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Abstract

This study focuses on migratory experiences in the locality situated in the North of England. This medium-sized town since the late 1990s became a destination for international migrants. Contemporary migration to this locality has been associated with two structural policies: the dispersal of refugees and asylum seekers by UK government and the opening of the UK labour market to the new EU citizens from Central Eastern Europe. The study’s sample has included migrant participants coming both from EU and non EU (dispersed) backgrounds. This piece of research is explorative and inductive in nature. Its ontological and epistemological stances are influenced by interpretivism. The data has been gathered through biographical and semi-structured interviews, focus group interviews and ethnographic observations. The data and its interpretations contributed to the understanding of the following aspects of migrant living in this locality: the motives of migration, the arrival mechanisms, the experiences of paid employment and informal work. The study also examines the local dynamics of ethnic intolerance and individual experiences of housing provision. The interpretation of empirical data is used to construct a theoretical analysis exploring the migration process in the locality which has a particular set of social and labour market characteristics.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of contents</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1 Literature review</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 The receiving and sending contexts</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 The arrival trajectories: the analysis of policies and mechanisms regulating migration</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 New destinations and the patterns of employment</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Ethnically motivated hostility to migrants</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 The experiences of housing</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2 Research methodology</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Interpretivism: the philosophy of social science and its implications for the study</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 The chosen methodology: the grounded theory approach</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Doing the fieldwork: techniques, concepts and processes</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Research ethics: challenges and responses</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Translating as an issue of research methodology: techniques and theories</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 7 Settling down in Northtown: the places of residence

7.1 The preference for social housing

7.2 The private sector provision

Conclusions

List of references

Appendix

Abbreviations
Introduction

The principal concern of this doctoral thesis is to explore social and labour market experiences of migrants residing in a medium-sized town in the North of England (to use the invented name given to it – Northtown). Its empirical contribution to a large extent lies in the interpretation of interviews conducted with labour migrants from Central Eastern Europe (CEE) residing in this locality. However, the analysis also includes the material gathered through the interviews conducted with non EU migrants as well as the representatives of voluntary and statutory support groups. Those sources of empirical data form the basis for the construction of theoretically informed understanding of migrant living in a medium-sized town. While the study does not cover all aspects of migrant living (e.g. such topics as health are left out), it nonetheless attempts to build a holistic and comprehensive picture of social and labour market experiences of migrant newcomers. It aims to explore the experiences of being a migrant in a medium-sized town which is perceived to be new to migration and ethnic diversity.

The analysis begins from looking at how and why the study’s participants became migrants and then dedicates its attention to the understanding of migrants’ lives in Northtown itself. More specifically, the study examines pre-migratory experiences of migrants – particularly those which influenced their decision to migrate, asks why migrants have settled in this locality and not elsewhere in the UK, reconstructs the labour market entry trajectories and analyses the lived experiences of paid employment and individual and family experiences related to informal work. In addition, the analysis is focused on the experiences linked to the local manifestations of ethnic intolerance. The final aspect of migrant living covered by this study represents the experiences of housing.

All of those diverse themes are united by the common purpose: on the basis of available empirical data to build an interpretive framework designed to provide understanding of social and labour market experiences of migrants residing in a particular locality. While the study aims to understand the subjectivity of individual experiences on a local level, the interpretations also show how lived experiences of
participants are being shaped by broader structural influences. Those structural influences include socio-economic difficulties in the sending countries, the EU and UK level migratory regulations and the divisions in the local labour market. The similar approach is adapted when interpreting migrants’ experiences of housing and ethnic intolerance – they are analysed as social processes influenced by structural mechanisms rather than treated as isolated social interactions. Thus, even though the study is focused on the experiences in one selected locality and it stresses the significance of individual subjectivity in exploring labour market and social experiences, the testimonies of individuals are positioned vis-à-vis corresponding structural contexts. The analysis demonstrates that migrants residing in a certain locality interact with existing structures both in terms of exploiting existing opportunities and when it comes to facing various difficulties created by the existence of structural barriers on various levels. Such theoretical positioning forms a starting point for the ways primary data has been presented and interpreted.

Methodologically, the study’s research design is guided by the principles of grounded theory. The principles of grounded theory have been applied in adjusting and reformulating the aims’ of the study. The initial aims of the study were focused on the exploration of labour market experiences of only EU migrants from CEE and the analysis of social interactions between this group of migrants and statutory as well as voluntary groups. While those aims remained constant and constituted general impetus behind the research project, the specificities of fieldwork introduced new dynamics to the ways findings were collected, interpreted and structured.

First of all, while initially I planned to explore migrants’ experiences in a more general national context, the nature of fieldwork – the interviews and observations were conducted in one particular area, led towards the acknowledgement of the local dimension. Secondly, a number of migrants from a non EU background were interviewed. While a number of dispersed non EU migrants were initially interviewed in their capacity of voluntary groups’ representatives, the material gathered through those interviews became relevant in analysing the local migratory dynamics more broadly, as opposed to a more narrow focus on the
forms of social support provided by those groups to a particular group of migrants. Non EU participants had also talked about biographical experiences of living in Northtown and such data was added and matched with the overlapping testimonies of EU participants. Moreover, in some cases non EU migrants took part in the same interviews with CEE migrants from the new EU member states – two focus groups with the English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) course students in the local college. Most of non EU interviewees came from the countries belonging to the geopolitical entities (the former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia), which collapsed in the early 1990s. The participants coming from those countries were affected by the processes of social transition from state socialism to neoliberal market economy. The same applies to CEE participants who became the new EU citizens in 2004. Moreover, a considerable number of participants were interviewed in two languages (Russian and Polish), which provided a degree of consistency for the analysis and interpretations. At the same time, the inclusion of participants coming from diverse national backgrounds allowed to explore how the differences created on a structural level (e.g. EU migrants versus non EU migrants) impact on social and labour market experiences of individual migrants. Overall, the research material gathered through a variety of techniques which included biographical interviews, semi-structured interviews, focus group interviews and ethnographic observations conducted in public and private spaces led towards a construction of theory aiming to explain how individual experiences of migration develop in the context of local particularities which are in turn embedded within wider structural contexts.

The logic of grounded theory is also reflected in the organisation of the thesis. It opens up with the literature review specifically designed to provide a contextual background of the main analytical themes articulated in subsequent empirical chapters. One of the main themes of the study is associated with the significance of local migratory dynamics. Northtown was seen by many participants as an area new to migration and many problems facing migrants were attributed to this newness. This particular theme is contextualised by the review of the literature covering international migration research on the phenomenon which is described as migration to new destinations. The review of this strand of literature analyses
structural and individual factors which lead to migration to the areas which have not been traditionally associated with inward migration prior to the late 1990s. This literature is further supplemented by the review of UK and EU specific developments which played a central role in bringing migrant participants to Norhtown: the UK dispersal policy of non EU migrants and the opening of the UK labour market to the new EU citizens. The review covers a number of subjects which are relevant to the understanding of empirical material. The particular attention is given to the contexts of sending countries, the causes of migration to new destinations and the experiences of work in the areas of settlement. In addition, there is a discussion of the studies related to ethnic intolerance and housing. The primary aim of the literature review is to provide a contextual background for the empirical chapters: each section of the literature review is matched by a respective empirical chapter. The literature review is followed by the discussion of methodological issues with a particular attention given to philosophical principles underlying the processes of data collection and interpretation, the principles and application of grounded theory and specificities of methods employed to gather data. The part on methodology dedicates a considerable amount of attention to the subject of translation (many interviews were conducted in Polish and Russian), discusses ethical dilemmas encountered in the fieldwork and provides a socio-demographic overview of Norhtown.

The study’s main contribution lies in its empirical component. The presentation of it is organised around five main chapters. The discussion of the chapter three covers the issues related to the departure of the country of origin and the arrival to the UK and Norhtown. It asks why Norhtown’s migrants decided to migrate to the UK in the first place. The analysis of the causes and motives of migration is complimented by the examination of the ways by which migrants have eventually reached Norhtown, settled down in this locality and entered the local labour market. The coverage includes the analysis of the role played by family in the migration process, pre-migratory experiences of participants and the type of mechanisms used by participants to arrive to the UK and settle in the chosen locality.
The discussion of arrival trajectories is followed by the chapter four which focuses on the labour market experiences. The empirical material on paid employment is interpreted and organised around a number of main themes. It included the analysis of downward occupational mobility experienced by the study’s participants and the structural barriers which they faced in the local labour market, e.g. ethnic segmentation in the workplace. The theme of the labour market also included the moral dimension of paid employment: participants had not only described the reality which they faced, but passed moral judgements over their labour market experiences.

In the chapter five, the analysis focuses on the experiences of paid and unpaid informal work (usually home based), unpaid voluntary work as well as community work. Those issues particularly affected migrant women interviewed for the study. The chapter six discusses the manifestations of ethnic intolerance: it involves the review of the acts of abuse and the responses of both migrants and statutory agencies to those acts. The chapter seven explores the experiences of housing paying particular attention to individual experiences of private and public sector housing provisions. Each chapter begins from brief introductions which identify key analytical categories built on the basis of empirical material.

Although the empirical chapters reflect the multiplicity of themes and interpretations, there is one underlying aim: to explore lived experiences of migrants residing in a particular locality. The study asks how and why the participants became migrants, why they have settled in Northtown and examines their labour market and social experiences. The interpretation of primary research material suggests that social worlds of migrants, who happen to be settled in the area which has specific social and labour market dynamics, are constituted through the interactions between individual actions (representing individual agency) on one side and local, national and international contexts (representing structural mechanisms) on the other.

This recognition of multi-layered scaling of migratory experiences constitutes the major empirical and theoretical contribution of this study. The inductive nature of the study suggests that migratory lives in this particular locality can be represented
in a form of the sphere at the centre of which are individual actors positioned vis-à-vis multiple structural contexts. Such theorisation leaves the space for individual agency without downplaying the significance of structural mechanisms. It shows how some of those mechanisms can facilitate migrant participants in their actions or contribute to their negative experiences in the labour market and broader social spheres. This exploratory empirical study comes to these conclusions through bottom up theory building which follows the logic of grounded theory: through reading and interpreting narratives of individuals residing in Northtown, it reveals how their lives are embedded within broader structural contexts. It is shown that while individual and family experiences of migration are specific to a certain locality, such experiences are influenced by broader national and international processes going beyond the confines of geographical space in which migrants have settled. This is significant in terms of demonstrating that local and broader processes are mutually constitutive when it comes to shaping social and labour experiences of migrants residing in a medium-sized Northern English town. The empirical evidence and the chosen interpretive line demonstrates that when it comes to the understanding of social worlds of individuals involved in migration, it is neither advisable to conceive migratory experiences without reflecting on the significance of the locality in which migrants reside nor to separate the local dynamics from wider structural contexts. Forthcoming discussion will show how and why those particular sets of conclusions have been reached.
Chapter 1 Literature review

Introduction

The study of international migration has accumulated a wealth of literature related to migrants’ lives in major urban constellations worldwide. The focus on such areas has been at the center of migration studies from the classical work of historical sociology such as the one by Handlin (1973) to more recent discussions of migrants’ lives in global cities, e.g. in London (Sassen, 2001). It has been argued that these areas acted as the poles attracting migrants due to employment opportunities, the presence of migrant communities and the availability of social support groups. Gradually major urban centres such as Boston and New York in the US and London in the UK have emerged as traditional destinations for migrants and acquired ethnically diverse populations. Such configuration has turned these areas into so-called arrival cities – the urban hubs of economic dynamism and cultural exchange (Saunders, 2010). According to Hirschman and Massey (2008), the established urban centres of migration continued to attract migrants even when the governments of receiving countries sought to spatially disperse newly arrived migrants to other parts of the receiving state. Once migrants would have gained socio-legal rights, they would move to the areas where their co-ethnics have already managed to establish social support groups and immigrant businesses: ‘...secondary migration revealed a seemingly iron law of spatial concentration. New immigrants tend to settle in the largest cities where earlier immigrants of the same national origins have previously settled’ (Hirschman and Massey, 2008, p6). Such patterns have affected the study of contemporary CEE migration to Britain, at least when it comes to qualitative pieces of work: social research on CEE migration to Britain has been focused on London (Rayn et al.,
...and/or on the cities such as Leicester, which are known for inward migration and ethnic diversity (Vershinina et al., 2011).

