) high rates of productivity whilst minimising labour costs\textsuperscript{25}. Given this context, it is not surprising that CEE economic migrants have been viewed as a resource to fill occupations with both ‘skills’ and ‘people’ shortages\textsuperscript{26}. In terms of the former, they have supported public service provision through the up-take of a variety of roles – both semi-skilled

\textsuperscript{20} Building and Social Housing Foundation (BSHF) (2008) Home from Home: Addressing the Issues of Migrant Workers’ Housing, Coalville: BSHF.
\textsuperscript{21} Building and Social Housing Foundation (BSHF) (2008) Home from Home: Addressing the Issues of Migrant Workers’ Housing, Coalville: BSHF.
and skilled – such as bus, lorry and coach drivers, care workers, teachers, researchers, classroom assistants, dentists, doctors, nurses, and medical specialists.

Due to the emphasis on ‘people shortage’ occupations, the UK Government’s current national strategy for asylum and immigration identifies that labour from CEE countries will, over time, enable a phasing out of low skill immigration schemes for individuals from other parts of the world. This began with the rolling out, from February 2008, of the new Points Based System (PBS) for migration from outside the EU and the introduction of the resident labour market test requiring employers to demonstrate that they have failed to fill vacancies from within the UK and European Economic Area (EEA) before they are able to recruit from outside Europe.

Nevertheless, the issue of ‘brain waste’ is of increasing relevance to CEE migrants and it is claimed that there is now a ‘new migrant division of labour’ in the UK, which involves CEE migrant workers regardless of linguistic capabilities, employer prejudices, work experience and/or the ability to convert existing qualifications/utilise existing skills – being concentrated in less skilled occupations. These include hospitality, leisure, retail, social care, domestic and personal services, agribusiness, warehousing, distribution and parts of the manufacturing and construction sectors. Moreover, the largest single WRS-recorded occupation of CEE migrant workers in the UK to date has been within the category ‘Process operative (other factory worker)’ – accounting for 28% of all WRS registrations between 1 May 2004 and 31 March 2009.

It has also been highlighted that they provide national macroeconomic benefits such as reducing the average age of the workforce (81% of those arriving since May 2004 have been aged between 18 and 34) and facilitating economic and employment growth, as well as helping to keep inflation down. Such a contribution has been championed by UNISON who stated that between 2004 and 2006 migrant workers contributed £2.5 billion to public accounts. The extra demand for consumer goods and services brought about by a larger working population is also viewed as beneficial to the national economy.

---

A recent report\textsuperscript{36} additionally set out how CEE migrants can make a positive contribution to local economies, through helping businesses to expand and diversify (as a result of links to their home country and an associated increase in the size of the market that UK businesses can sell to), as well engaging in entrepreneurial activity conducive to creating more jobs for the UK population. It has been estimated that in the North West region alone each migrant worker will account for more than £7,000 of tax revenue\textsuperscript{37}, whilst there is evidence that migrants are aiding housing market renewal as they have increased the demand for private-rented and owner-occupied housing in marginal/deprived areas\textsuperscript{38}.

In overall terms, what the existing literature reveals is an emphasis on measuring the contribution of CEE migrants in financial terms and from a third person perspective (i.e. what others, such as large public bodies, see as worth measuring and publishing). There has been a lack of research into the contributions that CEE migrants make from their own perspective, including very little focus on contributions beyond the economic. The following sections therefore attempt to fill this gap.

\textsuperscript{36} Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) (2008) \textit{Your Place or Mine? The local economics of migration}, London: IPPR.
3. Methods

Chapter 1 provided information in relation to the background and aims of the study, whilst Chapter 2 explored existing sources of information looking at the motivations and contributions of CEE migrant workers. The aim of this chapter is now to focus specifically upon the fieldwork and the methods employed in this research. It discusses issues such as sampling and access, highlighting any ethical concerns or limitations of the methodology, and looking at the methods of analysis that were used on the data. This chapter also includes some background information about the CEE migrants who were interviewed.

3.1 Interviews

Given that a key purpose of the research was to generate a more in-depth exploration of CEE migrant motivations and contributions, the research methodology involved semi-structured interviews with migrant workers.

One pilot interview was undertaken to provide the opportunity to ‘test out’ the interview schedule in terms of looking at useful prompts and how sensitive certain issues might be. This pilot interview raised some issues around the complexity of the language that was being used and, as such, some small amendments were made to the questions to make translation easier.

A total of twenty interviews were undertaken between June and September 2009. All of the interviews were carried out at locations suitable for the respondents. On average, the interviews lasted for about one hour.

3.2 Sampling and access – guiding principles

- For this research the selection process was not concerned with representativeness in any statistical sense;

- A mix of ‘purposive’ and ‘snowball’ sampling was used. Purposive sampling involves selecting individuals on the basis of their relevance to the research questions\(^{39}\), while the use of ‘snowball’ sampling is regarded as one of the best methods of accessing hidden or ‘hard to reach’ populations\(^{40}\);

- An attempt was made to ensure a mix of interviewees by gender, age and household type (i.e. single, families);

- Attempts were also made to ensure that interviewees comprised of both a mix of relatively recent arrivals and those who had been in the UK longer;

- A mix of highly skilled and low skilled migrants were sought;


• Although we are aware that migrant workers come to the UK from across the globe, the focus of this research was CEE migrants, who currently feature most in public and political debate. In particular, Czech, Polish, Slovak and Lithuanian migrant workers were targeted for both pragmatic reasons (resource/time constraints and language skills/community links of the interviewer), but also due to such communities being relatively prominent within the case study area (Liverpool);

• Liverpool was selected as a case study area given the fact that it has suffered more than most cities in terms of the impact of processes of globalisation and economic restructuring, leading to population decline (-22,200 1997-2007), lower employment rates (65.2% 2007/08 as opposed to UK average of 74.5%) and an increasing reliance on economic migrants to fill ‘job gaps’ – both skilled and unskilled. The research team also had links to the CEE migrant community in Liverpool from previous studies.

3.3 Community researcher approach

The accounts of CEE migrants whose command of English was not very proficient were felt to be potentially important to this study, as this would be a possible factor influencing their motivations and/or contributions. This study employed a community researcher with Czech, Polish and Slovak language skills. The benefits of working with a community researcher, however, did not just related to language but also the social networks within Liverpool, which enabled the research to include a range of individuals who would otherwise have been difficult to access. This was crucial in generating trust between the researcher and the migrant interviewees, which in turn (it was envisaged) would ‘enrich’ the responses that were received.

When carrying out cross-language research, however, there are a number of issues to consider. For example, there are an abundance of different words that can be used to convey meanings, and some words may not have the same meaning once translated into a different language. Indeed, language “speaks of a particular social reality that may not necessarily have a conceptual equivalence in the language into which it is to be translated.” In order to overcome such issues, an induction session was held with the community researcher to ensure that they were conversant with the interview schedule, and that they had a full understanding of the meaning of the questions. Moreover, given the importance of the community researcher to the overall process, they were also provided with training in broader research methodology and interviewing techniques involving the use of face-to-face interviews.

---


3.4 Ethical considerations

The study adhered to the principle of ‘informed consent’, which involved the researcher explaining:

“…as fully as possible, and in terms meaningful to participants, what the research is about, who is undertaking and financing it, why it is being undertaken, and how it is to be disseminated and used.”

It was explained to the respondents that confidentiality and anonymity were assured. The interviews were recorded, with permission from the respondents, and from this were transcribed. The interviewee transcripts were subsequently analysed in line with the key questions/issues set out in the introductory chapter in terms of people’s motivations/contributions.

3.5 Photographic project

In addition to carrying out interviews with migrant workers, the research also worked in collaboration with a photographic project. This photographic project was carried out by Matthew Davenport, a professional photographer, as part of his Masters in Documentary Photography at the University of Bolton.

The respondents who took part in the interviews were asked if they would like to take part in the photographic project. This involved a choice of one of the following, depending on what the respondents were most comfortable with:

- a portrait photo of them or other family members
- a photo of items around their home that have meaning to them

Those who took part in the photographic project were offered a free portrait session for them or their family and ten prints to keep. A number of the images produced in the project feature in a separate booklet entitled *Migration Works: Exploding the myths about migration and exploring the motivations which bring migrant workers to the UK* (available from Migrant Workers North West).

3.6 Background information about the respondents

The characteristics of the CEE migrant interviewees who took part in the study are detailed in Appendix 1. As highlighted previously, a mix of Czech, Polish, Slovak and Lithuanian individuals formed the basis of the sample, with a roughly even gender balance. A mix of young (16-29), middle age (30-44) and more mature individuals (45+) participated in the research, with a balance between those who identified themselves as single (and living with friends or on their own) and those who had families.

---

The majority had been in the UK for over two years and were currently employed in jobs which mirrored national patterns (such as warehouse operatives, food processing, packing, cleaning and production-line work). A small number were employed in more skilled occupations (such as teaching), while three people indicated that they were currently unemployed.

When questioned about their previous employment in the UK, by and large they had been working in similar types of jobs. Two of those who were currently unemployed had been working as production line operative or in construction (two sectors that have been susceptible to the recent economic downturn).

Similarly, the respondents had been employed in broadly comparable employment in their home country before arriving in the UK, with the exception of a small number of individuals who were now unemployed, but had previously worked in sales, construction, or as youth workers.

Finally, the sample of interviewees, in the main, held intermediate level qualifications in the form of diplomas (or equivalent). Qualifications appeared to have little influence on their current type of employment in the UK. For example, two individuals identified that they degree-level qualifications; one appeared to be working in an occupation with direct relevance to their qualifications (teaching), while the other was not (packer in a factory).

What follows now is a discussion of the main findings of the interviews focusing on motivations and contributions.
4. Migrant Motivations

The literature review (Chapter 2) highlighted that migration has to be understood in terms of both structural relationships and social networks. Although economic and political conditions (for example, discrimination) can shape the broad outline of migration flows, non-economic factors such as educational opportunities and family relations, as well as the availability of formal and informal networks (and human agency) may determine how they are constituted locally.

Equally (and beyond economic factors), a series of other influences were of relevance to ‘return’ migration, including negative experiences/poor working conditions in the UK; the opportunity for family reunification in their home country; and perceived improvement in economic conditions in their home country.

The aim of this chapter is to explore the extent to which these findings continue to be of relevance, whether other influences may be of equal or more importance on an individual basis, to challenge existing interpretations for migration according to age, family ties, experience and profession\textsuperscript{46}, and to provide more in-depth information relating to CEE migrants’ motivations for coming, staying or leaving both Liverpool and the UK.