However such positioning of mainstream scholarship has also led to the calls for the re-focusing of migration studies and the inclusion of geographical areas in the UK which have been largely excluded theoretically and empirically from contemporary migration research. Stenning and Dawley (2009) noted that certain parts of the UK, which were not seen as the places where migrants would tend to go and settle historically, became destinations for sizable numbers of Polish and other CEE migrants after 2004. Stenning and Dawley (2009) explain the diversion of migration from London and other traditional centres and the emergence of new areas of migration in the UK by the existence of freedom of movement within the EU, the decision of CEE citizens of the EU to exercise this right and move freely to the UK. Stenning and Dawley (2009) pointed to local skill shortages and employer demand as other structural factors attracting migrants to new areas.

Stenning and Dawley's (2009) line of inquiry has been mirrored by migration research conducted in the US. New distinct conceptualisations of migration to less explored areas have appeared in North American literature: Williams et al. (2009) spoke about migration to new destinations, Godziak and Martin (2005) used the notion of migration beyond the gateways and, finally, Hirschman and Massey (2008) referred to new places of migration when discussing the changing geography of migration to the US. The mentioned scholars have been using different wording in articulating the conceptual framing, but it could be argued that in spite of semantic differences, they have been referring to the same phenomenon. The attention of the majority of the studies conducted by the authors cited above have been directed onto small and medium sized towns which prior to the 1990s tended to have ethnically homogeneous populations. Moreover, those studies moved the focus from traditional destinations (the major cities) to medium-sized towns which had not been seen as places where migrants tend to settle. Such localities also had not been seen destination for migrants after 1945: e.g. they were not affected by New Commonwealth migration to the UK or Mexican and other Latino migration to the US. It allowed the authors cited above...
to use such adjective as ‘new’ in conceptualising the relation between place and migration.

For the purpose of this study, the use of the expression ‘new destinations’ appears to be more appealing because of its emphasis on the locality and the ascribed, at least in relative terms, novelty of migration. Moreover, it includes a possibility for the migrants to move to those localities from the established migratory areas as a secondary act of migration. Whist the scale of scholarship on new destinations is much smaller in terms of quantity when compared to the study of global cities, a considerable amount of research evidence has been accumulated. Two main themes could be identified in this emergent but rich literature: firstly, there is a focus on structural underpinnings used to explain migration to new destinations – e.g. state policies and labour market segmentation. Secondly, there is a focus on exploring particular social processes associated with migration to new destinations. The covered topics include the study of paid employment, the role of social support networks as well as the conflicts stemming from the tensions existing in ethnic relations. The studies, which can be organised under the umbrella term new destinations, tend to stress the newness of migration to the localities when explaining individual, family and collective experiences of migrants residing in such areas.

It would be also important to make a terminological observation: the term ‘new destinations’ is used by such authors as Massey (2008) to describe migration specifically in relation to certain localities within those nation states which have had a long standing history of immigration (e.g. the US). It does not refer to migration to nations states, which did not have longstanding history of inward migration, e.g. the newly established Russian Federation which from the early 1990s started to receive migrants from the post-Soviet space (Pilkington, 1998).

One of the aims of this literature review is to discuss the studies on migration to new destinations and highlight theorizations and findings relevant to this PhD thesis. However the discussion of the literature on new destinations is going be to be complemented by the discussion of those UK based studies, which are not
exclusively concerned with the geographical areas labeled as new destinations. This is going to be done for a number of reasons.

The purpose of this literature review is to provide a contextual background for the interpretation of original empirical findings. Some of the issues which are going to be interpreted in empirical sections, e.g. the question of labour market rights of CEE migrants (the new EU citizens), are not determined by the particularity of receiving localities but by national and EU based regulations. Whether CEE migrants arrive to the global cities such as London or to the medium sized towns, as the one discussed in this study, their acts of migration are being regulated by a number of national and pan-European mechanisms. When it comes to such social experiences as the organization of community groups on a local level, migrants are still affected by the structure of funding regime determined on a national level (MacKenzie et al., 2012).

Moreover, irrespective of geographical context, labour migrants may still experience a similar pattern of labour market segmentation - e.g. the confinement to certain sectors created by employer recruitment strategies and migrants’ willingness to earn higher wages compared to those available in the countries of origin (MacKenzie and Forde, 2009). Hence, it would be relevant to examine the studies which are embedded in different geographic settings, but still reflect labour market and social experiences of migrants working and living in the UK. Furthermore, the majority of the studies on new destinations have been conducted in North America, hence, a complimentary analysis of UK based structural policies would be necessary in order to understand regulatory mechanisms affecting migrants whose working and social lives are explored in the UK based context. One of those mechanisms is the UK based policy of the dispersal of non EU migrants which has a direct impact on the examined locality. It is particularly relevant when considering the arrival routes of non EU migrants, but also in terms of exploring ethnic intolerance affecting migrants in Britain’s new destinations more generally. Since those elements feature in the interpretation of empirical data gathered for this PhD thesis, it would be logical to include them into the literature review in order to set up the context for forthcoming theoretical interpretations. To sum up, an isolated discussion of migration to new destinations
would be insufficient in its ability to provide a contextual background for the study of social and labour market experiences of migrants residing in a medium-sized Northern English town.

Following the preliminary observations articulated above, it would be possible to outline the structure of the literature review. The review will consist of five parts. Firstly, the discussion will focus on socio-economic contexts influencing migration to new destinations: it will examine the features specific to new destinations as well as the contexts related to the sending and receiving countries more generally. Secondly, the discussion will move to the review of policies structuring individual trajectories of migration. It is important to do so because the policies determined on national and international levels are instrumental in understanding structural contexts which migrants had to face while developing their individual and family migration strategies. Paying particular attention to CEE migration and EU freedom of movement, it will also discuss the mechanisms used to access the UK labour market. Thirdly, the focus will be dedicated to the experiences of paid employment of migrants in new destinations and UK more generally. Fourthly, the focus will be on the literature covering ethnically motivated hostilities directed against migrants in new destinations specifically and UK more generally. Finally, the analysis will consider the issues related to the access to social and private housing sector provisions. The attention is going to cover both local and national aspects of the issues related to migrants’ ability to find suitable accommodation.

Importantly, those topics are not chosen randomly for this literature review, but reflect the main streams of inquiry coming from the studies on new destinations. Moreover, the chronology of the presentation and the selection of the topics mirror the chronology of empirical chapters. This is in line with the thinking articulated by the proponents of grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006): a good literature review should set the context of the discussion and provide conceptual tools in interpreting empirical data.

As indicated earlier, each of those sections will include the discussion of empirical findings relevant to the understanding of migration to new destinations as well as the studies exploring those social processes in the UK-wide context. Significantly, it
will involve the incorporation of both local and national, and when needed, international dimensions. In practice, it means that the discussion of each part will commence from the review of research on new destinations and will conclude the review by an additional analysis of the issues relevant to UK embedded context. The only exception will be the analysis of arrival trajectories, which will prioritise the discussion of national policies. The discussed literature has been carefully selected to mirror forthcoming empirical analysis: e.g. it includes the discussion of post-communist countries (within and outside the EU) in order to contextualise pre-migratory experiences of migrants interviewed for the study. Those topics will form the main empirical blocs when it comes to the content and organization of the interpretations. At the same time, since the analysis focuses on the studies relevant to the empirical parts, it will lead to the exclusion of certain topics, which are not related directly to the analysis of primary empirical data, e.g. it excludes the detailed analysis of refugee organizations or the discussion of the experiences related to health and education. Finally, the analysis will exclude the discussion of the data related to population flows: the aim of the review is to provide structural background relevant to the understanding of individual experiences of migration rather than to articulate general statistical trends.

1.1 The receiving and sending contexts

The causes of migration to new destinations have been studied in different national contexts. Authors like Godziak (2005, p.4) link migration to new destinations with the impacts of economic restructuring on a local level: ‘the roots of today’s new settlement patterns are complex. In some cases, businesses actively recruited immigrants into new communities. During the 1980s, industries involved in the processing of beef, pork, chicken, and fish began to relocate from north central states to south central states to recruit non-union, low-wage labour’. In other words, it is argued that employer demand for labour constitutes an important factor contributing to migration to new destinations. The specificity of employer demand in new destinations is worth noting since it distinguishes such localities from global cities: the demand for migrant labour in the latter has been
driven by the service sector (Sassen, 2001), whilst in the former it has been primarily concentrated in the meat packaging and recycling sectors (Godziak, 2005). Massey and Hirschman (2008) point to a general pattern of industrial restructuring, which sustains migration to new destinations. Those authors have suggested that in the last three decades, the advanced capitalist economies moved away from employment systems characterized by relatively secure and well paid jobs, recognised trade unions and internal labour markets to a system of insecure and deregulated low wage employment. The geographic location of labour intensive industries in low income areas and the reliance on workers with weak tradition of collective mobilisation allows employers to maximise gains from industrial restructuring: ‘although not all industries restructure in the same fashion, they all seek to achieve common outcomes that affect workers – lower wages, fewer unions, reduced fringe benefits and easier layoffs’ (Massey and Hirschman, 2008, p.10).

While the demand for migrant labour tends to be dominated by low pay, low skill and labour intensive sectors, there are instances of some employers directing relatively high pay and high skilled migrants to new destinations. In a case study related to this phenomenon, Bach (2010) explored the hiring practices of the NHS. Bach (2010) noted that the NHS posted migrant health professionals to the geographical areas unattractive to British professionals. These areas are often located in rural or small-medium sized urban areas with weak traditions of ethnic diversity and migration (Bach, 2010).

The movement of migrants away from the core urban centres and traditional destinations could be also explained by broader socio-demographic policies which are implemented in receiving countries: Krahn et al. (2005) provides the example of the policies of the Canadian government in promoting settlement of refugees in under-populated urban centres. Such policies are seen as a tool of addressing demographic imbalances, particularly the shortages of labour in certain areas. Reflecting on the combination of employer demand and government policy, in the example of North Carolina, Bailey (2005) identified two structural factors contributing to migration to new destinations: firstly, the state’s policy of directing migration flows to less populated areas and, secondly, employers’ demand for low-
wage labour, e.g. in the meat and poultry industry and in the recycling. Thus, when the evidence coming from different studies are brought together, it appears that state’s policy and employer strategy can be seen as integral parts of the structural context which has created a possibility for migration to new destinations.

While the analysis indicates the significance of structural mechanisms, the understanding of local migratory dynamics should also include the reference to migrants’ agency. While some migrants are recruited or posted directly by employers (Griffith, 2008), others arrive to new destinations because of emerging migrant networks. Such migrants relied on informal contacts with the members of extended kin who have recently arrived and already managed to find work in new destinations (Gouveia et al., 2006). On the other side, the existence of employer demand helps to sustain migrants’ willingness to move to new destinations. In spite of difficult nature of work in the meat packing sector – one of the key industries in new destinations, migrants tend to see some advantages in those jobs, e.g. greater employment security, particularly if the jobs available elsewhere are insecure and temporary (Fenelly, 2005).

In spite of the reference to migrants’ individual and family preferences and strategies in explaining pull factors of migration, the available literature on new destinations tends predominantly to focus on the policies of receiving nation states, the particularities of receiving localities and the strategies of local employers in attracting labour migrants. The contribution of such literature lies in exploring influences associated with the dynamics linked to receiving countries and localities.

In contrast, it would be also important to explore how the contexts of sending societies influence individuals and families’ decisions to migrate and settle in new destinations. In order to address this question, it would be relevant to provide a brief review of socio-economic factors affecting those migrants from CEE and other countries who would settle in the locality as the one chosen for the study.

The wage gap between CEE countries and the UK have been generally influential in affecting migrant decision making: MacKenzie and Forde (2009) report that highly educated migrants would secure low status and low skill jobs in the UK for which
they would still be paid several times more than for professional jobs which they had prior to migration in such CEE states as Estonia and Lithuania. It has been also noted that when it comes to cross-national comparisons, the citizens of those new EU member states, which have lower income per capita, tend to migrate in greater numbers (Blanchflower et al., 2007). Hardy (2009) argued that the neo-liberal nature of post-communist transition failed to meet fundamental socio-economic needs of large sections of the population in CEE countries and those policies could be seen as directly responsible for the magnitude of emigration which followed EU enlargement. Hardy (2009) and Ost (2005) suggest that structural unemployment created by the privatisation and/or closure of state owned industries combined with the scaling down of the welfare state constitute important contexts for anyone interested in understanding political dynamics affecting individuals and families.