4.1 Motivations for moving to the UK – the relative importance of ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors

Five key reasons for coming to the UK were advanced by CEE migrants. Indeed, in parallel with existing literature on CEE migration, economic motivations – both in terms of high rates of unemployment/a lack of opportunities in the labour market in their country of origin (a ‘push’ factor) and in respect of perceived/actual employment opportunities in the UK (a ‘pull’ factor) - were identified as the key reason for moving by virtually all of the interviewees. Equally, in terms of access to, and availability of, employment in the UK, the European Commission (EC) Accession Treaty (2003), which opened up access to work in the UK for those from CEE countries, combined with the very favourable exchange rate and strength of the UK pound between 2004 and 2007 were of significance:

“I had been unemployed for two years. And I couldn't find anything. Then my friend found a job for me on the internet - care work in an elderly home in the Wirral. They arranged everything for me, like Worker Registration at the Home Office and my tenancy agreement” (Interviewee 6, Polish female, aged 53)

“Employment was a major reason [why I came to the UK] because whilst I earned over 20,000 Sk and worked like crazy in the Czech Republic, here [in the UK] I could earn twice as much and work less...you must remember, the pound was much stronger a few years ago and it was very much worth it coming here for work” (Interviewee 11, Slovak male, aged 21)

Beyond economic reasons, it was clear that a number of other non-economic factors were also relevant, which were acting as ‘pull’ factors; for example, a desire for new experiences. However, whilst a number of previous studies have highlighted how younger CEE migrants arrived in the UK in order to broaden their horizons\textsuperscript{47}, our research indicates that ‘experiential’ influences are not just of relevance to young people. Indeed, older respondents also noted this as being a key issue that had impacted on their decision to come to the UK:

“We realised that we are not young anymore and we felt we had the last chance to travel abroad and get some work there (the UK)” (Interviewee 10, Czech male, aged 45)

Confirming previous research\textsuperscript{48}, the importance of educational opportunities in the UK was also noted by respondents; nevertheless, a number of interviewees again pointed out that the (frequently less recognized) issue of linguistic development for older, as well as younger individuals, was a key reason for moving:

“The reason is that I wanted to learn better English. I was not happy with my teachers of English at home” (Interviewee 3, Polish female, aged 47)

It was perhaps unsurprising to find that Czech (Roma) interviewees cited a particular ‘push’ factor as racism and discrimination in their home country. In the words of one interviewee: “there are no jobs there, especially if you are dark skinned like us” (Interviewee 3, Czech female, aged 33). Indeed, this has been recognised as being a contributory influence in other studies, as has family reunification\textsuperscript{49}. However, the perception that the cost of living in Liverpool was cheaper than elsewhere in the UK was an interesting ‘local’ (pull) influence of relevance, which is less recognisable in existing research.

Furthermore, existing studies have not tended to focus on the extent to which the relative importance of push/pull factors have changed over time. In this respect, the study in Liverpool revealed that for around 60% of respondents, the influences on their decision to come to UK (and Liverpool) had not changed at all since they had arrived. This was despite, in theory, their ‘agency’ increasing as a result of becoming eligible for certain forms of welfare benefit. In the words of one interviewee:

“Work and solid pay is still the main motivation to stay. This country provides much more employment opportunities for older people than in Poland” (Interviewee 6, Polish females, aged 53)

For most of the remaining respondents, the research revealed that securing employment in the UK, coupled with a view that conditions in their home country had deteriorated (for example, higher unemployment, fewer opportunities for their children and increased racism/discrimination) had simply served to reinforce the


importance of the ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors that had caused them to move in the first place. As two respondents noted:

“The racism is even worse now in the Czech Republic......the violence from skinheads gets worse. So it’s clear for us more than ever that we would be unwelcome if we went back to the Czech Republic” (Interviewee 8, Czech female, aged 39)

“At the moment I am here because I know that it is easy to support myself than in Poland.....I have got contracts with my internet and mobile phone company, so if I would move back, I would lose money” (Interviewee 5, Polish male, aged 25)

Although access to welfare was suggested to have little influence on decision making, interestingly, pension contributions did appear to have some impact on motivations. Indeed, whilst much previous work has focused on the influences/duration of stay of younger CEE migrants in the UK, access to a UK state pension appeared to be of relevance to how long older migrant interviewees planned to remain in the UK. This is of particular relevance for those who have already been in employment for a considerable period of time, as one respondent highlights:

“I am 53 and I am thinking about my pension. The law says that if you work in the UK for more than 5 years, you are entitled to some state pension here. Not much money but at least something. So now I see that I have to stay here until I have worked for at least five years. If I return to Poland before then, I will not receive any pension from the UK” (Interviewee 6, Polish female, aged 53)

### 4.2 Neighbourhood and accommodation preferences of CEE migrants

It was apparent that there was a small degree of variation in terms of the particular neighbourhoods that CEE migrants were living in. In this respect, the relatively deprived inner-city areas of Kensington, Toxteth and Picton were consistently apparent (with such areas having a long history of immigration/migrant communities and ‘marginal’/failing housing markets), although some respondents were living in areas such as Sefton Park, Tuebrook, West Derby, Everton and Bromborough (Wirral). The respondents had lived in these neighbourhoods for between six months and five years.

The key factors which had informed the selection of such neighbourhoods were numerous, some of which related to traditional patterns of ‘chain’ migration to the UK50. Therefore the presence of family/friends residing in such neighbourhoods was important, as noted in previous research51:

---


“I didn’t know Liverpool at all before and spoke no English. So I had to follow my daughter to Kensington… I stayed for a few weeks in her house before I found my own accommodation. Then my wife joined me here” (Interviewee 7, Slovak male, aged 49)

“I joined my friends. I had little choice because I spoke no English in the beginning and I knew just them in Liverpool. So I had to follow them and moved to their area and their house” (Interviewee 1, Czech male, aged 38).

Equally, relating to the idea of “Contact Zones”[^52], the presence of other CEE migrants influenced initial neighbourhood selection (this was especially the case for Czech respondents, but less apparent for Polish respondents). As one interview summarised succinctly:

“There were a lot of other migrants from the Czech Republic and Slovakia in the Kensington area - for example Galloway Street where we had lived before this January was like a Czech village” (Interviewee 4, Czech female, aged 33).

Coupled with the above factors were the actions of employers and recruitment agencies with much of the accommodation that was provided for CEE migrants by employers when they first arrived being located in such neighbourhoods. By and large, this was due to the presence of cheap, private rented property which could be modified/developed into Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs):

“My employer found my accommodation for me and the place had to be near to my work because of the character of work, a carer must be ready to come quickly if needed” (Interviewee 6, Polish female, aged 53)

Even where CEE migrants’ initial accommodation was not tied to a particular job, such individuals tended to locate to similar areas due to lower rates of rent[^53], and the ability to share costs with other economic migrants (this was particularly true for Polish and Slovak respondents) in HMOs:

“I found a house in Kensington. This is a cheap area, rents are low here... if you have got money, you have got many options. I don’t earn enough, so I can’t choose much” (Interviewee 14, Polish female, aged 27)

The above point is pertinent in the context of increasing migrant ‘agency’ over time, with virtually all of the interviewees indicating that they had moved since first arriving in Liverpool. Nevertheless, most did not appear to have enough income to make radically different neighbourhood choices than those already identified. Simply put, whilst their desire to move to less crowded and better quality accommodation were two key influences behind their decision to move, in effect, their economic position acted as a restraint on neighbourhood selection:

[^53]: The neighbourhoods were all significantly deprived according to the Indices of Deprivation (ID) (2007).
“The first house was just provisional and crap. The second place in Galloway street was much nicer but too small for us, we are two adults and three kids. And we had problems with annoying kids in the next street. So we moved to this street nearby [but in the same neighbourhood] as the house is bigger and the street is quiet” (Interviewee 4, Czech female, aged 33)

From a theoretical perspective, such findings correlate with the ‘constrained housing choices’ discourse, which has dominated analysis of the housing situations and experiences of immigrants over the last twenty years or so, and has recognised the restricted housing choices for such groups. Consequently it has been reported that CEE migrants initially parallel the ‘well-trodden path’ taken by many new immigrants who arrive into the UK, with restricted rights of access to the benefits of the welfare state, including access to social housing. They are therefore reliant upon their own resources to secure and maintain cheap (often poor quality) accommodation in the private rented sector left behind and avoided by others.

Ultimately, the availability of certain types of (private rented) accommodation (and informed by size and cost, and where possible, quality) overrides the influence of a desire to live in a ‘good neighbourhood’ for most CEE migrants, until their economic position has increased:

“If changing a house, it’s always about consensus and long discussions with other house mates because I can’t simply move on my own. I need to share the rent with other colleagues and so do others” (Interviewee 6, Polish female, aged 53)

Despite these constraints, a degree of individual opportunism was apparent in relation to one or two interviewees, and this had impacted upon their choice of accommodation, and ultimately a desire to locate to a ‘better’ neighbourhood. As one respondent summarised:

“When we came here to look at the house, a neighbour said that these houses would be knocked down soon and all people would be rehoused into council housing elsewhere. So I spoke with my wife and we decided to try it if there was a chance to get a new and bigger council house (and a better neighbourhood)” (Interviewee 12, Slovak male, aged 33)

4.3 Influences on CEE migrants’ decision to stay in their current area or to move elsewhere

In general terms, the majority of respondents indicated that when they had initially arrived in the UK, they had planned to stay for a reasonable amount of time (more than two years), with some noting that they originally intended to stay indefinitely. Respondents constituting the latter group had generally experienced forms of racism or discrimination in their home country (e.g. Czech Roma interviewees).

Having arrived in Liverpool, mainly as a result of job availability (often employer or agency-related) and/or the presence of family/friends, a small number of CEE migrants who were interviewed highlighted that they now planned to move again within the city as a consequence of a number of ‘local’ factors, such as a poor local environment/poor housing. The availability of local services (education, health and transport), but also, interestingly, the proximity of family/friends or other migrants did not appear to act as a critical influence on their decision to stay or leave an area. Rather, the availability and type of employment (locally) to CEE migrants was argued to be the key issue on whether they stayed a) within their local neighbourhood; b) within the city itself (Manchester was seen as alternative destination in respect of job opportunities); and c) within the UK. Indeed, in terms of leaving the UK, the economic downturn appeared to have created some uncertainty amongst one or two interviewees as to whether they would leave in the short-term as a result of losing their jobs (i.e. in the next six to twelve months):

“We were planning to stay for five years...Now? I will be happy if we survive till the end of the year...We left our work a week ago. I don't know whether we will find another job. If I find a job I will stay longer of course, like we initially planned, for five years. It is hard to plan anything at this moment” (Interviewee 10, Czech female, aged 45)

“I am interested mainly in keeping the job I do now. If I lose it and will not be able to find a similar teaching job, then I would lose my major reason for staying in the UK” (Interviewee 3, Polish female, aged 47)

Additionally, it was argued that intra-migrant tensions were increasing in the current economic downturn as a consequence of more competition for fewer jobs (see Chapter 5 for further discussion of this issue). This had led some CEE migrants to either move elsewhere in the city (for employment and to avoid conflict) or in some cases to even move back home:

“Most agencies [in Liverpool] are run by Poles and you can't get a job with them. They just block you off when you need their help and they are not bothered...” (Interviewee 8, Czech female, aged 39)

Command of the English language was also argued to be increasingly important for CEE migrants to secure and maintain employment, and to stay both within Liverpool and the UK:

“The availability used to be very good, now it is horrible. Now you won't find job as simply and quickly as before. When I came to the UK, I didn't speak English but I used to get offers or be invited for interviews or at least for trainings. Now, if your English isn't perfect you won't get a job” (Interviewee 11, Slovak male, aged 21)

Failure to remain in work was therefore regarded as having a substantial impact on the motivation of individuals to remain here. Only two interviewees highlighted that their experiences of work (in terms of satisfaction with current working conditions/levels of pay) were seriously leading to a reconsideration of whether they wished to remain in the UK. This over-riding economic imperative in the current
climate is interesting as other studies have suggested that disillusionment with work/poor wages has been a key factor in shaping return migration:55

“Our income was reduced because the employer stopped paying us for our breaks. Before one of the two breaks, the longer one, was paid. So I am losing two hours working time each time. But it’s still worth staying there for me” (Interviewee 7, Slovak male, aged 49)

Another other point to note was CEE migrants’ perceptions on the extent to which local skills/employment mismatches were in evidence. What is interesting to note is that while this has been reported as being an important issue in previous studies, particularly in terms of the need to encourage the occupational progression of skilled migrants, the individuals in this study did not – in the main – perceive this as problematic. Although people did have aspirations to work in better paid and more skilled employment, the majority of people appeared to have an acceptance that they would remain in the same types of jobs that they were currently undertaking. There were three main reasons for this. The first related to a number of respondents being relatively unskilled in the first instance. Secondly, limited command of English language was a key barrier preventing people from changing their type of employment, with people suggesting that until they had developed sufficient English language skills, this mismatch was acceptable. One respondent, for example, who was working the production line at a printing company talked about language as her own internal ‘block’:

“If I got another chance, for example, if someone offered me a receptionist job or an admin work in an office, I would go. But I would be uncertain whether my new employer would be satisfied…Some people have encouraged me to leave this job and find something better but there is a block inside. That’s why I think that I will stay there for some time in the future…my English is not good enough” (Interviewee 14, Polish female, aged 27)

While another three respondents also referred to the constraints of limited English language skills:

“I always take the first job which is at hand…But most probably I will stay with these simple jobs for years, until my English gets much better” (Interviewee 1, Czech male, aged 38) (currently a meat packer)

“I hope to learn more English and get a more interesting job, something where you have to use your brain more…But I am realistic at the same time, I have to deserve such a job by learning the language” (Interviewee 9, Czech male, aged 30)

“You know, without good English you can’t get a better job than a factory” (Interviewee 19, Polish female, aged 19)

The third reason, again, related to the current economic climate and the affect this had on their ability to change jobs. For some, there was almost a ‘gratitude’ attitude towards employment, with the perception that they were lucky to have a job. One person, for example, made reference to their awareness that there was a ‘queue of people’ waiting for their job. Another respondent indicated that their current employer was not averse to using the economic climate as an excuse for withholding payment:

“…He gives me £50 for seventeen hours of work. On Sundays we get £70 for the same hours, it’s cash, no pay slips. So I am not satisfied. Sometimes he doesn’t pay me at all. He says it is the financial crisis. He owes me £200 at the moment” (Interviewee 13, Slovak male, aged 52)

Furthermore, one person was also led to believe, through conversations with other migrants, that there were restrictions on what migrant workers could apply for:

“…I occasionally watch job vacancies on internet because I’d like to work for more than minimum wage. But I don’t think I can aspire to more qualified work here in the UK, especially not now with the work shortage when better jobs are reserved for native people. That’s at least what I heard from others” (Interviewee 6, Polish female, aged 53)

Political and media debate often focuses on perceived ‘benefit tourism’ of migrant communities. Whilst the majority of interviewees had actually claimed some type of benefit (the most common being Working Tax Credits/Child Tax Credits, Child Benefit and Housing Benefit), only around a third of respondents suggested that this had acted as an influence on their motivation to stay in the UK. Those with dependant children particularly emphasised how it provided a ‘fall back’ mechanism if they lost their job or could act as a supplement to their low income. There was a near universal response, however, on the difficulties that they had experienced in securing such support:

“After I lost my job in the chocolate factory, I was looking for a job. After more than two months I decided to go to a Job Centre to claim for JSA. They rejected my claim but never wrote to me on paper to say what the reason was. So I went to a CAB office and they helped me to write an appeal. So I appealed against their decision and demanded to reopen my claim. So now it takes already four months and they still have not decided yet and I haven’t seen a penny! But at least they helped me to get housing benefit to cover part of my rent...what made me most upset was the fact they didn't make any effort to explain to me the reasons for their decision, you know?” (Interviewee 6, Polish female, aged 53)

Slightly more interviewees responded that they kept track of the relative position of ‘origin’ economies compared to the UK (usually through the newspapers; internet; and satellite television) than those who did not. However, most respondents – regardless of having knowledge of conditions in their home country – indicated that this was not acting as an influence on their motivation to return, and which again is contrary to some previous studies\(^\text{56}\). Indeed, respondents suggested that economic

---

conditions were currently pretty much the same everywhere and that their experiences in the UK since arrival had reinforced their decision to come in the first place:

“I don’t follow the situation over there [in the Czech Republic]. First, the real differences between the countries are minimal now. It’s so much linked together and mutually dependent that the local situations are pretty much the same” (Interviewee 2, Czech male, aged 35)

“Some Polish from the chocolate factory where I used to work went back [home]. And what I heard is that some of them are planning to come back again to Liverpool. They say they can’t find work and they are all young people” (Interviewee 6, Polish female, aged 53)

One or two respondents did suggest that rather than looking at the economic position in their home country per se, they considered in more detail the working conditions/nature of work within particular employment sectors back home and in other EU countries. It was on this basis that they then decided whether or not to move:

“I am the kind of person who does the job for its unique character, not for the money. So what I follow more than economics are the professional and organisational changes in the educational sector in the Czech Republic and the EU” (Interviewee 3, Polish female, aged 47)

From analysis of the characteristics of the CEE migrants in our sample, it is clear that many had been in the UK for quite a while. Accordingly, this may have impacted upon the responses collated and the extent to which their perceptions over the ‘upheaval’ of moving (particularly with families/dependants) reduced their propensity to move, regardless of the conditions back home:

“I have got a family and I don’t want to drag them with me all over Europe. I don’t want to change the country...we already know it here, they [our children] go to British schools” (Interviewee 9, Czech male, aged 30)

Continuing looking at wider influences, very few CEE migrants appeared to have an awareness of where and when labour market restrictions in other EU countries were to be relaxed. Those who did tended to be older and had been in the UK for a reasonable length of time, and the majority did not think that this would impact upon their future motivations. Some respondents, however, particularly those who were more qualified, did suggest that they may be more likely to leave in the first instance, with Belgium, Germany, Denmark, Sweden and Finland being seen as potential destinations. Job availability and a positive local (built) environment (for example, good quality housing) were key reasons for moving to such countries:

“In August I will meet a Czech work agency that arranges work in several EU countries. I will talk to them and see what they have to offer. I am particularly interested in trying Belgium, some of my friends live there and work is available” (Interviewee 15, Czech male, aged 33)
“If I am single like now, I will go to Germany. And I will try to start there again, from zero. Because I speak German as good as English - at the same level. Berlin...it is clean in the city, the houses are better quality... just walk in Berlin or Dusseldorf, you feel like being in Europe there. But here, Kensington, Toxteth, it’s the Third World” (Interviewee 14, Polish female, aged 27)

At the same time, linguistic capability was viewed as being a limiting factor on the ‘alternatives’ available to many CEE migrant workers. In essence, only Ireland was seen as a viable alternative for those who had no knowledge, understanding or expertise of other languages:

“It’s hardly relevant for me [moving to other EU countries] because I speak only English and no other language...you have to know at least the basics of the language of the country where you want to live. The UK is the only country available to me” (Interviewee 6, Polish female, aged 53)

4.4 Conclusions

All of those who were interviewed were asked to reflect on their responses and highlight the greatest influence on their motivation to either stay in Liverpool and/or the UK, to move to another EU country (or beyond), or to return home. The responses that were received generally paralleled those that they provided for coming to the UK in the first place, namely the availability of (stable) employment opportunities (in comparison to their home country). This was coupled with a good quality of life; proximity to family/friends; language and education development (especially for dependants); and a desire for a ‘new experience’ (for older and younger CEE migrants alike).

What the research shows, therefore, is that while the reasons for CEE migrants coming to the UK were (by and large) primarily economic, the relative importance of economic ‘pull’ factors – in the form of the availability of employment and a favourable exchange rate - may have lessened slightly in the current economic climate. This has clearly had some impact on overall numbers coming to the UK (and the case study area), which have slowed over the last twelve to eighteen months. However, the significance of ‘push’ factors in their home country (high rates of unemployment and a perceived lack of opportunities, along with continuing discrimination for Czech Roma individuals) has meant that those that have remained in employment in the UK appear more reluctant to return, with such factors reinforcing their original motivations to migrate (i.e. ‘work and pay = stay’).

Having arrived in Liverpool, the economic position of most of our respondents indicates an initial lack of ‘agency’ in terms of neighbourhood selection. Their spatial patterning correlates with long-established ‘chain migration’ trends, whereby people locate in traditional reception areas/established ‘contact zones’ (such as Kensington, Picton and Toxteth) due to the presence of family/friends and other CEE migrants that they can share property with (to reduce costs) but who also act as an initial information resource. In addition, the availability of cheaper housing/lower rents in such (deprived) areas has also been used by employers to initially accommodate CEE migrants (frequently within HMOs). Over time, it is apparent that significant relocation has taken place as they have searched for better and larger accommodation, but by and large economic constraints has meant that while they
may have moved property, they are less likely to have moved away from these types of neighbourhoods, unless they have had to migrate elsewhere for work.