The weakening of public institutions made the institution of family instrumental in coping with socio-economic difficulties. Titkow and Duch (2004, p.70) commenting on the implications of transformation argue that ‘economic problems, crisis of social institutions, political parties backing off from various warranties and social benefits, and anomy of values made the family a capital link of great importance. It has been the only relatively stable element and a point of reference in the vacuum of transformation’. The ethnographic studies of Polish families indicate that migration became a livelihood strategy or a coping mechanism in the context of high local unemployment and the absence of reasonable alternatives (White, 2011). Meardi (2007) argued that when it came to the context of sending countries, this wave of labour migration should be also understood in relation to the weakness of labour market institutions: without strong unions capable of improving wages collectively, emigrating can be seen as an individual and family strategy of CEEs seeking to improve their level of income. However, the study of Polish migrants living in Ireland also revealed that members of this social group also had ‘non-economic motives – such as the desire to learn English or simply the search for adventure’ (Krings et al., 2013, p.88), when it came to the decision to migrate.
Such mixed evidence would tend to suggest that CEE migrants could choose to move and settle in different parts of the UK because of the combination of personal choices and socio-economic difficulties which they faced as individuals and households in the countries of origin. Hence, when analyzing structural underpinnings of CEE migration to various localities within the UK, it would be important to locate this migration wave in relation to the dissatisfaction with socio-economic opportunities existing in sending countries, the exercise of new EU mobility rights and the life-style choices made by families and individuals.

It should be reminded that the new EU member states prior to the changes, which took place between the 1989-1991, were part of a broader Soviet dominated bloc which stretched from CEE to Eurasia. While eight countries and later two additional countries has joined the EU, which improved mobility rights of their citizens, other post-communist countries in Europe and Central Asia were not part of EU integration. However those countries also have been part of migration system existing between the UK and former communist bloc in a broader sense: according to Robinson et al. (2003), the geopolitical changes of the 1990s created new migration waves to the UK, which the dispersal policy (the housing of newly arrived migrants in new destinations) aimed to address. Moreover, non EU migration can be seen as a part of socio-economic changes taking place in post-communist countries outside the EU. Some of interviewed non EU migrants came from such states – Azerbaijan, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan, Georgia and Kosovo. Thus, it would be relevant to provide a note on socio-economic realities contributing to migration from those countries.

The scholars of post-communist transition Ruget and Usmanalieva (2007) have introduced the notion of ‘weak state’ in order to analyse the dramatic rise in socio-economic inequalities in Central Asian states which became independent after the collapse of the USSR in 1991. The weak state is characterised by the inability to provide basic security to citizens, extremely high levels of corruption in public and private spheres, very high levels of social deprivation, unemployment, ethnic conflicts and the rise of authoritarian regimes. Authors such as Ruget and Usmanalieva (2007) categorise Kyrgyzstan as a classic example of it: a post-communist state which went through extreme difficulties after gaining
independence. Moreover, the changes of the governments in mid 2000s – also known as various colorful revolutions, did not lead to improvement in socio-economic standards. It is argued that those social-political upheavals led not to a genuine structural transformation of power relations and social improvements in the lives of ordinary citizens, but to the reshuffle of post-Soviet elites (Tudoroiu, 2007). Significantly for this study, those contexts affected non EU migrants who arrived to the UK and were subsequently dispersed to new destinations.

After discussing those contexts, it would be possible to look at the trajectories of migration.

1.2 The arrival trajectory: the analysis of policies and mechanisms regulating migration

When it comes to structural mechanisms, the arrival to a certain country and locality is regulated by the policies adapted by the state. Hence the analysis of structural landscape which migrants have to navigate when arriving and settling in certain localities should include the discussion of UK national migration regulations and EU based policies. As it was indicated earlier, two major migration policies have had a formative effect on the arrival of migrants to new destinations in the context of the UK: dispersal policies and EU freedom of movement. The impact of dispersal policies on the arrival of non EU migrants is going to be discussed first.

The policy of dispersal adapted in the UK and other Western European countries (the Netherlands, Sweden and Denmark) has had a formative impact on the patterns of settlement of non EU migrants. As the term ‘dispersal’ indicates, the main principle of the policy has been to diversify the settlement of migrants and to spread it nationwide as opposed to concentrating them in traditional migrant destinations, for example in global cities such as London (Robinson et al., 2003). Since dispersed non EU migrants do not have control over where they can choose to live in the receiving country, the policy of dispersal is involuntary in principle. It further highlights the difference between labour migrants who have EU citizenship and forced migrants who are not EU citizens: the mobility rights of the latter group
are restricted even after the arrival to the destination country – asylum seekers and refugees cannot move and settle based on their preferences.

In the review of migration policies of New Labour government, Somerville (2007, p68) claims that ‘dispersal was among the most fundamental of Labour’s reforms to asylum policy. Introduced in the 1999 Act, ‘dispersal’ relocated asylum seekers to various parts of the UK in order to relieve housing pressure on London. Unless an asylum seeker chooses the option of subsistence only support (which does not offer help with housing costs), there is no choice of destination. In effect, asylum seekers are relocated by official sanction’. While Somerville’s (2007) quote captures pointedly the significance of dispersal in UK public policy making, however its narrow focus on the relieving of housing shortages in London as a sole explanation of dispersal policy is disputable. While there is recognition that dispersal is a restrictive policy linked to housing availability, it has been also stressed that there have been other factors, e.g. social cohesion, which contributed to the adaption of dispersal as a way of responding to the arrival of non EU migrants seeking asylum and refuge in the UK (Stewart, 2011).

Moreover, while dispersal is justified by financial considerations and as a way of controlling migration flows, dispersal as a practice and process is administratively complex and multi-staged phenomenon. In the UK dispersal typically involves six stages: initial entry, provisional accommodation, primary dispersal to temporary housing, further relocation, the decision over whether to grant or deny asylum application, and re-settlement or deportation depending on the decision on asylum application (Hynes, 2009). The process has been described by dispersed non EU migrants as bureaucratic and impersonal, the descriptions which increased distrust towards it (Hynes, 2009). Robinson et al. (2003) has also argued that dispersal itself and processes associated with it pre-dated the Immigration and Asylum Act of 1999. It was claimed that all major waves of migration after the Second World War to the UK included some form of dispersal: the Polish resettlement scheme, the Ugandan Asian scheme, the Vietnamese quota refugees and the Bosnian scheme more recently in the 1990s (Robinson et al. 2003). In all those cases, the state settled migrants not based on their preferences, but linked to its own agendas whether on labour shortages, foreign policy or race relations.
Robinson et al. (2003) note that the dispersal of refugees under New Labour was reactive and dependent on political events and it was inconsistent with the government’s own immigration policy. In the case of Kosovan (or Kosovar) scheme, refugees were settled around areas of their initial arrivals across the UK, and it was not clear ‘whether this was deliberate policy or a casual by-product of the location of reception centres’ (Robinson et al., 2003, p.121). Notably, no EU dispersed migrants are not affected by EU freedom of movement, which contrasts them to EU migrants from CEE for whom EU freedom of movement acts as the major structural factor leading to migration to new destinations in Britain (Stenning and Dawley, 2009). The overlapping issues of CEEs migrants to the UK and EU freedom of movement are going to be discussed below.

The phenomenon of CEE migration to Britain might be described as different in socio-legal terms when compared to the regulation of migration in post-1945 Western Europe and North America. In contrast, it was argued that those individuals from the new EU members’ states who had moved to the old EU member states (e.g. the UK) should not only be seen as labour migrants but as the new EU citizens (Ciupijus, 2011). The fact that this migration regime is underpinned by EU freedom of movement makes the initial act of migration easier – the absence of the requirements for visas or work permits facilitates the entry to the UK labour market via a variety of formal and informal mechanisms. The kinship networks and labour market intermediaries such as employment agencies act as bridging mechanisms for migrants when they move from CEE to the UK and look for jobs in various localities in Britain (Garapich, 2008). Moreover, employment agencies not only play a role in facilitating initial access of newly arrived migrants, but act as employers for significant part of migrants after they settle down (Anderson, 2010). The continuous flow of migration from CEE to the old EU member states is sustained by employer demand for migrant labour: in their study of employer recruitment strategy at the time of economic boom in Ireland, Moriarty et al. (2012) demonstrated that employers preferred to hire qualified migrants from Poland rather than employing and training Irish nationals. It created a situation which made Polish migrants to believe that they would be able to enter the Irish labour market without any problems (although the same authors
recognize that it became more difficult to find paid employment after the economic recession).

The possibility to migrate as a family unit became also important. White (2010) documents livelihood strategies adapted by Polish families: one member of household would migrate first, and only after she/he would secure accommodation and paid employment, she/he would be joined by spouses and children. The flow of people between CEE has been also sustained by the proliferation of low cost airlines linking not only London with the capital cities in CEE, but regional cities in the UK and sending countries (Burrell, 2011). Although those airlines have been associated with the overcharging and the lack of courtesy to CEE commuters, who helped to expand the geography of their operations and increase their profits, they made it easier to move between Britain and sending countries (Burrell, 2011). In effect it gave migrants and their family members greater discretion in deciding where to settle in the UK, where to enter into the employment relationship and where and when to take a holiday. Migrants with EU nationality could decide when to come, leave and come back to the UK, though those choices have been influenced by the possibility to find paid employment. Such relatively liberal regime led to backlash: it was decried in anti-immigration tabloid press as the example of UK government’s weaknesses in controlling its external borders and the betrayal of local communities struggling to deal with mass migration (Fox et al., 2012). Moreover, the direction of migration (the East to West) and individual experiences of CEE migrants point to the continuous influence of Orientalist stereotypes of ‘Eastern’ Europe (CEE migrants as not fully European and ‘White’) projected onto new arrivals from CEE (Ciupijus, 2012b).

Importantly to the context of this PhD thesis, the policy of open access of the UK labour market has been associated with geographical dispersal of migrants from CEE, which distinguishes from post-1945 migration waves (Duvell and Garapich, 2011): newly arrived CEE migrants have spread all over the UK and have settled in the geographical areas which did not have established migrant communities. Thus, indirectly, EU freedom of movement with its emphasis of labour migration determined by employer demand and migrants’ choices rather than state’s regulations led to migrants’ arrival to new destinations in the UK. It can be also
noted that EU freedom of movement also limited employers’ ability to control migrants’ spatial mobility: migrants could exercise greater discretion in choosing the area of settlement.

In overview, this section has covered structural regulatory mechanisms related to migrants’ arrival to new destinations in the UK. Two distinctive mechanisms were covered – the dispersal policies of the UK and EU freedom of movement. While the latter was related to the arrival of non EU migrants, the former explained the migratory patterns of CEE migrants.

The next issue to be covered by this literature review relates to the sphere of paid employment. It will consider both national and local dimensions of migratory experiences.

1.3 New destinations and the patterns of employment

The literature on new destinations contains some evidence on labour market experiences of migrants. It tends to be dominated by the discussion of migrants’ employment in labour intensive private sector companies. Hirschman and Massey (2008) argued that the industrial restructuring of the 1980s and 1990s acted as a major influence in directing labour migrants to new destinations: firstly, it created demand for their labour and, secondly, it directed migrants’ employment into low paid and low skilled jobs. The advantage for employers based in those areas is clear: migrants constitute a reliable workforce prepared to take jobs unattractive to local workers. This explains why employers tend to claim that migrants have superior skills when compared to the workers coming from established local communities. Employers perceive migrants as people with traditional, religious values and more susceptible to work discipline than local workers (Bailey, 2005). In the UK MacKenzie and Forde (2009) described how a low-wage employer in a town located in the former mining area started to recruit various groups of migrants. It initially focused on dispersed non EU migrants but subsequently started to recruit EU labour migrants after 2004. Whilst the interviewed employer stressed migrants’ work commitment, MacKenzie and Forde (2009) argued migrants’ attraction for such employers lied in CEE migrants’ socio-economic vulnerability and their
readiness to work long hours in order to earn higher wages than in sending countries.