Indeed, analysis of interview material clearly showed that participation in the labour market was again a key motivating factor to remain within Liverpool and/or the UK (and often despite skills/qualification mismatches), rather than moving elsewhere in the EU or going back home. Nevertheless, there were a number of more subtle influences at work which also need to be recognised, and which vary slightly depending upon individual ‘agency’ and preferences. These include the extent to which individuals were experiencing tension/discrimination by other migrants, as well as their command of English (and other) language(s), which impinged on their access to work and subsequent motivations for staying or moving on.

Moreover, in terms of relations between CEE migrants, the extent to which ‘bonding’ and social networks was important appeared to vary and certainly tensions were noted between individuals of different nationalities (for example, Polish and Czech), but it was also claimed that such tensions were sometimes apparent between those who were from the same country (this was especially noted by Polish respondents). Thus, whilst the presence of family/friends/other migrants may initially facilitate access to advice/support, over time many argued that they had become less dependent on such networks, and that they were actually ‘marginal’ in terms of improving their rights and responsibilities, beyond facilitating access to cheap accommodation (see Chapter 5 for further discussion of this issue).

Finally, it is possible to note that a perception of similar economic conditions elsewhere in the EU; linguistic capability in languages other than English (which is of relevance as labour market restrictions are relaxed beyond the UK); and the presence of dependants in school education, all appear to act as a restraint on migrants’ agency and their motivation/desire to leave the UK. Furthermore, there was evidence that older CEE migrants, who were likely to become eligible for a state pension in the UK within the next year or two, were also using such enhanced ‘rights’ as a basis for remaining in situ.
5. Migrant Contributions

The literature review (Chapter 2) has highlighted the contribution of migrant workers from the perspective of employers or in economic terms; for example, it has suggested that migrant workers bring a number of positive benefits for employers such as reliability, willingness to undertake tasks that perhaps the indigenous population would not carry out and high rates of productivity\(^\text{57}\). They have also helped to fill significant ‘skills’ and ‘people’ shortages across the UK\(^\text{58}\), as well as the suggestion that in the North West region alone each migrant worker accounts for more than £7,000 of tax revenue\(^\text{59}\).

Very little research, however, has focused on contributions from the perspective of CEE migrants themselves. The aim of this chapter is therefore to explore the views of migrants in relation to their financial contribution to the UK, their contribution to the needs of employers, as well as any wider contribution they are making to community life. Ultimately, this chapter provides in-depth insights into what migrant workers feel they bring to the UK.

5.1 Financial contribution

“Hmm, these contributions...I have been asking myself this question before. This society accepted me here, their social assistance supports me and my family to live here and what do I give back to this country? One thing is taxes of course. I work and pay all my taxes...” (Interviewee 12, Slovak male, aged 33)

How much money is spent and how much saved?

It was clear from the interviews that CEE migrants were spending the majority of their income in the UK. The percentage of wages that people currently spent ranged from all of their wages to 50% of their wages; however, very few people made reference to sending money back to their home country:

“The people who save their money are the ones who want to return back home. But we live like [we are] at home here” (Interviewee 12, Slovak male, aged 33)

A number of respondents did try to save some money; however, it was not always clear as to the purpose of this saving beyond simply wanting to have a ‘safety net’. As one respondent highlighted, people sometimes saved in case they were ever without paid employment:

“…I need to reserve money in case I lose my job as it happened to me in winter” (Interviewee 6, Polish female, aged 53)

Interestingly, some respondents made reference to having debts in the UK that they needed to pay off. One lady, for example, had spent money on clothes and furniture in the UK and she was now paying for that expenditure.

The length of time that people had been in the UK also appeared to influence levels of spending/saving, with the suggestion that new arrivals were more likely to save, but after living for some time in the UK people started to spend their savings. In some cases this was due to changing circumstances; for example, no longer living in shared accommodation. However, some respondents simply referred to wanting to buy additional things as time went on, making use of local shopping facilities.

Linking in with current spending/saving patterns, we wanted to explore any perceived changes to CEE migrants’ future saving/spending patterns. There was a perception from some people that they were likely to save less and spend more in the future. Generally, this was not due to any desire to spend more money on particular activities or items, but rather due to rising cost of living coupled with low wages:

“When I arrived in the UK, my first wage was £5.10 an hour. Now I get minimum wage again and it is £5.73. So the difference after four years of work is only 60p, so how many percent increase is that? And now compare the increase of prices, I think the prices went up almost 50% for example for food and local transport. So I rather expect shrinking savings” (Interviewee 6, Polish female, aged 53)

One or two respondents, however, did have aspirations to be able to spend more in the future on activities such as travel, particularly within the UK. As one person suggested:

“…I would spend more on travelling, I like to travel. I would buy a car for sure, so then I would have to pay for everything which is included in that, like petrol, insurance, maintenance” (Interviewee 5, Polish male, aged 25)

What do people spend their wages on?

Previous research has highlighted that the extra demand for consumer goods and services brought about by a larger working population has been beneficial to the economy in the UK. The respondents interviewed in Liverpool suggested that they were making financial contributions at a national and local level. People listed their main expenditures in the following order: rent, utilities, food. Indeed, from this list, rent was by far the biggest expense for nearly all respondents.

Food was also a key expense; however, it was an expenditure that people were often passionate about, with some respondents suggested that they did not like to compromise on a healthy diet or what they regarded as ‘good’ food, regardless of their income:
“...I believe that there are some kinds of food which you can’t replace by anything cheaper. For example, I spend quite a lot on good meat...My treat is Nutella and I will never replace it with anything cheaper” (Interviewee 5, Polish male, aged 25)

With regards to where people spent their money on food, what was interesting was that people either shopped in the large supermarkets (Tesco, ASDA, Lidl, Iceland) or picked up items from smaller specialist shops (for example, Polish deli, Asian shops, etc.).

Following the three key expenses (rent, food and utilities) individuals made reference to spending their income on transport/travel (this included to and from work, as well as for leisure purposes); clothes; mobiles phones; internet; as well as leisure activities such as museums, cinemas and theatres.

A number of respondents also made reference to membership at local gyms or sports centres. For one respondent, this type of activity acted as a method of engaging with local people:

“My gym matters a lot for me. I do body building. I feel that this is a kind of culture, community. We are a very diverse group of people; doctors, posh people, ‘scallies’, teenagers...But when we are inside, you don’t see any differences, doesn’t matter whether you are black or white. No prejudice. A kilogram is the same for each. I get to know people from another point of view” (Interviewee 15, Czech male, aged 33)

Furthermore, some respondents had spent money on particular items in the UK (for example, lawn mower, sowing machine, computer) as these were more expensive in their home country.

5.2 Contribution to the labour market

Perceived contribution to meeting the needs of employers

The accounts of the CEE migrants confirmed previous research which has highlighted perceptions of migrants’ reliability, hard work, etc\(^{60}\). Indeed, all the respondents felt that CEE migrants in general contributed to the labour market, with individuals clearly demonstrating the willingness of migrants to work harder. There was also a very clear comparison from some respondents with regards to their own attitudes to work and that of some of their English counterparts:

“...we Poles are used to working hard. In Poland we are used to caring about our jobs, to value the job because there was a lack of them. So if you had a job, you got hold of it. Then we came here and we worked hard and fast for the employers...The English workers, most of them, don’t care about their work...When we take a break, we take ten minutes and then hurry back to the line. They take twenty minutes and aren’t bothered that someone must do the work instead of them” (Interviewee 14, Polish female, aged 27)

“In our factory we all had to work so hard, in this cold. An English person would not be able to bear this. Once, an English worker came to our shift, but he disappeared after a week…” (Interviewee 10, Czech female, aged 45)

“The employers get profits from people like me…migrants like me take even jobs which English people would never take because they are badly paid. I don’t think this is changing and it will never change. These jobs must be done by some people, cleaning streets or toilets” (Interviewee 1, Czech male, aged 38)

In addition to the contribution people who were currently working felt that they made, some respondents also made reference to the contribution that their children would make to the UK in the future. This related not just to their contribution as ‘workers’, but also at a wider level:

“I think my contribution is my seven children…seven future citizens and workers to this state. Children try to integrate in society, they participate in many activities…one of my daughters, who is at college now will start youth work course in a few weeks, as a volunteer. She will take the small kids on holidays. She would like to become a social worker in future” (Interviewee 8, Czech female, aged 39)

“…my contribution is my five children who will work and live in this country in [the] future” (Interviewee 12, Slovak male, aged 33)

Changes in work ‘behaviour’ over time

What is sometimes missing from research with migrant workers is a focus on whether or not people’s attitudes towards work, and consequently their work behaviour, changes during their time in the UK. The interviews elicited a number of interesting issues in relation to work ‘behaviour’ and how this changed, if at all, over time. One respondent made reference to a general pressure of having to work harder, whilst still receiving the same salary:

“There is mounting pressure to work more and more, to be more productive but for the same money…in the beginning only three years ago the norm was 140 picks an hour…Now the norm is 170 picks” (Interviewee 15, Czech male, aged 33)

What was interesting about this person’s account, however, was that they perceived migrant workers, in one sense, culpable for this increasing pressure:

“I think it’s us, the foreigners, to blame for the increased norms. [We] broke the norms because you are afraid of losing your job and this fear was misused by managers…Because there [are] a lot of foreigners here. So if you don’t work like crazy, you lose your job and someone else will replace you and WILL work like crazy” (Interviewee 15, Czech male, aged 33)

This person had worked at the same factory for three and a half years and indicated that over time they had adjusted to the working patterns of co-workers, learning what they deemed as ‘appropriate’ behaviour. They felt that the high turnover of new
workers often made it difficult for workers who had been there for longer periods of time:

“...as the Czech saying goes ‘new brooms sweep well’. So the norms rise because the new people work too hard during the first months at work” (Interviewee 15, Czech male, aged 33)

Given the length of time that this respondent had worked at the factory, however, he now felt confident enough in his position at work that he would follow the norms of the English workers and felt that, to a certain extent, the English workers respected him more for that.

Another respondent also highlighted the difference in work patterns between newer arrivals and those who had been in the UK longer. Like the respondents above, this related to the ‘work ethic’ or culture of the home country and how this can change to fit into the norms of the host country over time:

“Those who are in the UK longer, say three years, they see and they learn from the English and begin to work like them. But the ones who are here just a short time, they have this old system encoded in them, to be a 100% good model worker” (Interviewee 14, Polish female, aged 27)

Naturally, the interviews revealed both good and bad experiences of working in the UK, with the suggestion that it depended very much on the employer/supervisor and their individual approach and attitude towards migrant workers:

“In the work I do now, we are not pushed to work harder than local workers. In the previous work...the English didn't have to and we had to. We were treated worse, we were exploited. In the present work it’s different because it’s a big company...In the previous work...we were given the fastest lines, the worst work...Our supervisor disliked Polish people...The line for English workers was speed three and ours was speed six” (Interviewee 14, Polish female, aged 27)

Interestingly, linking in with the issue of intra-migrant tensions as highlighted in Chapter 4, some respondents talked about their negative experiences of working with other migrants who held managerial or supervisory positions. One person, for example, had worked with a Polish supervisor:

“If we are done with a load and the line is stopped and the Polish manager passes by, he takes on me every time and gives me additional work, never to the English colleague, it's me every time...he used to divide the workplace in a way that the agency workers, mostly not English, got the worst jobs to do. Now, since the manager is English, he divides the work fairly” (Interviewee 12, Slovak male, aged 33)

While another person had previously worked in an Indian restaurant:

“...I did two jobs, runner and bartender at the same time and all for the minimum wage! I felt that was unjust, but a funny situation isn’t it? They were migrant workers too as me, but I was a minority inside another minority!” (Interviewee 5, Polish male, aged 25)
Although these were both very different experiences, they demonstrated a sense of ‘hierarchy’ amongst migrant workers.

Once again, the current economic climate also featured in people’s responses in relation to work behaviour. One person suggested, for example, that the recession was changing the attitude and work behaviour of some British workers:

“…young English workers who came to work right from their schools and didn’t bother at all about [the] quality of their work…now with the crisis…the same young people are afraid of losing their jobs and now they care about how they work and work harder” (Interviewee 6, Polish female, aged 53)

5.3 Contribution to community life

The sections above have focused on contributions from an economic perspective. What we will explore in this final section is the often under-researched, but also potentially undervalued contribution that CEE migrants make to community life in their local area. This includes looking at any activities they were involved in, as well as more general issues around engaging with local people.

What activities are migrants involved in?

The respondents made reference to a range of activities that they were currently taking part in; for example, church related events featured for some, while others made reference to attending area specific social events:

“I went with my wife and my neighbours to the Food Festival in Kensington…people from different countries brought their national meals to the venue and we were free to taste everything…I baked and brought some poppy seed rolls and the people liked it a lot” (Interviewee 11, Slovak male, aged 21)

Some respondents attended events organised by Merseyside Polonia, including Polish parties61.

One respondent listed a number of different activities that they were currently involved in:

“I have been on two [table] football tournaments in the city…I am active in Liverpool social centre, which is an alternative social club in the city centre…I went to vote in the recent local elections because I was concerned about the rise of the BNP. In the end my vote did not help much, but my conscience is clear at least…I am a member of the University student guild…” (Interviewee 5, Polish male, aged 25)

For some respondents, however, community engagement centred around involvement in the setting up of new community groups to help migrant communities. Two respondents made particular references to this type of activity, both of whom had previous experience of charity work in their home country. One was trying to

---

establish a Roma community group. The other respondent had been invited to attend a community event in Kensington for Czech and Slovak communities and had decided that they would like an active role in this work. As a result, they were working with children to establish a dance group and were currently looking for a suitable venue for rehearsing.

Two other respondents also talked about how they had been involved in helping other migrants. One on a very informal level:

“...I met some people through my landlord. He rents his flats out to Poles or Czechs and sometimes asks me to help him interpreting for them” (Interviewee 14, Polish female, aged 27)

While another helped migrant communities through their work at a local college:

“My most frequent contact point is the school where I talk to the parents of Czech, Slovak and Polish kids. It includes things such as filling in various benefit claim forms, translating official letters...A couple of times I took the kids and their parents to youth clubs and helped them get to know these places” (Interviewee 3, Polish female, aged 47)

This individual had been on a Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) training course and although they currently did not have time to undertake voluntary work, given their full time job, they did use this specialist knowledge to advise migrant communities when necessary: “my contribution has been much more effective on the individual level”.

Who were they mixing with?

Previous research has indicated varying levels of contact between migrant workers and the indigenous population, but also between migrant workers and other migrants. The people interviewed in Liverpool showed a similar pattern to previous research. In relation to British people, contact was primarily through work, although friendships did develop that extended beyond the workplace:

“...on Mondays when we don’t work we go out to a pub with people form work, some English people come too. I mix with them normally” (Interviewee 14, Polish female, aged 27)

With regards to socialising with other CEE migrants, again, people often had a lot of contact at work; however, they also appeared to have specific friendship groups who would meet at people’s homes. Interestingly, local supermarkets (such as a nearby ASDA) were also places where people would often see each other.

Although previous research has shown the importance of social networks in decisions to move to UK or to particular areas/neighbourhoods, these interviews have demonstrated that these networks can be relatively superficial, perhaps serving a particular purpose (for example, providing initial information about accommodation/employment/services), but not necessarily demonstrating a strong bond between people. As highlighted in Chapter 4, a number of accounts suggested feelings of ‘competition’ between CEE migrants and consequent reluctance to share information or provide assistance:
“Some migrants are very selfish...When I came to the UK, a Czech housemate who had been living here for two years didn’t want to help...it’s sad that people from the same country don’t cooperate more, especially those who already settled down in the UK. When I learned how to do it, I was different, I tried to help others...In terms of migrants, it’s more complicated with them. It depends on [the] individual, but I learned not to expect anything from them” (Interviewee 13, Slovak male, aged 52)

“...a Czech friend helped us to get the Working Tax Credits. But some Czechs don’t want to share this information, I don’t know why. Maybe they see the others as competition” (Interviewee 10, Czech female, aged 45)

“They don’t stick together. I don’t know why, maybe the [economic] crisis leads to this behaviour, so that they compete more...Sometimes it even seems to me that they are happy when you get into trouble” (Interviewee 8, Czech female, aged 39)

Interestingly, one respondent felt that in the UK, migrants were often ‘forced’ to be friends with people that they would not necessarily choose to be friends with; their confinement to a particular accommodation type in some respects was seen as reinforcing this situation:

“...in my flat for example, I got this feeling that people there are, how to say it, like forced to be with each other...they believe that they can’t go and mix with British people and make friends with them, so they are forced to make friends between each other, [when] they would otherwise not be friends in Poland...They are forced to these friendships which are not real friendships if you know what I mean” (Interviewee 5, Polish male, aged 25)

Consequently, there was a real desire amongst respondents to mix with a range of people:

“I find these communities based on race or origin not interesting. I prefer a mixed community where you can meet different people and local people too. You can integrate easier than if you only hang around with Poles or Slovaks or other foreigners” (Interviewee 19, Polish female, aged 28)

Indeed, having British friends in particular was perceived to have a number of benefits; for example, British people were seen as more helpful in terms of providing information, but also with regards to the opportunity to learn English:

“...it’s much better to have an English friend than a Slovak because he will give you advice. But the Slovaks will let you down or ignore you... Here everybody competes for work, nobody wants to lose his job. People will not tell you that there is work in their company” (Interviewee 11, Slovak male, aged 21)

“You learn new things, for example, how the law works here, language, you learn it, sometimes you learn ‘scouse’ words. And it’s good fun with the English, they know how to make fun in their life” (Interviewee 14, Polish female, aged 27)
“At the moment I work at a place with many English people and I learn a lot from them. I learn the language and their way of life. It’s just now that I am getting to know their mentality, their way of humour… I like the way they behave here” (Interviewee 12, Slovak male, aged 33)

Two respondents also felt that British people were more welcoming:

“It seems to me that English people are more open than Poles. I can’t imagine Poles would accept so many from other countries…It’s very easy to get used to life here because I don’t feel unwelcome here” (Interviewee 6, Polish female, aged 53)

“I prefer English people around. My experience with migrants at work is mixed. I have got bad experience with Polish people. They formed something like a closed group… Inside a small team they even made their own team” (Interviewee 20, Lithuanian male, aged 24)

Perhaps unsurprisingly, language was the main barrier to not being able to mix with British people; however, there was a sense that migrants needed to make an effort to speak to British people regardless of their language skills:

“There is a lot of Poles who don’t want to mix. There is a lot of Poles who say that English are bad and so and so and they are scared of them and stay closed in their house…I think it’s all down to language. The Poles are shy to speak English. I think you have to try, even if your English is bad” (Interviewee 14, Polish female, aged 27)

Some respondents talked about a sense of ‘neighbourliness’ that they had established in their local area over time:

“The more we talk to each other, the stronger relationship we build. In the beginning there was a kind of tension between us…Step by step we built a kind of tolerant relationship, we spoke with them, introduced ourselves, we told them why we were here…” (Interviewee 7, Slovak male, aged 49)

“I have a good relationship with my English neighbours. Sometimes at night they knock on our window and say ‘good night, you forgot to close your window’” (Interviewee 9, Czech male, aged 30)

These types of relationships had not developed overnight, but rather had required effort on both sides to make contact. These individuals felt that it was important to make an effort to establish these relationships, with one respondent even going as far as to say that migrants needed to make a ‘good impression’:

“I want that everybody will know about us here, so that we will not hide here anymore. I want to show the people what our people achieved, what they are able to do. So that they can say ‘ah look at them, they seem alright, lets go to that gig’. I very much want to change how English people think about us” (Interviewee 4, Czech female, aged 33)
Barriers to community involvement

As highlighted above, length of time was sometimes a factor to community engagement and involvement, with those who had been here for only a short time being less likely to be involved in community activities; however, it was also dependant on individuals and their skills and motivations. In common with previous studies\(^{62}\), having time to get involved in activities and socialise sometimes acted as a barrier. This primarily related to people’s working patterns:

“My work patterns are changing. I work weekends twice a month too. It’s hard to plan anything when you work for an agency” (Interviewee 12, Slovak male, aged 33)

“I played football with some Slovaks recently and we really enjoyed it. But when I suggested to meet again and start playing regularly, they just went ‘oh no, impossible, I am busy, I work these days in a week and he works different days...’” (Interviewee 9, Czech male, aged 30)

Some respondents also felt that more needed to be done in terms of organising regular community events in their local area:

“There is nothing here for local community. They have no community venues here but the library…I have never come across a festival or party in this area” (Interviewee 6, Polish female, aged 53)

“If someone would organise regular events…I noticed that a group of people play football every Sunday in the Botanic Park. It’s packed there, every Sunday, and everybody has great fun there…I don’t know where they are from but they are not English. I really envy them” (Interviewee 9, Czech male, aged 30)

5.4 Conclusions

This chapter has highlighted a range of ways that the CEE migrants were contributing in the UK. From a financial perspective, analysis of the interviews revealed that respondents were mostly spending their income in the UK, with only a small number indicating that they were currently saving (although this was not necessarily to send money but rather to provide a ‘safety net’). The rising cost of living coupled with low wages was one reason that was cited for not saving money. Perhaps unsurprisingly, however, it appeared that length of time in the UK led to increasing spending to some extent, with people opting to buy more consumer goods. With stability in employment/accommodation there were aspirations to be able to save more, but at the same time spend on activities such as travel. Furthermore, some respondents had also accrued debts in the UK, which they were currently paying off.