In the US, Donato and Bankston (2008) identified a similar pattern in the study of employment experiences in a new destination: employers praised soft skills of migrants, especially the preparedness to work long working hours and the tolerance towards adverse working condition. The typical employers, e.g. the food production companies, in new destinations also expressed a notable degree of hostility to any form of collective representation: such employers would tend to close unionised plants, would subsequently re-open them and would hire non-union migrant workers to fill those jobs (Fenelly, 2005). Such evidence suggest that migrants are more attractive since they are less likely to complain over poor working conditions, join trade unions and go on strike. Moreover, migrants’ ability to challenge employers has been also often curtailed by the absence of citizenship rights especially among undocumented migrants and the lack of information over employment protections (Fenelly, 2005). Such conditions may not only affect undocumented migrants, but, for example migrants who may have citizenship rights in the EU and the UK: particularly in the first stages of settlement – e.g. after arriving to the destination, migrants may lack skills and may not be knowledgeable in employment law (Greer et al., 2013). Finally, migrants’ concentration in low pay and low status jobs in the local labour markets is mirrored by the segmentation at the workplace level: migrants are typically grouped with their co-ethnics and are employed as line workers, while the supervisory/managerial positions are reserved for employees coming from local established groups (Hernandez-Leon and Zuniga, 2006).

The described employment patterns of migrants create multiple problems going beyond the sphere of paid employment. Low wages and high childcare costs restrict the ability of migrant women to improve their positions in the local labour market and push them to leave paid employment (Gouveia et al., 2006). Shutika (2008) points out that the temporal patterns of work make it very difficult for migrants to find time for social activities. The physical and psychological fatigue as well as the lack of time prevents migrants from attending English language classes; this can be seen as disadvantageous in long run since the knowledge of English is
crucial when it comes to increasing chances of moving out from the employment in low wage sectors (Hernandez-Leon and Zuniga, 2006). According to Grey and Woodrick (2006), there is a direct link between the pattern of migrant employment in new destinations and workplace injuries: bodily harm is particularly frequent in the meatpacking sector. It was also noticed that upward labour market mobility was low irrespective of the duration of migrants’ stay in new destinations; the evidence also points to the reproduction of disadvantageous employment patterns among children of migrants (Gouveia et al., 2006). Moreover, although the rate of labour market participation is very high among migrants, low wages do not alleviate poverty among migrant families. Gouveia et al. (2006, p.32) concludes that ‘local labour market structures do not appear to offer significant upward mobility for immigrants. It remains to be seen whether other factors, such as institutional adaptation and host community attitudes can make up for those failings or are more likely to reinforce segmented incorporation’.

While the literature on new destinations highlights the structuring of migrants’ employment in the secondary labour market, it provides limited evidence on other forms of migrant employment. The exceptions relate to immigrant entrepreneurship. Hernandez-Leon and Zuniga (2006) point to the emergence of small and medium sized businesses such as restaurants and repair shops owned and run by migrants, which are popular both among customers from migrant and established communities. However the evidence on the employment beyond the secondary labour market is limited. Moreover, there is little discussion of informal work and/or unpaid whether at home or in a wider social sphere. Moreover, the studies tend to de-couple social experiences from work related ones. In the available literature on new destinations (e.g. Massey, 2008) social experiences are primarily associated with the interactions with formal and informal community groups, while insufficient attention is given to such migrants’ activities which combine self-employment, informal work and other work-related activities (e.g. childcare).

In the relation to industrial relations, the existing literature points to low trade union membership among migrants. It is explained by employers’ anti-union stances and strategies. Moreover, the studies exploring the relation between
unions and migrants in new destinations are scarce. However there is a number of studies specifically related to new destinations which should be mentioned.

Cornfield and Canak (2007, p. 9) write optimistically that ‘in this rapidly globalizing, formerly secluded areas of the nation, local labour movements and advocates for the new immigrants are beginning to form coalitions in order to address the employment problems’. In spite of this positive picture, Cornfield and Canak (2007) point to the tensions existing between trade unions and migrant advocacy groups: collectivist values of organized labour can clash with more individualistic aspirations, e.g. the inclination to promote small businesses, of the representatives of migrant groups. Another problem stems from employer strategy: when migrants have been specifically recruited to displace local unionized labour, it creates not only tensions within the community between workers from established communities, but further complicates the organizing of migrants when faced with extreme employer opposition to any form of collective representation (Grey and Woodrick, 2006).

While the analysis on trade unions is limited when it comes to new destinations, the literature contains some coverage on the use of non-union channels when dealing with the challenges related to the sphere of the labour market. Williams et al. (2009) have shown that migrants when dealing with the problems at work and beyond, can seek to establish their own groups as well to outreach local community organizations. Vasquez (2009) provided a valuable illustration of such assertions in the example of Brazilian migrants in the parts of Florida new to Latino migration. Brazilian migrants were subjected to exploitative working conditions (low pay and long working hours); they also lacked economic capital to establish formalized institutional groups or join a trade union. However migrants managed to use local and transnational networks to establish smaller, more informal migrant support groups which facilitated them in creating possibility to struggle for better conditions. It shows that non-union channels are significant even in the sphere of the labour market, since migrants for variety of reasons are not union members and the chances to join trade unions in new destinations can be even slimmer that in the major metropolitan areas.
While the literature on new destinations draws particular picture of migrant employment in certain localities, it would be also relevant to look at work experiences of CEE migrants in Britain more generally since the experiences of this social group should be seen in a broader UK context. The literature on new destination needs to be complimented by at least background coverage of labour market experiences of the new EU citizens in the UK. It is justifiable both theoretically and empirically: such literature explores the lives of migrants with the same socio-legal rights and it allows looking at the experiences in the sectors which might be also operating in such new destinations, as the one chosen for the study.

As it was argued in review articles covering the phenomenon of CEE migration to the UK (e.g. Ciupijus, 2011), this social group can be described as mobile in terms of places of settlement and the distribution in the labour market, but the jobs taken by CEE workers are concentrated in manual and low status jobs. However, while noting the reality of secondary labour market employment, some scholars see potential space for improvement. Anderson (2010, p.306) suggests that ‘European citizens are a Piorean case study, but importantly their temporariness is not state enforceable and their time horizon may indeed expand’. Schneider and Holman (2010) suggest that there is a tendency among the EU citizens to move to better jobs after spending in the UK a couple of years but add that there are multiple barriers in getting better jobs, the competency of speaking English in particular. Though not all CEEs are employed in low status and low pay jobs – there are examples of young migrants successfully entering jobs in professional services and in creative industries in such economic hubs of London and Manchester (Csedo, 2008 and Kennedy, 2010); others were conducting doctoral studies on CEE migrants at British Universities (Favell, 2008), the majority of migrants do not enjoy such kind of labour market opportunities and privileges. While there are exceptions and the mentioned scholars acknowledge the possibility of upward labour market mobility, the employment in secondary labour market tends to predominate. MacKenzie and Forde (2009) argue that such positioning can be attributed to the local labour market dynamics: when the local jobs tended to be concentrated in labour intensive and low pay sectors, it is very difficult to find alternative forms of employment.
While the possibility of paying low wages creates an obvious attraction for employers competing in cutting labour costs, the reasons behind the hiring of CEE workers differ across sectors. For examples, certain UK employers in the hotel and restaurant sector are attracted by ‘soft’ skills offered by young migrants with developed cultural capital (Lucas and Mansfield, 2010), while some employers in the construction sector are keen to tap into the supply of skilled manual labour instead of investing in vocational training and technology (Chen et al., 2010).

The available studies point to further problems at work. The problems at work include such diverse issues as the denial of holiday and sick pay, the deductions for transportation, health problems and the absence of collective representation (McDowell, 2009). The working environments are often characterised by ethnic segregation: British nationals act as managers and supervisors, while migrants overwhelmingly tend to be line workers (Hopkins, 2010).

The common theme connecting the literature on new destinations and on CEE migration to the UK acknowledges the structural barriers affected those groups of workers: migrants are concentrated in low paid and low status jobs. Those studies provide a plentitude of empirical evidence, but this kind of literature also points to a number of gaps. First of all, when it comes to experiences of work, the focus is entirely on officially sanctioned paid employment, but less on other forms of work such as informal work activities. Similarly, the studies of social participation of CEE migrants (Rayn et al., 2008) tend to divorce social experiences of migrants from those related to work. Secondly, while the existing studies are strong in their depiction of general patterns and the analysis of the nuances of labour process, it has much less to say on subjective aspects of employment, for example on how migrants reflect on their downward occupational mobility.

1.4 Ethnically motivated hostility to migrants

Williams et al. (2009) stress that migrants face additional difficulties in new destinations when compared to the metropolitan areas which have ethnically diverse populations. One of the key challenges relates to high level of ethnic intolerance.
Ethnic intolerance manifested in multiple ways. The examples primarily relate to social interactions between migrant newcomers and established local residents of ‘White’ background. The study of Shutika (2006) shows that even speaking a foreign language in a public space can provoke xenophobic acts: it is interpreted by some members of established communities as the attempt to undermine and challenge locally accepted cultural norms. Other acts of intolerance were linked to the practices of job search. When migrant men congregated around private properties in the areas where they could find casual work, e.g. in the construction, gardening or other services, it provoked negative response from some established residents: middle-class residents were prepared to benefit from labour offered by migrants, but were less tolerant to the ways migrants had to sell it (Hansen, 2005). However, the manifestations of ethnic intolerance come not only from middle-class and ‘White’ groups. The hostility directed towards newcomers can also originate from ethnic minority groups in new destinations, particularly when members of ethnic minority groups and migrant newcomers are competing for the same jobs in the local labour market (Grey and Woodrick, 2006). According to Marrow (2008), members of ethnic minority groups, especially those who already have been disadvantaged in the local labour market may display negative sentiments in relation to new arrivals if they feel that new groups are used by employers in the private sector to cut wages, intensify the labour process or even to displace them by low cost labour altogether. In such instances, xenophobia is not restricted to the ‘White’ majority, but extends to other groups anxious of changes and fears associated with migration.

The hostile reception of new arrivals is deepened by the perception of them being only temporary labour migrants rather than permanent residents: it is argued that such views implicitly contribute to the atmosphere of ethnic intolerance (Fennelly, 2005).

International research has also shown that new destinations located in the regions with a distinctive ethnic and religious mix can require from newcomers to confront additional forms of social exclusion (Solorzano, 2005): for example the structure of the economy of US state of Utah, which has been traditionally based on the religious mobilisation of Mormon community, tends to marginalise new incomers
not simply because of their different ethnic background, but because they are seen as a threat to the established ethno-religious domination in local economy and society. In contrast, Mormon migrants and converters to the faith (including those of Non-European ‘White’ background) receive support and assistance from the local business and religious establishment (Solorzano, 2005).

Fennelly (2008) studied different forms of racist narratives reproduced by individuals coming from ‘White’ ethnic background. According to the findings (Fennelly, 2008), individuals from middle-class background tended to express their racial prejudice by referring to the images of perfect and harmonious past, the time when the locality was ‘free’ of new arrivals and social problems attributed to them. The local past, in which migrants were absent, was portrayed as peaceful. In contrast, the arrival of migrants is associated with the disintegration of community and increase in crime and discord. In the US working class anti-migrant sentiment acquired a dimension related to social class: migrants were seen not only as a competitive group, but as a group threatening the established compromise between ‘White’ capital represented by local business community and ‘White’ organized labour (Fennelly, 2008). Migrants were also resented for the alleged preferential treatment received from statutory social agencies (Hernandez-Leon and Zuniga, 2006). The consequence of such tensions was the destabilization of traditional ethnic relations in which many members of local ‘White’ working class felt betrayed by the local business community and upper middle classes who benefit from migration economically, and threatened by migrants when it comes to the competition for work, housing and the use of statutory social support (Hernandez-Leon and Zuniga, 2006).

While ethnic intolerance is specific to localities, it is also a national phenomenon. Hence it would be necessary to focus on the UK context more generally. The issue of ethnic tensions associated with CEE migration to Britain has come out in a number of studies. Overall, the analysis tends to highlight the link between the competition for jobs and social services on one hand and the tension existing between newly arrived CEE migrants and members of established communities. Reed and Latorre (2009) point to the negative local impacts on low-skilled British workers who have to compete with new arrivals in low wage labour markets.
Pemberton (2009) argued that if CEE workers are seen as a social group undercutting wages and displacing low-skilled British workers in low-wage sectors, it can lead to the negative reactions of British workers and their family members. The study looking at workplace dynamics has shown that CEE migrants are subjected to various ethnic stereotyping by employers, which sometimes leads to open abuse justified on ethnic grounds (EHRC, 2010).