\(^{62}\) See, for example, Scullion, L., Morris, G. and Steele, A. (2009) A study of A8 and A2 migrants in Nottingham, Salford: The University of Salford.
Food was also key expense, with people favouring large supermarkets, but supplementing this with smaller specialist shops (often migrant owned). It was also clear from the interviews that respondents were making financial contributions to the local economy through expenditure on sports and leisure activities and in local businesses.

Overall, however, rent was by far the biggest expenditure. Previous research has highlighted that migrant communities are primarily concentrated in the private rented sector, while Chapter 4 has also focused on concentration of respondents in particular areas of the city (‘contact zones’). This suggests that the private rented sector (and individual landlords) in particular areas have benefited significantly from the arrival of CEE migrant workers. The extent to which this benefits the local or wider economy, however, remains unknown.

In terms of contributions to the labour market, there were a number of interesting issues raised. Respondents’ views very much aligned with the perception of migrants as ‘hard working’, ‘reliable’ and ‘willing to do jobs that the indigenous population did not want to do’, with comparisons being made between their conduct at work and that of British workers. However, once again, length of time in the UK was a key factor, with work behaviour appearing to alter over time as migrant workers ‘settled in’ to the work patterns of their colleagues. Interestingly, it was felt that new arrivals made it more difficult for workers who had been in the UK for longer because of the practice of new arrivals to work very hard. This suggests that there were divisions in the workforce, not just between indigenous workers and migrant workers, but also perhaps between new arrivals and migrants who had worked there for longer.

Finally, it was clear that beyond financial and employment contributions, a number of people were also active in their local communities. This ranged from very simple everyday interaction with different people and the establishing of friendship networks, to more involved activities such as setting up community groups. What was evident, however, was that community involvement often revolved around activities that were aimed at migrant communities and did not necessarily include the wider community.

Although CEE migrants were clearly mixing with a range of different communities, as highlighted in Chapter 4, there were tensions between migrants, which were seen to have worsened as a result of the economic downturn. Previous research has explored how social networks are important in decisions to move to an area, but also in terms of finding employment, accommodation, etc. Analysis of the interviews suggested that such networks can be very superficial, with networks developing, in some cases, primarily as a result of living in particular types of accommodation (i.e. HMOs), rather than from a desire to mix with certain individuals. In many respects, having British friends was perceived as more beneficial, providing opportunities to learn about the local culture, as well as helping with English language skills.
6. Overall Recommendations

This final chapter provides some overall recommendations based on the findings of the research. Indeed, with regards to both the motivations and contributions of CEE migrant workers moving to and from the UK, a number of implications arise for policy makers – especially those working either within Liverpool or the North West of England.

6.1 Improving economic intelligence and data capture

It is apparent from the research that in order to provide a more accurate understanding of the individual motivations and individual/collective contributions of CEE migrant workers, a more detailed analysis – including the use of economic forecasting – is required of labour market conditions in migrants’ countries of origin, including both the quantity and quality of employment available and wage levels relative to costs of living. In so doing, it will then become easier for organisations such as the North West Regional Development Agency (NWDA) and Migrant Workers North West (MWNW) to predict the likely flows of migrants into and out of areas such as the North West, although we have also shown that individual ‘agency’ may affect the decisions that migrants make in a number of ways (see below). Equally, more research on how, where and when CEE migrants spend their income – as well as the effects of the recent economic downturn in the UK on their expenditure/savings ratio will also be useful in calculating local multipliers and their benefit to local economies. Indeed, the fact that most CEE migrants indicated that the rental costs of accommodation was their biggest outlay needs to be considered in terms of the benefits accruing to private landlords and how this contribution can be capitalised upon in order to improve the quality of housing conditions in this sector of the housing market, particularly houses of multiple occupation (HMOs) within disadvantaged neighbourhoods.

6.2 Ensuring the availability of a suitable pool of productive labour for local and regional employers

Those interviewed were clearly contributing to the local labour market by filling (‘hard to fill’) job vacancies (especially in more manual occupations) and were generally uncomplaining of their existing working conditions. Some individuals, however, insinuated that this ambivalence was a consequence of a) a current shortage of jobs and suitable employment alternatives (either in Liverpool, elsewhere in the UK or EU or back home); and b) their lack of English language skills. Thus, as conditions improve in the UK or elsewhere and/or CEE migrants become more proficient in their command of the English language, their propensity to search for alternative work with better conditions or work that is more relevant to their existing skills/qualifications may increase. Consideration needs to be given to any effects this may have in terms of the recruitment of labour to work in lower skilled occupational sectors and the competitiveness and viability of local/regional employers currently dependant on CEE migrants.
Furthermore, the research highlighted how CEE migrants who had remained in the UK over a longer period of time had begun to reduce their ‘intensity’ of working (in the form of hours worked and relative speed of activity) as their rights and responsibilities (migrant ‘agency’) had increased. Thus whilst the current economic downturn may be resulting in employers demanding that CEE migrants (as well as the indigenous workforce) ‘work harder’ to retain their employment and to maximize their capacity (and productivity), this cannot be guaranteed to continue as and when conditions improve (and in any event may be unethical). Having said this, there is the potential for productivity to be maintained in the short to medium term through the arrival of new cohorts of CEE migrants.

Consequently, organisations such as Migrant Workers North West (MWNW) must continue to promote the active take up of its Employment Charter (for migrant workers) and lobby other agencies (such as the NWDA) and the Gangmaster’s Licensing Authority (GLA) to ensure that both existing and any new CEE migrants are not exploited (regardless of sector).

For more highly skilled CEE migrants, the nature of working conditions and opportunities for career enhancement in the UK relative to their home country was viewed as a key factor impacting upon their decision to stay or leave, rather than wage/income levels. Sector-specific strategies could therefore be developed which seek to accommodate the aspirations/priorities of CEE migrants alongside the local workforce in order to capitalise upon/retain such labour.

Given that some mature CEE migrants indicated a desire to remain in the UK and in employment (for at least five years) so that they could access a state pension, local and regional employers could be further encouraged to recruit and retain such individuals as a reliable (and stable) source of labour. Furthermore, they offer the opportunity to highlight the different ways in which members of the older indigenous population can contribute to the labour market.

6.3 More effective targeting of CEE migrants and housing/community cohesion implications

The research has identified in a reasonable level of detail with regards to the specific neighbourhoods that CEE migrants initially move to in Liverpool, with concentrations of particular communities (i.e. Czech and Slovak) in specific areas. This also reiterates recent research which identified a move by migrant communities to certain areas of the city. Hence there is the opportunity for those attempting to engage with migrant communities to target a range of neighbourhoods through a variety of techniques – both area based and perhaps more thematically (for example, housing). Consideration is required, however, with regards to the effect of such targeting on issues of community cohesion (i.e. perception by indigenous population of resources going to migrants). In order to ensure the delivery of services (such as education, health care, etc) can be planned and resourced appropriately there is a need to improve the evidence base, with regular monitoring of the local population.

---

Equally, given the apparent initial primacy of ‘suitable’ accommodation (in terms of cost, size and quality) over and above neighbourhood preferences, local authorities, RSLs and indeed the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) need to try and ensure a range of tenure opportunities (owner-occupation; private rented; social rented) are available to CEE migrants who wish to remain in Liverpool and who can make a substantial contribution to the local/regional economy, as well as different sectors of the housing market.

### 6.4 Improving the quality of the built environment

Although economic imperatives and the availability of employment (relative to elsewhere in the UK/the EU/their home country) are influential in terms of migrant motivations, it was noted that the quality of the built environment was also important. Consequently, there needs to be consideration of how regeneration, neighbourhood and housing renewal programmes can help to improve local conditions, and in turn facilitate a) positive perceptions of a more safe/quality local environment in which to live; and b) provide suitable accommodation (size, cost and quality) in both the public and private sector that is conducive to the needs of all CEE migrants (skilled and unskilled), as well as the local population.

### 6.5 Addressing intra-migrant tensions

From an employment perspective, there was some evidence that certain CEE migrants were (in the current economic climate) finding it more difficult to access work due to discriminatory or financial barriers being applied by other CEE nationals and/or CEE-run support agencies. It was suggested that this was leading some migrants to reconsider their options, potentially moving away from Liverpool in their search for work. Such issues require monitoring – and regulating - where appropriate. The provision of further information and/or advice (through a variety of mechanisms and in a number of places) is also advocated.

From a housing perspective, there is also evidence of tensions emerging between migrants. Local authorities and Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) therefore need to be aware of a potential increase in demand for (larger and relatively inexpensive) rental properties as CEE migrants a) become eligible for such properties once they have been in continuous employment for over 12 months; and b) as a consequence of being discriminated against by other CEE migrants/migrant landlords. This issue may well have implications for the number of migrants sleeping rough or the demand for sheltered accommodation, in line with previous studies undertaken in North West England and the East of England.

---

6.6 Recognising and responding to pressures on public services

Interestingly, more mature CEE migrants looking to claim a state pension in due course (and to a lesser extent those with dependants, those less proficient in languages other than English and those likely to experience discrimination if they moved back home) expressed a wish to remain in Liverpool/the UK as long as they were in work or had sufficient support for their dependants to continue in education. In turn – and reiterating previous research by the authors\(^\text{66}\) - the demand on education, health and welfare services by these individuals in the medium-term needs to be recognised by local Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) and Local Education Authorities (LEAs) and resources for language support/translation (a key issue noted with regards to access to health facilities by CEE migrants\(^\text{67}\)) and broader education/health service provision allocated accordingly. This is also something that the Migration Impacts Fund (MIF) could be focused towards.

6.7 Enhancing economic and community contributions

Finally, the research indicated a number of different ways in which CEE migrants contribute to the local economy and to community life - both individually and collectively - such as support to church-based activities and through establishing or becoming involved in community support groups. What emerged, nevertheless, was the opportunity to develop a wider range of activities – many of which could actively be promoted in workplace settings – to bring different groups together in order to reduce intra-migrant and intra-community tensions, as well as utilising the knowledge of migrants to support the wider community (e.g. CAB-type work). In addition, a concerted effort could be made through local Neighbourhood Agreements (NAs) to promote participation by CEE migrants in more formalised (democratic) decision-making processes.

With reference to local economic contributions, it is suggested that the New Economics Foundation’s Local Multiplier 3 (LM3) approach\(^\text{68}\) (or a suitable equivalent) is used to assess the local multiplier that emerges from a) public sector support to CEE migrants; and b) CEE migrants’ disposable income spent within the neighbourhood. Consideration also needs to be given to what may help increase local multiplier effects (such as procurement and commissioning activities by the public sector and the encouragement of short-term CEE migrants to spend more of their disposable income).

---


\(^{68}\) See http://www.lm3online.org/ for further details.
## Appendix 1: Characteristics of CEE Migrant Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>How long in UK?</th>
<th>Current employment UK</th>
<th>Previous employment UK</th>
<th>Most recent employment home country</th>
<th>Highest qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Single (with friends)</td>
<td>7 months</td>
<td>Chicken meat packer</td>
<td>Building worker</td>
<td>Production line worker</td>
<td>Qualified Butcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1 year 5 months</td>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>Warehouse packer</td>
<td>Construction – self employed</td>
<td>Construction qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Family (husband and non-dependant son)</td>
<td>1 year 10 months</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teaching assistant</td>
<td>Primary school teacher</td>
<td>Degree in Theology and Religious Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Family (husband and dependant daughter)</td>
<td>3 years 9 months</td>
<td>Unemployed (carer for dependant)</td>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>Youth worker /unemployed</td>
<td>No formal qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Single (no friends)</td>
<td>1 year 9 months (+12 months 2005)</td>
<td>Cleaner</td>
<td>Bartender</td>
<td>Bartender</td>
<td>Diploma in Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Single (with friends)</td>
<td>4 years 6 months</td>
<td>Packer – medical equipment</td>
<td>Production line operator; Carer</td>
<td>Warehouse packer/ unemployed</td>
<td>GCSE equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Family (husband and dependants and non-dependants)</td>
<td>4 years 2 months</td>
<td>Packer - clothes</td>
<td>Packer – food and drinks</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>Degree in Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Family (dependants)</td>
<td>1 year 7 months (plus 12 months 2002 asylum seekers)</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>No formal qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Employment History</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Additional Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Family (dependants)</td>
<td>5 years 2 months</td>
<td>Unemployed Production line operator - food</td>
<td>No formal qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Partner (no dependants)</td>
<td>2 years 7 months</td>
<td>Unemployed Production line operator - food</td>
<td>Sales manager Diplomas in accountancy, economics and marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Family (dependant)</td>
<td>2 years 4 months</td>
<td>Caretaker Cleaner, Food picker; Warehouse packer / operative</td>
<td>Caretaker GCSE equivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Family (dependants)</td>
<td>5 years 2 months</td>
<td>Warehouse packer Warehouse packer / operative</td>
<td>Construction worker Diploma / Certificate in engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Single (no friends)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Unemployed but working informally in hotel and catering</td>
<td>Builder Self-employed – waste management Diploma in technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Single (no friends; initially with partner)</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Production line operator Packer; Team leader in factory</td>
<td>Waitress GCSE equivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Single (friends initially; now no friends)</td>
<td>3 years 3 months</td>
<td>Warehouse operative Delivery driver; Warehouse operative Security driver; Chainsaw worker Diploma / Certificate in Electrical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Family (dependants); initially on own</td>
<td>2 years 4 months</td>
<td>Builder Building repair work Building Supervisor Diploma – supervisor / welding certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Single (with friends)</td>
<td>3 years 6 months</td>
<td>Cleaner Cleaner; Care Assistant Teacher Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>Previous Positions</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Single (with friends); originally with family</td>
<td>1 year 3 months</td>
<td>Night watchman on construction site</td>
<td>Building and refurbishment work</td>
<td>Swimming instructor</td>
<td>Certificate in Basic Electricity Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Single (originally with boyfriend)</td>
<td>4 years 6 months</td>
<td>Management Accountant Assistant</td>
<td>Machine operator; Accounts Clerk</td>
<td>Full time student</td>
<td>Masters degree in Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Single (originally with Lithuanian friends)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Warehouse worker</td>
<td>Warehouse work (various)</td>
<td>IT specialist</td>
<td>Degree in IT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: CEE Migrant Motivations – Interviewee Breakdown