Moreover, the expression of hostile feeling is not restricted to the people of ‘White’ British background. In their focus group interviews Cook et al. (2011) documented tensions between new arrivals from CEE and members of established ethnic minority communities, who perceived this group of migrants as potential competitors for jobs and social services. On their side, some CEEs reveal a repertoire of racial prejudice directed against people of Black and Asian background. They rationalise it by referring to their supposed superiority represented by ‘White’ European origins and the possession of EU citizenship (McDowell, 2009). However other studies suggested that the origins of ethnic intolerance went beyond the competition for the jobs and services: Garvey and Stewart (2015) demonstrated how the newness of migration to the North of Ireland (compared to other parts of British Isles), combined with the local context of sectarianism and on-going tensions between Republican and Loyalist communities reinforced xenophobic attitudes to migrants.

In general, the literature on ethnic tensions reveals certain underlying structural problems linked to the sphere of the labour market as well as to the persistence of social stereotypes. However, the discussed studies do not tackle the experiences of ethnic intolerance affecting CEE migrants in everyday life. On the other hand, the most extreme manifestation of intolerance – racism, receive greater coverage in the literature dedicated to the experiences of dispersed non EU migrants. A selective review of those studies is going to be provided next.

In the context of migration to the UK, the manifestations of ethnic intolerance are explored in the studies focused on migrants’ post-settlement experiences in the areas affected by the policy of dispersal. Grillo (2005) investigated the manifestations of racism in the language used by local politicians and journalists in
the case of a seaside English town chosen as an area of dispersal by UK government. Grillo (2005) identified the main narrative which this researcher labeled as the discourse of localism. This discourse both relied on the implicit and explicit manifestations of racism. The explicit dimension was linked to equating migration to terrorism and other forms of criminal violence. This was particularly propagated by the far right British National Party. In contrast, the implicit racist discourse rejected arrival of dispersed migrants on the grounds of additional economic burden and pressures on local ‘White’ British communities who were confronted with the unexpected increase in new ethnic diversity.

Robinson et al. (2003) discovered similar manifestations of intolerance in the analysis of national newspapers. Most tabloid papers tended to portray dispersed non EU migrants as individuals whose culture was incompatible with British norms and values. The neighborhoods in which migrants were housed were described by the media as the areas of street violence, crime and sex work. On the other hand, while broadsheets did not employ such explicit racist rhetoric, its portrayal of dispersed migrants was still determined by the agenda set by the anti-immigration discourse. The implication of such discourses was the production of moral panic associated with the settlement of non EU migrants: the dispersal of migrants was linked with the fears over community breakdown, crime and the proliferation of infectious diseases (Robinson et al., 2003 and Grillo, 2005). Dispersed migrants who arrived to the UK as refugees were portrayed not as legitimate victims of events beyond their control, but as dangerous burden on local ‘White’ British communities (Robinson et al., 2003). Such kind of discourses created a homogenously negative image of dispersed migrants (Finney and Robinson, 2008).

Some authors have argued that such stereotyping led to greater ethnic intolerance on a local level. Robinson et al. (2003) also tend to believe that when the media coverage was neutral or positive, the scale of hostility directed against dispersed migrant was weaker. Robinson et al. (2003) cite the example of the Kosovan scheme when a general sympathetic portrayal of the plight of Kosovar Albanians migrants led to more benign receptions in the areas to which they have been dispersed. Finney and Robinson (2008) also noted that local newspapers had played their role in reinforcing or challenging negative images of dispersed
migrants: in their comparison of two local papers in Yorkshire and Wales, Finney and Robinson (2008) had shown how Welsh journalists consciously adapted an approach aimed to explain the life histories of dispersed migrants to local public and highlight positive aspects associated with migration rather than to demonize new arrivals. In contrast, the Yorkshire paper presented the arrival of dispersed migrants as a strategy of national authorities designed to soften the impact of migration on London and the South of England at the expense of putting greater ‘burden’ on a poorer North. As a result, the dispersal of migrants to the city of Leeds was described in a pre-dominantly negative way (Finney and Robinson, 2008).

Such evidence suggests that the perceptions of dispersal are shaped by the interplay of national and local discourses. Moreover, those actors who are involved in creating those perceptions can shape them in one or another way. It should be noted that the discourses of intolerance towards migrants settling in the areas as a result of dispersal can be found not only in mass media and among policy makers, but among ordinary members of the public. Millington (2010) considers racist and xenophobic narratives directed against asylum seekers as the extensions of middle class identities of local ‘White’ British residents. Millington (2010) argued that the manifestations of hostility to migrants should be understood through a dual prism of the dynamics of local context and class identification of established residents: when middle class established residents would feel that the arrival of dispersed migrants endangered the socio-economic status of their areas of residence, they would employ a set of ethnic stereotypes aimed to separate themselves from those migrants.

Overall, the study of Millington (2010) and others provide a relevant analysis when it comes to the manifestations of racism, xenophobia and intolerance. However it largely focuses on the racist narratives employed by ‘White’ British residents, UK politicians and mass media. It says less on how migrants respond to and reflect on their experiences of hostility directed against them in everyday life. Moreover, by focusing primarily on ‘White’ racism and on dispersed non EU migrants, the literature does not explore xenophobia directed against and experienced by CEE migrants. Such gap points to the need to incorporate CEE migrants (who are, with
an exception of Roma, perceived as ‘White’ Europeans) into the study of local manifestations of racism and xenophobia. Moreover, it would be worthwhile to explore whether and how the difference in structurally mechanism (UK dispersal versus EU freedom of movement) contribute to local manifestations of ethnic intolerance.

In conclusion of this section, it should be noted that all three strands of research – the one exclusively dedicated to migration to new destination, the study of CEE migration and the work conducted on the dispersal of non EU migrants tend not only to focus racism and related phenomena, but also reflect on the ways in which both migrants and members of established communities seek to counteract to it. Williams et al. (2009) stressed that the existence of hostility towards migrants and the weakness of existing migrant communities could be compensated by migrants’ determination to establish their own groups, which in turn will seek to outreach local community organizations formed by established residents. Vasquez (2009) revealed how migrants, when faced with exploitative working conditions and ethnic intolerance, managed to use local and transnational networks to establish smaller, more informal migrant support groups which facilitated them in creating spaces for social relations and religious self-expression.

According to Steigenga and Williams (2009), when responding to social isolation created by racism, migrants tend to mobilise alongside ethnic lines, relying primarily on ethnic solidarity. Palma et al. (2009) demonstrated that transnational connections – the continuous relations with the relatives in sending countries, often compensated for the lack of social support in the areas considered to be both new and hostile to inward migration. Those groups were used to provide collective protection from the persecution of hostile local authorities and residents. Moreover, transnational networks can not only affect migrant livelihood strategies, but also forge links between sending countries and new destinations: Grey and Woodrick (2006) provided examples of how the members of ‘White’ English speaking, established communities in new destinations, e.g. in the teaching profession, got involved in raising funds in support of social services in the countries from which migrant communities originated from. The cooperation between local community organizations and migrant groups can also be fruitful.
On a local level both Catholic and Protestant Churches are being used as the sites of social interactions between the members of established community and migrant newcomers; the Churches provide important meeting spaces, which is often lacking in the workplace or neighborhood levels (Shutika, 2008). All of it leads towards changing perceptions of new destinations or, as Shutika (2008, p.276) puts it, to locality production: ‘it also encompasses the expansion of meaningful relationships and social networks, especially between newcomers and the established community so that they are connected to each other and their locale. Newcomers are no longer seen as transient, but “people who belong”. In this sense, the boundaries between newcomers and long-term residents begin to subside’.

There are other positive developments involving dispersed non EU migrants in the UK specifically. Griffiths et al. (2006) reveal that the dispersal of non EU migrants was accompanied by the rise of new refugee community organizations characterised by ethnic and religious diversity: in dispersed areas migrants tend to establish communities based on wider sense of kinship and solidarity, e.g. African communities representing migrants from the Great Lakes region, instead of prioritizing more narrow national and ethnic identities. It can be argued that such communities help to respond to both individual and collective challenges, including those related to ethnic intolerance.

The discussion of this section has shown that the scholars tend to place great importance onto the local context when exploring the manifestations of ethnic intolerance. Such focus resulted in the accumulation of substantial research material. However the discussion has also pointed to a notable research gap: when it comes to the experiences of ethnic intolerance of CEE migrants, the available literature largely remains silent. This is surprising given the scale of migration from CEE countries.

The final major issue, which has not only received attention of the studies related to new destinations but it is also relevant to forthcoming empirical analysis, is linked to the experiences of housing. It is going to be considered next.
1.5 The experiences of housing

The issue of housing received some attention in the literature, although it has been far less explored issue when compared to the subjects of paid employment or even ethnic intolerance. Painter and Yu (2010) cite more affordable housing costs as one of the reasons behind migrants’ choices to settle in medium-sized urban localities which were previously largely unaffected by international migration. At the same time, the literature points to the forms of social exclusion associated with the housing experiences of migrants in new destinations. In one such example, the production in the meat packing was based on the principle of twenty four hours operation, workers in order to make saving from low-wages paid by employers would not only share accommodations but rotate beds: three or four workers might sleep in the same bed, adjusting themselves to shift patterns (Schoenholtz, 2005). The deduction from wages for housing is also not uncommon: such practice reduces incomes of migrant workers as well as makes it more difficult for them to seek jobs elsewhere (Donato et al., 2006). The same authors conclude that tied accommodation – the dependence on employers in the sphere of housing, makes migrants less mobile in the local labour market (Donato et al., 2006).

As EU citizens, CEE migrants have the right to access social housing in the UK. However, Currie (2008) notes that UK policy makers have been seeking to restrict the access by imposing the requirement to be in continuous paid employment for more than one year. Such policy has automatically excluded unemployed migrants and new arrivals. Currie (2008) also argues that it created additional insecurities and discouraged family migration. Drawing from interviews with Polish migrants and representatives of employment agencies, Currie (2008) has gathered empirical evidence related to the experiences of housing of the new EU citizens in the UK. The majority of migrants interviewed by Currie (2008) were renting from private landlords or employers. Moreover, since they were working in low paid jobs, they could not secure mortgages and buy properties. Renting privately and with employer, most commonly with employment agency, was associated with a
number of negative characteristics: sometimes the number of people living in one room reached half a dozen. While migrants recognised certain advantages of renting directly from employers, e.g. the difficulties of accessing housing using alternative channels, they also expressed a considerable degree of dissatisfaction over the quality of housing. Employers would prioritise providing housing to higher skilled workers, which put less skilled (at least from the employer point of view) labour migrants into more insecure position in terms of their housing arrangements. Currie (2008) concludes that when the form of housing arrangement is determined by employers and is tied to paid employment, it can affect negatively migrants’ ability to build autonomous family lives outside the workplace.

While Currie (2008) produced a qualitative account of CEE migrants’ housing experiences, Robinson (2007) looked at secondary quantitative data related to the use of social housing by the new EU citizens in Britain. Robinson (2007) began the analysis from stating that the issue of housing has been neglected by scholars. It contrasts it to the amount of attention given to the labour market issues. At the same time, social housing became a divisive issue, when mainstream politicians resorted to blaming the housing shortages for ethnic tensions and started to call for the imposition of housing restrictions on CEE migrants. By looking at the available data, Robinson (2007) rejects claims that migrants’ receive preferential treatment in the sphere of social housing. Robinson (2007, p.110) concludes that ‘the point is that the divisive assertion that migrant workers are somehow stealing a march on long-standing residents and gaining access to the scare resource that is social housing is not supported by available evidence and is not part of the change currently being wrought by migration from the EU accession states’. At same time, there is some evidence indicating the existence of homelessness among CEE migrants in Britain (Henley, 2014), which would suggest that this particular social group needs to have the access to social housing rather than face new restrictions.

On the other hand, the existing evidence on housing experiences of CEE migrants is contradictory. There are regional differences: for example, the study of Polish migrants living in Glasgow conducted by McGhee et al. (2013) had shown that when compared to the difficulties in England, newly arrived CEE migrants in
Scotland could access social housing relatively easy. Moreover, this particular group of migrants in Glasgow would find their post-migratory housing arrangements to be superior when compared with their pre-migratory living in Poland. The migrants interviewed by McGhee et al. (2013) generally valued the possibility to access social housing – it gave newly arrived Polish migrants a feeling of protection in the face of the instability in the labour market. At the same time, there were concerns over the areas in which social housing was provided: migrants felt that they had to live in the least desirable neighborhoods.

In a different study of housing experiences of CEE migrants, Pemberton (2009) observed the existence of certain tensions between settled residents and newly arrived migrants. One of the reasons was related not only to the concern over housing but to the perception that newly arrived CEE migrants could act as competitors in the local labour market. From their side, the migrants studied by Pemberton (2009) felt a certain degree of distance in relation to their neighbors coming from settled background not only in terms of their national origins but when it came to the level of their education and the variety of cultural interests.

The situation of dispersed non EU migrants is different when compared to CEE migrants from the EU: dispersed migrants do get social housing automatically, however they do not have a choice over the area of settlement. Moreover, although dispersed migrants get social housing, the provision itself can be sub-contracted to the private sector. This form of arrangement has its own downsides: Hynes (2009) shows that dispersed non EU migrants in the UK are often being housed in substandard private accommodation which sometimes lack basic bathing facilities and are often subjected to unwarranted visits by private landlords.

On the other hand, Stewart (2003) argues that non EU migrants would stay in dispersed areas when the quality is housing is sufficiently good rather than engage in secondary migration to more traditional migratory destinations within the UK.

The reviewed literature on housing provides a relevant context of one aspect of migrant lives in new destinations. It points to the problems related both to private and public sector provisions. However it has notable gaps: while the literature on
new destinations provides a relevant context in analyzing experiences of dispersed and irregular migrants, it does not include the dimension related to CEE migration to the UK (e.g. Stewart, 2011). On the other hand, the studies on the housing experiences of CEE migrants either exclusively examine private renting or engage in quantitative mapping of migrants’ access to social housing. Both strands of literature do not incorporate the local dimension into the analysis. Instead the reviewed studies tend to detach the housing issue from the specific area of settlement or examine it from the national perspective. Such gaps point to the need for greater qualitative research of migrants’ housing experiences in the localities which could be described as new destinations.

**Conclusions**

After reviewing the studies which have been deemed relevant in providing a contextual background for the upcoming empirical analysis and interpretation, it would be possible to make the following conclusions. The aim of the literature review was to show that the debate surrounding migration to new destinations could be treated as a distinctive topic of academic inquiry. Moreover, instead of solely focusing on the studies highlighting the particularity of receiving localities, it was done through the complementing of the existing literature on new destinations by the studies relevant to migrants’ experiences in the UK more generally. The literature review has demonstrated that in order to explore labour market and social experiences of migrants who have settled in the area which could be described as a new destination in the UK, it is necessary to examine social processes from a number of angles. In order to understand the origins of migration, scholars have to take into the account the contexts of the countries of origin and the receiving state (the UK). It was shown that socio-economic and political changes in post-communist societies have influenced individual and family coping mechanisms. Migration became a livelihood strategy for individuals and families, particularly for those CEEs aiming to improve the level of income and escape the lack of prospects in sending countries. However for others, more specifically for non EU migrants who were dispersed to new destinations, the act
of migration became an escape strategy – a response to the extreme instability in the countries of origin. On the other hand, migration of all social groups was influenced by the UK and EU migration policies. The factors specific to the destination has also played a role: migrants would arrive because local UK employers’ have been keen on attracting migrant labour enabling them to maintain numerical flexibility. In other words, EU labour migrants residing in new destinations have been affected by their own decisions, national policies and the local labour market conditions. In contrasts, the studies suggest that non EU migrants often arrive to new destinations because of restrictive UK dispersal policies.

As a result of diverse structural mechanisms and individual/family based choices, EU labour migrants and dispersed non EU migrants would settle in the localities in the UK which could be described as new destinations. In the case of CEE migrants, the arrival routes are associated with the use of such distinctive migration mechanisms as informal social networks and labour market intermediaries. In other words, the arrival trajectory was not only shaped by institutional labour market actors, but also by migrants themselves. Local employers also play a direct role in attracting CEE migrants since they are responsible for creating and sustaining labour migration flows. Those employers tend to be based in low wage and labour intensive sectors. As a result, migrants in the local labour market tend to be concentrated mostly in low pay and unattractive jobs, e.g. in the meatpacking and recycling sectors. At the same time, the local realities of work reflect general patterns of the divisions existing in the labour market and its impact on migrants. The analysis has also highlighted two specific challenges facing migrants in new destinations: firstly, the problem related to ethnic intolerance, and secondly, the issue of housing. It was shown that although those issues are rooted in local social dynamics, e.g. relative ethnic homogeneity or the scarcity of affordable housing, they are also influenced by national structural contexts, particularly the competition for jobs and services.

The balance of argument would suggest that neither the stress on the particularity of new destinations, nor the continuous significance of national structural dimensions should be downplayed or dismissed. Similarly, while reflecting on the
importance of structural patterns related to local and national contexts, scholars need to pay attention to the dimension associated with migrants’ agency. That would include the manifestations of individual subjectivities, the relations within the family and personal decisions made during and after the migration process. Furthermore, those manifestations of migrants’ agency should be considered in the context of such structural influences as EU freedom of movement (including its social implications, e.g. housing) and UK dispersal policies. The mapping of those structural policies has direct implications for forthcoming empirical analysis: the narratives of interviewed migrants are not going to be treated as individual stories existing in a vacuum. In contrast, migrant participants are going to be represented as individuals who make autonomous choices in the context shaped by structural policies as well as personal and family-based preferences. The dimensions of structure and agency are going to be treated not separately but in conjunction, e.g. the individual acts of migration of CEE migrants are going to be treated as a part of EU freedom of movement. Hence this literature review not only provides a relevant context and points to existing research gaps which this doctoral thesis aims to fill, but provides analytical tools in interpreting original empirical data.

The forthcoming empirical parts are going to use analytical tools of existing literature as well as try to compensate it shortcomings. However, first of all, it is time to consider the methodological issues.
Chapter 2: Research Methodology

Introducing the chapter’s structure

The main purpose of this chapter will be to review the issues concerning research methodology, i.e. to show how the study was envisioned, designed and conducted. Firstly, in the section 2.1, the analysis will focus on ontological and epistemological issues relevant to this research project. Interpretivism – the philosophy of social science adapted for this study is going to receive a substantive coverage. The discussion of the interpretivist philosophy is not going to be conducted in an abstract way, but instead it will be linked with data interpretation. Subsequently, the review in the section 2.2 will proceed by the discussion of general principles of grounded theory and its application to this study. Thirdly, in the section 2.3, the focus will move towards the discussion of research techniques employed for data collection. In the section 2.4, it is going to be followed by a consideration of ethical dilemmas specific to the study. One of those dilemmas – the choice of language in interviews and more specifically the process of translation of interviewees’ narratives will be discussed in a separate section 2.5. A brief outline of the locality’s socio-historic context combined with the presentation of demographic data is going to conclude this chapter.

2.1 Interpretivism: the philosophy of social science and its implications for the study

The study’s philosophical perspective is closely linked to its theoretical and methodological frameworks. The most accurate description of the study could be articulated in the following way: it is an inductive, qualitative research project focused onto the exploration of social worlds through a multiplicity of qualitative research methods. Following the logic of grounded theory, through the interpretation of empirical data, the analysis seeks to construct a theoretically sound explanation of gathered research material. When it comes to social science
philosophy, grounded theory is most commonly associated with interpretivism (Charmaz, 2006). Moreover, the study’s purported aim was described as the intention to understand social worlds of migrants through their narratives – such intention puts the study’s philosophical views firmly within the boundaries of interpretivism.

The philosophy of interpretivism makes a priori assumptions when it comes to the description of social reality. The interpretivist standpoint assumes that social reality can exist only if individuals are able to see and interpret it (Blumer, 1969 and Charmaz, 2006). Social reality rests on the interactions between social actors, and even more importantly through the meanings attributed to those interactions by the actors involved. Such understanding provides an epistemological background: individuals describe social reality through the language. Thus by paying attention to the language, researchers can learn on the ways individuals relate themselves to social reality (Charmaz, 2006 and Schwandt, 1994). Epistemological views over the nature of knowledge are backed by broader ontological assumptions. It is argued that social reality is inseparable from a human act of interpretation (Schwandt, 1994). Social scientists working within the interpretivist tradition should strive to understand social reality from the point of view of research participants (Schwandt, 1994). The process of understanding is seen not as a deductive practice or as the imposition of external theoretical constructs, but as an act of interpretation, which treats the testimonies of participants as texts representing the multitude of social meanings which in turn are expected to be de-coded by social scientists (Geertz, 1973). In contrast to ‘lay’ readers who are dealing with literary sources, researchers are expected to engage with what Plummer (2001) calls the documents of life: ethnographic observations, texts produced by participants (notably, the study by Znaniecki and Thomas (1958) cited in Plummer (2001), which pioneered both a grounded theory approach and looked at the phenomenon of migration, and was based on the interpretations of letters written by Polish peasant migrants in early 20th century America) and, most commonly, oral histories which are conceived as biographical narratives.

The interpretivist standpoint rejects logical empiricism associated with the positivist tradition: the stress is not on the verification of the facts and
establishment of patterns, but on the imaginative understanding of what research participants are trying to express through their narratives and other documents of life (Plummer, 2001). The understanding of participants’ experiences is a dynamic one. They are seen as social agents, who are conceived as ‘autonomous, intentional, active, goal directed; they construe, construct, and interpret their own behaviour and that of their fellow agents’ (Schwandt, 1994, p.120).

The interpretivist approach is not only concerned with the discovery of social worlds through the interpretation of qualitative and ethnographic materials, but it places a central emphasis on the role of researchers. The interpretivist vision of researcher is very different from the positivist quest for objectivity and neutrality. The opposite is the case: in all levels of researcher’s involvement, whether in data gathering or interpretation, researchers are seen as a participant in generating data and creating meanings: researcher’s conduct during interviewing hers/his class, ethnic and gender identity - all of it contributes towards the ways social reality is being represented (Schwandt, 1994). It is argued that the researcher’s subjectivity cannot be removed from the research process; instead it should be reflected and treated alongside gathered materials. It does not mean that the research process and data which it generates are always unique and unrepeatable: e.g. Denzin (1994) is a strong advocate of interpretivist stance in a postmodernist form, yet even this author, concedes that different researchers can get very similar answers to the questions they investigate. However, it is up to individual researchers to go beyond the subjectivities of research participants and their own positionality (e.g. the influences stemming from their own social identity), and articulate an imaginative interpretation of social phenomena. The interpretations are not based on prescriptions imported from external theoretical models, but on the researcher’s reflexivity and continuous interaction with qualitative material jointly accumulated with research participants (Charmaz, 2006).

Interpretivism is seen as a philosophical background underpinning the approach of grounded theory (Chamaz, 2006). According to Charmaz (2006), a number of features make interpretivist philosophy and grounded theory methodology compatible. Both call for the immersion into participants’ social worlds either through observation or in-depth interviewing. What is also significant is the
inductive and exploratory nature of grounded theory: the focus is on finding research techniques capable of revealing social processes interesting to researchers, not on imposing objective techniques capable of measuring and describing social phenomena. Blumer (1969, p. 41) specifically stresses this dimension: it is argued that the research techniques applied to the study of social life ‘may involve direct observation, interviewing of people, listening to their conversations, securing life-history accounts...There is no protocol to be followed in the use of any of these procedures; the procedures should be adapted to its circumstances and guided by judgement of is propriety and fruitfulness’. In other words, the interpretivist philosophy invites researchers to be flexible when it comes to the choice of research methods: the dynamics of fieldwork determine which qualitative methods are chosen to investigate social processes, not vice versa. The priority is given not to the statically pre-arranged research design and research schedule, but to researcher’s own reflexivity, i.e. her/his ability to grasp the changing dynamics of research process and understand participants’ social worlds (Charmaz, 2006).

Such position also requires from researchers a continuous reflection of one’s own positionality in order to reflect on personal subjectivities: while it is impossible to eliminate one’s own subjectivity, personal opinions or political views should not determine the interpretation of empirical findings (Geertz, 1973). However, in spite of questioning the ability of researchers to be objective in a positivist sense, the advocates of interpretivism argue against impressionistic and perfunctory approach to data collection and interpretation (Geertz, 1973). Denzin (1994) stresses that the researcher, who belongs to the interpretivist tradition, should provide a clear indication of her/his sampling strategy, indicate the number of interviews, review the demographic characteristics of research participants and clarify the objectives of research questions. A continuous note taking and transcription of interviews is encouraged (Charmaz, 2006). Moreover researchers should not cross ethical lines generally recognised by social science scholars working within alternative paradigms. Although the line between the researcher and researched is more blurred than in other philosophical perspectives, it is stressed that researchers should avoid going native, at least in a full way
(Schwandt, 1994). Instead a model of ‘marginal’ native, a researcher immersed in social worlds of interviewees, but at the same aware of ethical norms and research objectives, is advocated by Schwandt (1994).