### Why come?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>How long</th>
<th>Influences on coming</th>
<th>Any influences changed and why</th>
<th>Influences this area</th>
<th>Why move from another area of Liverpool?</th>
<th>Influences on choice of accommodation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 months</td>
<td>Lack of jobs at home and for experience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Picton -6 months- Friends</td>
<td>Toxteth – 1 month – lack of social capital</td>
<td>Social Capital/Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>To start a new life</td>
<td>Yes – considering moving back in future; more open to Czech lifestyle now</td>
<td>Sefton Park – 17 months - Ex-girlfriend</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>To improve English; to be nearer family (son)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>West Derby – 22 months - Friend</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Better life; to avoid discrimination; for a job</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Picton -3 years - Partners’ family; other migrants</td>
<td>Poor accom; accom too small; poor relations</td>
<td>Quality, size; good neighbours; near school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>For a job – high unemployment at home; to complete education; for family</td>
<td>Yes – money / job even more important now; now settled</td>
<td>11 months – Speke – Environment / Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Wirral (1 month); City centre (8 months) Too busy and too much pollution</td>
<td>Size of accommodation (6 friends)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Lack of job at home; to improve education</td>
<td>No – work still motivation to stay; easier for older people in UK</td>
<td>4 years 6 months – Bromborough - Tied to initial job</td>
<td>Bromborough – size of accommodation</td>
<td>Size; cost (share with friends); proximity to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>For a new life’ to avoid discrimination; financial; to be near daughter</td>
<td>No – experience reinforced reasons for coming; the ‘quiet life’ the key to remaining</td>
<td>3 years 6 months – Kensington -- Family – daughter and other migrants</td>
<td>Kensington – 8 months – lack of housing availability</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Reason for Coming</td>
<td>Reason for Staying</td>
<td>Place of Stay</td>
<td>Additional Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 year 7 months (plus 12 months 2002 asylum seekers)</td>
<td>For a job; to avoid racism</td>
<td>Racism worse at home – reinforce reasons for coming</td>
<td>6 months – Picton - Other migrants</td>
<td>Toxteth; Kensington; Poor landlord</td>
<td>Cost; good landlord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 years 2 months</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Yes – job has increased motivation to stay</td>
<td>4 years – Picton - Wife’s parents; other migrants (Czechs especially)</td>
<td>Kensington – 8 months - Poor relations with other young people – personal safety</td>
<td>Quality; proximity to other migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 years 7 months</td>
<td>Education – language; for experience</td>
<td>No – language still key reason</td>
<td>2 years 7 months - Tuebrook; Tied to agency work</td>
<td>Tuebrook – House too small; poor quality</td>
<td>To have independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 years 4 months</td>
<td>Job; level of wages; to find a new life</td>
<td>Yes – lost job and was to return but now secured another job and family also here</td>
<td>2 weeks - Everton - friend</td>
<td>Kensington (and Bristol) – poor landlord</td>
<td>No choice – only one available – cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5 years 2 months</td>
<td>Job; for a new life; family and relatives</td>
<td>No – situation at home reinforces desire to remain</td>
<td>4 years – Wavertree – cheap housing (rent)</td>
<td>Picton – 1 year – brother-in-law - had to move out – too crowded</td>
<td>Cost - also earmarked for demolition so perceived would facilitate access to larger council house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>To earn more money; currency rate favourable; Blair said jobs in UK</td>
<td>No – to earn money is still key – stay for at least another 2 ½ years</td>
<td>4 months – Sefton Park – friend / tied to employment</td>
<td>Kensington and City Centre – tied to agency work; new work = new accommodation provided</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Tolerance of UK; to avoid racism; for a job</td>
<td>Split with partner but no desire to return – settled.</td>
<td>2 years – Kensington – cheap housing (rent)</td>
<td>Anfield (2 years) and City Centre – brother moved away – needed to look for somewhere else</td>
<td>Friend; cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3 years 3 months</td>
<td>For the experience; language; no real economic reasons</td>
<td>No – still staying for experience even if economic situation deteriorated</td>
<td>3 years – Kensington – tied to employment</td>
<td>Kensington – unstable ownership of property residing within</td>
<td>Cost, space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 years 4 months</td>
<td>Daughter in Liverpool; Financial – no stable jobs in Poland and for children’s Education</td>
<td>No – settled now</td>
<td>8 months - Toxteth – Liverpool 8 – quality of house and area</td>
<td>Anfield – rent cheaper in Toxteth</td>
<td>Central heating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3 years 6 months</td>
<td>No jobs in Poland; to meet family; to improve English’ to test abilities and independence</td>
<td>No – but less emphasis on paid work and more on voluntary work</td>
<td>10 months – Wavertree – nice area and near town centre and work</td>
<td>Croxteth – not safe and too far from city centre; also too expensive</td>
<td>House is much better quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1 year 3 months</td>
<td>No jobs for someone their age; family advice of better prospects in UK</td>
<td>No – but had difficulty securing employment sometimes</td>
<td>1 year 3 months – Liverpool 8 – niece living in that area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Friend; cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4 years 6 months</td>
<td>To join partner after graduation</td>
<td>Yes – relationship ended, but had secured job and settled into life in UK</td>
<td>2 years – Aigburth L17 – nice and close to work</td>
<td>Toxteth; Tuebrook; Kensington – lived there because of partner/relatives - wasn’t safe, also relationship breakdown</td>
<td>Recommended by ex-neighbour; quite street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Came to UK for holiday; visited other parts of the UK but did not like them; English friends invited them to Liverpool</td>
<td>Yes – stayed because it is a better life in UK, more employment, less poverty</td>
<td>2 years 5 months – Toxteth – friend knew the landlord</td>
<td>Kensington – no longer room in shared accommodation</td>
<td>Needing to move from previous home; friend knowing landlord of new property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why stay/go? (1) – Original and future intentions and neighbourhood and accommodation preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>How long initially plan to stay</th>
<th>How long now stay</th>
<th>Why change?</th>
<th>Plan to move to different area?</th>
<th>Plan to move to different accommodation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>For good</td>
<td>Positive experience</td>
<td>Depends on whether get a better job</td>
<td>Depends on job – would like to become Owner Occupier and then let rooms out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Not sure; may return within 6 months</td>
<td>Want a new experience either somewhere else in UK or back home</td>
<td>Yes – tensions with other migrants</td>
<td>Yes – tensions with other migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>12 months at least</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No – but if lose job may go to Bath</td>
<td>No – stay with a friend and no rent to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>For good</td>
<td>For good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No – friends in close proximity</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-3 years to complete education</td>
<td>A further 2-3 years to complete education</td>
<td>Failed studies</td>
<td>Yes – another city possibly or Ireland as they speak English</td>
<td>Depends on cost of accommodation and ability to share costs with flatmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2-3 years to get money</td>
<td>At least 6 months</td>
<td>If stay longer in UK can get a state pension; need to work 5 years to get this – if lose job go back to Poland</td>
<td>No – friends and work in close proximity</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>Until lose health / job / too old to work</td>
<td>Knows how system works – work with it</td>
<td>No – cheap accommodation in area and city as a whole</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>For good</td>
<td>For good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Depends on job availability; not at present</td>
<td>Looking for a bigger flat in same area (rented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 month to take daughter home</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>Stay in UK because of children</td>
<td>No – stay in area – friends in close proximity</td>
<td>Yes – house is too small for family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>Lost job</td>
<td>Depends on job availability – area doesn’t matter – cost and quality of accommodation is key</td>
<td>Depends on cost and quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>As long as possible</td>
<td>At least 10 years</td>
<td>Good job and prospects</td>
<td>Same area</td>
<td>Yes – bigger room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Reason for Moving</td>
<td>Employment Security</td>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>Desired Neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>For good</td>
<td>For good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes – to Everton but worried about neighbours as no other migrants in the area</td>
<td>Yes – house is too small and want to rent from council than from private landlord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>For 2-3 years so that income can be calculated into Slovak pension</td>
<td>Secured employment</td>
<td>No - church and friends are in close proximity</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Violence and crime; depends on access to labour market in Germany</td>
<td>Yes – too dangerous in current area; looking at moving to Aigburth or Garston – more CCTV cameras there</td>
<td>Yes – but not looking for better type of house – just better neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Maybe – depends on job; but familiar with local neighbourhood</td>
<td>Maybe – current flat is too big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>For good</td>
<td>For good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes – depends where social rented (council) property becomes available</td>
<td>Yes – flat is damp and cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>Not sure – depends on whether secures job as Polish language teacher; if not will go back home. Will go back to parents in Poland one day</td>
<td>Found out that liked to teach Polish students.</td>
<td>Yes – but stay in same area</td>
<td>Yes – flat too expensive and disagreements with flat mates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>Not sure – thinking about staying until retirement</td>
<td>Secure employment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not sure – my landlord is my employer. Might move to another flat owned by them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Not sure – thinking of staying indefinitely</td>
<td>Secured employment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 – 3 months - came for holiday</td>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>Found good job; made friends</td>
<td>Yes – Kirkby or Fazackerley</td>
<td>Yes – landlord has not fixed the property as promised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Experiences of living in neighbourhood</td>
<td>Type of housing available</td>
<td>Availability of local public services</td>
<td>Friends / family / migrants nearby</td>
<td>Family / dependants moving to Liverpool (or UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Key reason to stay – friends - provide support and information</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deterioration in relations with other migrants – key reason to move</td>
<td>Poor quality but not huge impact</td>
<td>Not a key reason to stay or go</td>
<td>Not a key reason to stay or go</td>
<td>No family / dependants – not a key influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Satisfied with neighbourhood – not a key influence</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
<td>Not an issue either way if migrants are around or not; but good to be in proximity to some</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Harassed by youths but overall not an issue</td>
<td>Satisfied with housing</td>
<td>Services are OK – school, shops, health centre all OK</td>
<td>Family moved to Colchester; not an issue; came back to Liverpool</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Speke is fine – no problems</td>
<td>Is an issue – quality is bad – influence on whether stays</td>
<td>Key issue – need to be good services, especially library</td>
<td>Not a key issue; not a key issue if migrants nearby or not</td>
<td>Mum key reason why came to Liverpool but not a key reason for staying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>People friendly</td>
<td>Easier to find here – not an issue</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
<td>Have son in Liverpool but not a reason to stay or move; migrants nearby no real influence</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not an issue – neighbourhood ok</td>
<td>Worked with landlord and police to sort accommodation – not an issue</td>
<td>Only issue is interpreter in hospital; otherwise this is fine</td>
<td>Not dependant on family; other migrants nearby not reason for staying or going</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children prefer area and lots of friends</td>
<td>No real issue with housing</td>
<td>Services are good</td>
<td>Not important – presence of migrants nearby not an issue</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Not a problem – mixing going on</td>
<td>Quality in Liverpool not very good – an issue</td>
<td>Availability and quality is good except for health services</td>
<td>Not an issue if family close by or not; work with other migrants if around and try to support</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Has had some negative influence – neighbours molesting / noisy</td>
<td>Quality is various but not a key issue</td>
<td>Transport OK; one negative experience of using health facilities</td>
<td>Family and friends can assist – positive motivation to stay; migrants – not a real factor</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Neighbours good but nearby park unsafe</td>
<td>Quality of accommodation is appalling – key issue</td>
<td>Bus services good; JCP appointment difficult; hospitals good but GPs poor</td>
<td>Family acts as a positive and negative influence but no overall impact on motivations; other migrants nearby has no overall impact</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Small flat key reason to leave neighbourhood</td>
<td>Housing does not motivate to stay</td>
<td>Emergency services are poor; but schools and transport are good</td>
<td>Wife and children are a motivation to stay; family less important; other migrants nearby is a positive motivation to stay</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kensington “the worst area” – very unsafe</td>
<td>Plenty of choice but affordability is an issue</td>
<td>Health services OK; JCP less so</td>
<td>Friends/family not a key reason for staying; proximity of other migrants not important</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Environment/Conditions</td>
<td>Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes – poor environment/conditions can be a key factor influencing return migration</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
<td>Health service excellent; police less so but no overall impact</td>
<td>Family not important but friends are quite important in terms of motivations to stay or go; proximity of other migrants not a key influence</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
<td>Quality is sufficient</td>
<td>Bus services good; health services are ‘mixed’; local services are good in general and a motivation to stay</td>
<td>Not bound by family or friends – not a key issue; no feeling of having to associate with other migrants</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Area is very exciting and people from all over live in the area</td>
<td>Worse than in Poland. Landlords too powerful</td>
<td>More available than in Poland</td>
<td>Daughter lives in Liverpool – an important influence; positive to have other migrants nearby</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Silently respect other neighbours</td>
<td>Can always choose another house but have to stay put if cannot afford to move</td>
<td>Services are good but English is key to accessing.</td>
<td>Polish friends are similar and motivation to stay; positive to have other migrants nearby</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Don’t speak English and don’t go out much, but thinks it is safe area</td>
<td>Not an issue – is ‘poor’ so is used to poor quality accommodation</td>
<td>Don’t know about them yet</td>
<td>Not an issue – originally moved in with niece but they exploited him</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Important – you need to feel welcome</td>
<td>Poor quality; lack of information about what is available</td>
<td>Good experience of services</td>
<td>Important to have friends/family but not a reason to stay</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Would like to live in nicer area but can’t afford to</td>
<td>Poor quality; nice houses too expensive</td>
<td>Things are ‘dirtier’ here than in Lithuania (buses, etc); health services worse than in Lithuania</td>
<td>Friends are very important but prefers English friends</td>
<td>Not an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Claimed benefit?</td>
<td>Which?</td>
<td>Impact on motivation to stay or go?</td>
<td>Keep track of conditions in home country?</td>
<td>Make any difference to motivations to stay or go?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No – here 7 months</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No influence – came to work</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No – doesn’t want to go back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No influence – never thinks about it</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No – real differences between countries are minimal now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Applied October 2007</td>
<td>Child Benefit</td>
<td>No influence at present – didn’t receive</td>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>Job more important than money; but if wages grow in education sector in Czech they may go home earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Working Tax credits; Child Tax credits; Child benefit</td>
<td>Not really – benefits not sufficient to live on – job more important</td>
<td>Not really interested</td>
<td>No – got used to the UK; too early to talk about this yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Language Proficiency</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Retirement Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly – need to balance positives against negatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Applied JSA; Housing Benefit</td>
<td>No – not interested unless deep crisis with money – applied and rejected for JSA previously; worked with CAB to appeal; received Housing Benefit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – compare situation in UK with Poland – if good job at home then would go back</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – increasingly thinking about the situation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Housing benefit; Child Tax credits; Child benefit</td>
<td>Yes – system in UK is better than in Czech but slower</td>
<td>No – just curious as to what is going on back home</td>
<td>Depends on availability of employment in UK; would need to find employment for all family members if moved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Housing benefit; Child Tax credits; Child benefit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Depends on availability of employment in UK; would need to find employment for all family members if moved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>JSA; Housing benefit; Child Tax benefit; Child credit; Child benefit</td>
<td>Yes – better than in Czech – if without work, children will not suffer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Working Tax credits; enquiring about JSA as now unemployed</td>
<td>Not had any impact to date</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Child Tax credits; Child benefit; Working Tax credits; also applied for Housing benefit – did not receive</td>
<td>Yes – what is provided in a week in the UK would take a month back home although system discourages individuals from applying in the UK</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – situation back home confirms reasons for staying in UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes – situation back home confirms reasons for coming to UK</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Child Tax credits; Working Tax credits; Child benefit; Disability allowance (for daughter)</td>
<td>Yes - benefits provide security but still need a job</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Working Tax credits</td>
<td>Yes – system over complicated - denied Income Support when out of work – finally received notification that can claim JSA and Housing benefit – CAB and friends helped</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Working Tax credits</td>
<td>No impact – helps to get by but no overall impact</td>
<td>No – not interested</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children’s education in the UK and their future prospects

Work and friends act as influences to stay; crime and violence in the UK are influences on leaving
<p>| 15 | Yes | Housing benefit; Working Tax credit | A little – but system in UK is geared up to supporting those with families rather than those who are single; system is painful | Not really | No – doesn’t feel a need to return; social and economic situation doesn’t matter | No | Depends on availability of work; some will move and this will leave more jobs available for migrants who stay in the UK; considering a move to Belgium through support from an agency | Quality of life in UK and Liverpool and experiences; desire for new experiences in future may influence a desire to move |
| 16 | Yes | Child benefit; claimed for Working Tax credit recently | No impact | No | No – some are returning to build infrastructure but will leave when work dries up | Yes | No impact – wants to stay and stabilise life | Quality of life and education in UK – cheaper to live and learn |
| 17 | Yes | Claimed and received Working Tax credits but removed after 5 months when became in receipt of higher income | No – did not come here for the benefits | Yes | If conditions and job availability and quality improved then they would return | No | No | Education is key to remaining in the UK, although a desire to be with parents is an influence to return once studies are complete |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applied</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Seekers Allowance (claim rejected)</strong></td>
<td>No impact – didn’t think they could get benefits anyway</td>
<td>No – not interested</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Tax Benefit (claim rejected)</strong></td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>Yes – sometimes read news</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfying work; chance to improve qualifications; settled into UK life</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No – too old for travelling around Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Having chance to work until retirement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>