Similarly, researchers are called not to reproduce narratives of participants, but to understand and theorize them (Plummer, 2001). The aim of the researcher is not only to describe the subjectivity of lived experiences of individuals and social groups, but to show how individuals and social groups are making sense of the social worlds which they inhabit and, crucially, to provide original theoretical explanations. Those explanations are built on the analysis of social worlds of individuals, which acknowledges both the autonomous potential of human agency and the contextual influence of social structures. Drawing on one of the inspirational ideas of interpretivism – the French existentialism, Plummer (2001, p.164) insists that ‘this method is a way of reading a life through moving both backwards (to sources and conditions in class, race, gender, emotion, etc) and forwards (to pragmatics and consequences) from a key event in person’s life-linking all these to wider issues of history and culture throughout. It is a method of ‘totalization’, trying to see ways through the whole life by moving through it and connecting to wider issues’. To sum up, although the researchers belonging to the interpretivist tradition seek to reveal personally unique experiences and emotions, as social scientists they have a duty to place them within a broader context underpinned by structural divisions.

To stress once again, the interpretivist philosophy of this study intrinsically linked with personal experience of the fieldwork and theoretical stances developed through the research process. A more detailed analysis of how interpretivist philosophy manifested itself in the fieldwork and data analysis will be conducted in three subsequent sections; at this point, a concluding comment over the extent to which interpretivism has influenced the fieldwork and interpretations seems to be appropriate and adequate.

Interviews with participants have resulted in the production of complex individual and family narratives. The produced narratives can be treated as a form of oral reflections over social interactions in the labour market, the places of residences
and elsewhere. Those experiences came out in the interviews in the form of narratives which were produced in the process of my (acting in the role of the researcher) interactions with participants. Participants’ testimonies and actions gave me insights into their social worlds which they themselves performed, created and interpreted, while being interviewed and observed by me. Those experiences were communicated to a specific person – a doctoral researcher from CEE background (who moved from the Republic of Lithuania to the UK in 2006) and as such the interviews included a form of dialogue, in which certain contexts and nuances, e.g. emotionality, were visible only to the researcher and the researched. Participants’ narratives, actions and opinions have been treated as summative articulations of experiences related to migration: they provided the insights on how the individual ‘self’ was formed through interactions with family members, co-migrants and co-workers, representatives of statutory/voluntary groups, employers and members of wider established communities in Northtown.

It is important to recognize that similarly to everyday interactions in which they played a role of conscious social agents, in the interviews participants also shaped the images of themselves in the ways which carried social meanings to them. In some ways, participants’ narratives were forms of self-reflections and self-interpretations communicated to me as a researcher – the participants were interpreting their own lives by creating oral narratives. Hence the research encounters and raw data which came out from them can be understood through the use of conceptual framework associated with the interpretivist philosophy.

The second layer of interpretivism can be detectable in data analysis: on one hand, I have consciously been trying to preserve various subjectivities of migrants’ testimonies, e.g. their ways to express their feelings by relying on certain expressions (e.g. the emphasis on ethnicity in the narratives such as ‘We Poles…’). However, on the other hand I have engaged in structural readings of their testimonies, the readings which took into the account both human agency with its properties of autonomy and individuality but also social structures within which participants had to position themselves. Moreover, it should be stressed that those interpretations were built on thick descriptions coming from participants, not imposed on them in order to illustrate pre-existing theoretical assumptions. In
other words, the subjectivity of individual testimonies and the role of social structure were not position against each other, but brought together in the act of theoretical interpretation. The act of theoretical interpretation has also performed a function of producing knowledge acceptable by social scientists as opposed to superficial and impressionistic depiction of social processes associated with journalism (Bloor, 1991): lived experiences of participants through the framework of grounded theory were translated into a methodologically and conceptually sound understanding of what does it mean to be a migrant in a medium-sized town in the North of England.

To conclude, interpretivism is well suited in providing philosophical underpinning for the study: whether one examines the way research encounters are being treated or the meanings assigned to participants’ narratives, the assumptions over the constitution of social reality or the conception of knowledge produced through data gathering and interpretation, interpretivism seems to provide understanding and justification for the logic of this study. It is particularly well equipped in allowing both to dedicate attention to human individuality and subjectivity as well as to bring various structural dimensions into the discussion, when empirical material allows doing so.

The discussion so far was focused on research philosophy. However it was also mentioned that methodologically the study adapted a grounded theory approach – the approach closely associated with interpretivism. The main principles of grounded theory and its implications for the study are going to be introduced next.

### 2.2 The chosen methodology: the grounded theory approach

Conceptually, grounded theory was first articulated by Glaser and Strauss (1999); those authors explicitly positioned it against the positivist paradigm which mirrored conceptualizations physical/natural sciences. Glaser and Strauss (1999) advocated an inductive, bottom up approach: in contrast to the positivist paradigm, which aimed to break down social processes into numerically measurable parameters and repeating patterns, grounded theory aimed to construct understandings of social reality on the basis of qualitative data (see also
Charmaz, 2006). Glaser and Strauss (1999) used a variety of examples in illustrating the principles of grounded theory, including those coming from the field of work and employment, for example the classical study of alienation conducted by Blauner (1964). While I have read the classical text by Glaser and Strauss (1999), it was the text by Charmaz (2006) on constructing grounded theory and its application to qualitative analysis, which I found to be the most helpful as well as closed to my own data gathering and data analysis experience. Charmaz (2006) work is particularly relevant since similarly to the traditions of symbolic interactionism (Goffman, 1990) and symbolic anthropology (Geertz, 1973), Charmaz (2006) not only pays in-depth attention to the micro dynamics of social interactions, but compliments it with a call to contextualise individual experiences within the macro structures of power and inequality. Thus, it would be logical to introduce central principles of grounded theory by using the text written by Charmaz (2006) as a starting point. Furthermore, a background review of grounded theory is needed in order to illustrate from where I am coming as a researcher. The review is going to be followed by the illustration of how general principles of grounded theory applied to this specific study.

According to Charmaz (2006), the researcher who had adapted a grounded theory approach should strive to combine the processes of data collection and data analysis. In other words, the process of data analysis and collection are treated as inseparable, they should go hand in hand. It is expected that such strategy would lead to the emergence of analytic codes from the data. Significantly, it assists researchers in developing empirically based theorisations instead of projecting pre-conceived theoretical constructs on the data. Charmaz (2006) advocates the immersion into the gathered data – the use of existing data in developing new questions and also the comparisons between different segments of qualitative research material. More controversially, Charmaz (2006) argues that literature search should be conducted after the analysis of data has been completed and after the newly discovered theory has emerged already from empirical findings. It is argued that by doing so researchers would avoid squeezing data analysis towards theoretical constructs external to the data and won’t undermine the main
principle of grounded theory – constructing theory on the basis of original empirical findings.

Grounded theory’s particular advantage lies in its continuing examination of emerging data, which does not preclude a re-formulation of research questions (Charmaz, 2006). However, this strategy does not deny researchers’ the right to have distinctive disciplinary and theoretical standpoints. Before going to the field, researchers may have wide ranging ideas about what kind of social phenomena they are planning to examine. Moreover, the existing scholarship of the subject can affect the trajectory of their initial research questions. In dealing with such seeming contradictions, Charmaz (2006) draws on the tradition of symbolic interactionism, a sociological tradition going back to the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, which had a significant influence on the formulation of grounded theory. Thus, it would make sense to refer to the original sources of symbolic interactionism, mainly to the known works of Blumer (1969) who explicitly explored the relation between the application of theoretical concepts and the process of data collection. According to Blumer (1969), it is unavoidable for researchers to have theoretical concepts related to the processes which they plan to explore. Moreover, a reflective employment of such concepts is seen as an integral part of the research process: initial ideas and assumptions ‘are significant elements in the prior scheme that the scholar has of the empirical world; they are usually the categories for which data are sought and in which the data are grouped; they usually become the chief means for establishing relations between data; and they are usually the anchor points in interpretation of findings’ (Blumer, 1969, p.26).

The logic of such argument clearly recognises the need to have wider analytical concepts before undertaking the fieldwork. At the same time, Blumer (1969) and later Charmaz (2006) strongly emphasize that initial concepts should be used as points of departure, not as ultimate theoretical constructs dictating the dynamics of research process. They are tentative in nature, and should be adjusted to the emergent empirical data. As Dey (2004, p.83) stressed, ’in grounded theory, too, there was no grand theory that could be presumed to make predictions in advance of analysis’.
While the significance or pre-fieldwork preparation should not be underplayed, the treatment of emerging data received much greater attention in the works of grounded theory advocates. The key operational technique intrinsic to grounded theory research is data coding. For Charmaz (2006, p.43), ‘coding means naming segments of data with a label that simultaneously categorizes, summarizes, and accounts for each piece of data’. The purpose of coding is not simply to break down data into smaller pieces, but to organise it into analytic units. Thus, coding is a first step of interpreting: researchers not only read and re-read their data and label its segments, but actively interact with research material and make choices over its sequences and meanings. Coding allows researchers to define the social process, which they have chosen to explore (Charmaz, 2006). Through consistent immersion into the data and its coding, researchers both contextualise and theorize it. While the former places separate pieces of data within a broader research framework, the latter allows researchers to transcend spatial and temporal subjectivities of analysed data (Charmaz, 2006).

Charmaz (2006) strongly advises to combine data collection with coding: listening and reading through already gathered research material can help researchers to identify new leads, and reflect on his/her mistakes. Coding should not be confused with the imposition of meta-theoretical constructs on data: on the contrary, coding is understood as a process in which researchers actively construct analytic categories from the data (Charmaz, 2006).

There are different types of coding from word to word coding to line to line, and episode to episode. A more analytical type of coding is represented by what Charmaz (2006) calls focused coding: this practice is based on coding bigger chunks of text and is seen as a move towards introduction of analytical categories. In all types of coding, the preference is given to the coding of transcribed interview material rather than raw research notes. However, since grounded theory approach often combines in-depth interviewing with observations, Charmaz (2006) suggests to treat all contextual material as data and to code it. Thus the codes can emerge from the observations made in spaces in which interviews are conducted – e.g. participants’ places of residence, work, worship, education and entertainment.
All of it constitutes ethnographic research material, which could and should be coded.

Alongside data coding, grounded theory requires researchers to engage in memo-writing. Memo writing occupies an intermediate stage in data interpretation: it performs the role of intermediate step bridging descriptive coding to writing a draft containing empirical analysis. According to Charmaz (2006), memo-writing should be treated as an informal writing exercise and as a form of reflexive diary produced by researcher on her/his empirical material. The importance of this activity lies in the discovery of reoccurring patterns among focused codes (Strauss and Glazer, 1999 and Charmaz, 2006).

Thematic grouping of the codes containing overlapping content or their clustering leads towards the discovery of analytical categories. The discovery of analytical categories is seen as a further step in data analysis; their aim is to ‘explicate ideas, events, or processes…a category may subsume common themes and patterns in several codes’ (Charmaz, 2006, p.91). Researchers need to compare focused codes across their data: the categories are formed in the process of cross-comparison between different sets of transcribed interview material. It draws not from a single interview or observation but from multiple interviews/observations conducted with participants. This process of bringing scattered codes together and drawing a coherent system of analytical categories is being seen as fundamentally important (Charmaz, 2006). The process is highly selective and requires from researchers a critical examination of data: since analytical category should be based on substantial data, researchers should include incorporate the codes featured across gathered data. Similarly to codes, the names of analytical categories can come straight from the data; that said, analytical categories should contain an element of theoretical rendering of empirical material as opposed to represent an exercise in purely descriptive labelling.

The process of identifying of analytical categories is closely linked to theoretical sampling. In grounded theory, theoretical sampling is conceived as a strategy of looking for and finding relevant data, and attributing it to appropriate categories (Charmaz, 2006). It is about filling analytical categories with matching data. In
practice it means that researchers should first of all articulate analytical categories from emergent data and then seek to refine and enrich them through the gathering of additional material. In contrast to the positivist approach with its pre-fieldwork definition of sample’s size and strategy, the sampling process in grounded theory is seen through the interpretivist lenses and is explicitly linked to data collection. Dey (2008, p.84) pointed to the following merits of theoretical sampling, as conceived in grounded theory: ‘it freed researchers from usual rigour required of producing representative samples. The aim was to sample theoretically stimulating settings, not to generalize from representative samples of populations’.

Charmaz (2006) identifies the following practices associated with theoretical sampling. Firstly, researchers should develop analytical categories from emerging data: such beginning should allow them to understand which research aims they should prioritize in their pursuit and start using theoretical sampling in refining analytical categories emerging from existing and future data. The studying of social processes goes hand in hand with making choices over whom to interview and what kinds of questions to ask. Theoretical sampling is built upon the identification of analytical categories. As Charmaz (2006, p.103) suggests, researchers should ‘follow hunches about where to find data that will illuminate these categories and then go collect these data’.

Once again, it is argued that theoretical sampling is something which is dynamic and evolving, as opposed of being static and pre-determined. Theoretical sampling should go on until researchers determine that their analytical categories have been saturated. Importantly, the concept of saturation is treated differently in the interpretivist grounded theory than in the positivist tradition. Saturation does not occur when some kind of repeating pattern is identified in the data – a premise of positivist approach of which Charmaz (2006) is very critical. In contrast, it occurs when researchers through cross-comparing the content of their analytical categories can reasonably say that they have accumulated sufficiently rich empirical material to fill the categories and through drawing on those categories can build theoretical interpretations of studied social processes. Charmaz (2006) and Dey (2004) argue that researchers should stop gathering data, when they feel
confident that its totality points to refined analytical categories or, in other words, when the quality of data is sufficient for researchers to build theoretical interpretation. It is up to researchers to determine that they have collected a sufficient amount of data.

The paragraphs above map a set of general principles of grounded theory. However, as Dey (2004) and Charmaz (2006) recognise, grounded theory, when implemented in practice, may be very different from the ways it has been proposed in more recent books and in pioneering studies. So how did grounded theory framework appear to work in this doctoral research project? First of all, prior to starting data collection in Northtown I had general ideas about the purpose of my project: the focus was on biographical experiences of labour migrants, their social and labour market mobility trajectories, and migrants’ interactions with social support groups. Hence prior to undertaking material gathering, I have been aware of the constructs which Blumer (1969) called sensitising concepts: such concepts included ‘the change of occupation after migration’, ‘the access to social services’, ‘the membership in voluntary groups’, ‘the attitudes to trade unions’, ‘the places of residence’, etc. I had been also using a number of pre-conceived codes aimed to analyse data – low-wage employment and labour market segmentation. I had learned about those sensitising concepts through the engagement with labour migration literature and conducting interviews elsewhere in the UK.

After the start of research process in Northtown, gradually through paying attention to emergent data, I had started to identify initial codes directly linked to empirical data. All of this allowed me to move to a different level of understanding. For instance, in the interviews I had noticed a reoccurring theme linking ethnicity and (perceived) social particularities of Northtown, hence I had started to ask questions over the significance attributed to participants’ ethnicity and daily living in Northtown. More generally, I had started to work out basic codes through listening to audio tapes and going through field notes. It was a first step not only in coding but also in translation since most of interview material was in other languages than English, and my task was to translate it to English. Through listening to the tapes, making transcriptions and eventually reading through
transcriptions relied on line by line coding as well as incident by incident coding, I have eventually moved towards focused coding. The codes played a dual role: firstly, their aim was to analyse data, but also to identify emerging analytical categories. This was not a straightforward exercise: initially I came up with a six theoretical categories and I had tried to identify sections within interview texts corresponding to those categories. It did not work – the thematic richness of interviews’ material resisted to being squeezed into six overarching categories. Similarly, I had tried to organize part of interviews’ materials related to one particular Northtown employer and describe it in a form of mini case study. Again it was problematic: it looked like a ‘notice board’ with segments of interview material coming from different interviews being artificially stitched up and given a label of the case study. It should be noted that there have been some positive outcomes coming from those exercises: firstly, it forced me to immerse myself in my own data, and secondly, demonstrated that the imposition of ‘external’ concepts and models was not the best way to proceed in data analysis.

The breakthrough came when I started to compare different interviews between themselves and look at the data not as a collection of isolated and fragmented empirical cases, but as a set of diverse testimonies on overlapping issues. It allowed me to identify repeating themes and I started to move from labelling data with separate codes into organising codes into analytical categories. Analytical categories were built on codes capturing empirical data; however, in contrast to codes, they not only described and recorded the data, but aimed to analyse it and theorise it. What I was trying to do was to saturate analytical categories with codes representing data and move towards theorisation. When I felt that some of analytical categories cannot be saturated with sufficient data or are marginal to the theory I was trying to build, I would put them aside and try to re-assign the data to different categories. For example, it happened to the analytical category which was labelled ‘out of Northtown mobility’. I felt that I did not have sufficient data in order to saturate it and that category was not essential to the theory emerging from the data, hence I abandoned it.

On the other hand, some of key categories emerged naturally from the data to the extent that their titles come from expressions used by interviews: for instance, the
category called ‘the spectrum of humanity and inhumanity at the workplace’ came from the words used by interviews – i.e. human and inhuman relations. However, as a category, this notion did not simply repeat testimonies of participants but organized it within an analytical theme covering issues around workers’ dignity in the employment relations. On the other hand, the codes around jobs taken by migrants in the local labour market and in the workplaces were organized into the analytical category labelled by myself as ‘the ethnic division of labour’. This category covered the issues related to various forms of ethnic segmentation in the workplace and in the local labour market. Analogically to the category on humanity and inhumanity, but distinctively in terms of the semantic origins of labelling title, it emerged from the data and performed an analytical and interpretive role. The purpose of establishing those categories rested on the intention to interpret data in order to build and discover theory capable of providing analytical descriptions of migratory experiences in Norhtown.

The process of discovering analytical categories was intrinsically linked to continuous memo-writing. I had started to write memos straight after conducting the interviews: while taking train journeys back from Norhtown to Leeds, I was writing down my reflections of the interviews. Listening and reading interviews later was also accompanied by similar exercise. In conjunction with other ways of engaging with the data (e.g. preparing and delivering conference papers), it led to the crystallization of analytical categories. It was accompanied by literature search of the studies relevant to my own lines of inquiry: among other things it led to the identification of the literature concerned with the migration beyond traditional gateways. The summative contribution of coding, memo-writing, secondary research and the interpreting of primary allowed envisioning the basis of PhD’s structure. When Dej (2004, p.86) argues that the research inspired by grounded theory can be compared to ‘the picture slowly emerging as a patchwork mosaic’, my own experience of research and analysing reflects this imagery. In my case, the mosaic emerged following the activities involving various stages of data analysis. It involved both intuitive way of reflection and theoretically informed thinking as well as the presentation of data orally in the conferences and continuous attempts to express my understanding of empirical material in writing.
When it came to the final stages of the research process, the relation between interpretations of empirical findings and conceptual assumptions of grounded theory can be described as mutually constitutive. Moreover, my personal experience of employing grounded theory can be used to address specific criticisms of this methodological approach (for more general description, see Charmaz, 2006). Burawoy (1991) has been one of the strongest opponents of grounded theory, which he accused of multiple failings, which ranged from the (allegedly) obsessive focus on micro-sociology at the expense macro structures to the generalizations of unrelated social situations to the extreme interpretivism which treated data as a cultural text akin to fictional literature.

Burawoy (1991) contrasted grounded theory to his own approach of extended case study. In contrast to the inductive approach of grounded theory, which explicitly demanded researchers to construct their own theories based on emerging data, Burawoy (1991) called for the reconstruction of macro theories. Burawoy (1991) believed that the interpretation of empirical data should be infused with the existing macro theories of hegemony and domination, and empirical data should be used not to construct a new theory of its own, but to refine and improve existing theories. In Burawoy’s (1991) understanding, grounded theory went from micro to macro-sociology, while extended case method used theoretical construct of macro-sociology in understanding micro realities.

Looking at the experiences of my own field work and data interpretation, the approach of grounded theory could be defended on the following grounds. Firstly, while I had not entered the field with a fixed intention to explore social reality through the theoretical lenses of existing theories, part of my thinking was guided by macro theoretical constructs which in turn were woven into many interview questions. Those included ethnic divisions framed around the notions of ‘Whiteness’, the structural impact of UK and EU migration policies and labour market segmentation and its impact for migrants. These were explicit macro concepts which framed many of my questions which were posed to interviewees; moreover, these macro concepts featured strongly in data interpretation. Thus, I did consider structural power inequalities throughout the research process – the consideration, which in Burawoy’s (1991) positioning, grounded theory fails to do.
Moreover, my interpretations were firmly connected to the political and economic contexts of the studied urban locality. Burawoy (1991, p.280) argues that unlike his own extended case studies method, ‘grounded theory, on the other hand, discovers generalizations by abstracting from time and space’.

Burawoy’s (1991) criticism can be confronted for the following reasons. Two intermediary analytical categories, which emerged from the data, were explicitly related to time and space. Instead of producing a set of delocalised interpretations detached from the specific temporal and spatial dynamics, the grounded approach led to the construction of theoretical account of migration where time and space were fundamental in understanding the ways participants imagined their social worlds through the narratives articulated during the interviews.

Furthermore, instead of being imported from macro-sociological tradition, analytical categories of time and space were constructed from migrants’ narratives. Spatial dimension was covered by interviewees’ tendency to see migration specifically in local terms, to single out Norhtown as a very special kind of place when it came to the mobility of individuals from the ‘broader’ outside – migrants from CEE or dispersed migrants from other parts of the world, or even British citizens from ethnic minority background. The dimension of time related to migrants’ tendency to see the character of migratory experiences to this location through the prism of temporal chronology. The structures of Interviewees’ narratives favoured dynamic interpretations of their Norhtown’s experiences over the static vision of place. Although those categories emerged from the data rather than were imported from existing theories, potentially they still could be framed in terms of external theoretical analysis, e.g. by the conceptualisation found in the work of Harvey (2001). According to Harvey’s (2001, p.124) framework, time and space are firmly related with individual perceptions of social reality: ‘our sense of who we are, where we belong and what our obligations encompass – in short, our identity – is profoundly affected by our sense of location in space and time. In other words, we broadly locate our identity in terms of space (I belong here) and time (this is my biography, my history)’.
Although the notion of time and space, as discovered in the material gathered for this study could be related to the ideas of Harvey (2001), it should be stressed that those analytical categories were not imported from existing theories, but emerged from the data. However, as the reference to Harvey (2001) would suggest, such analytical categories could be also connected to pre-existing theoretical constructs. Moreover, the discovered analytical categories of time and space were framed within various forms of structural divisions, e.g. social implications of economic restructuring or the weakness of local traditions of ethnic diversity. Although the themes of time/space were not presented in the separate chapter but were integrated into the part on ethnic intolerance, their articulation demonstrated that in principle the grounded theory approach in itself did not preclude the interpretations of findings, where individual subjectivities of participants’ narratives were seen within the context produced by social structures connected to rather than decoupled from time and space.

Finally, it could be argued that the grounded theory approach was more suitable for this study for the pragmatic and conceptual reasons, when compared to the stance advocated by Burawoy (1991). Buroway (1991) firmly attaches his extended case study method to the research of what he calls the modern metropolis. This brings analysis to an important methodological caveat: as Savage el al. (2003) have shown, urban sociology has accumulated incredible rich sets of data on the modern metropolis - in Sassen’s (2001) terms– the global city, which allowed developing multiple theoretical frameworks. However, when it comes to the study of medium sized towns, particularly in the case of in-ward migration, there is a noticeable shortage of theoretical constructs and empirical data. In other words, there aren’t many theories of ‘modern medium sized towns and migration to them’, which could be refined and reconstructed in the sense suggested by Burawoy (1991). The small number of existing studies (mostly conducted outside of the EU, see the literature review section) can be used only as contextual reference points. Hence, it was a research approach of grounded theory rather than of extended case study method which was logically more suitable for the study of the social process associated with migration to Northtown.
2.3 Doing the fieldwork: techniques, concepts and processes

An array of qualitative research methods have been employed in data gathering. The methods included biographical interviews, focus group interviews, semi-structured interviews and non participant observations.

It would be worthwhile to begin from pointing to some general aspects related to qualitative research techniques. As it was argued earlier, grounded theory is associated with qualitative methods. Its emphasis on lived experiences and individual subjectivities presupposes a qualitative investigative approach. The main advantages of such an approach are well known: it gives participants opportunity to express themselves and allows researchers to gather rich data (see e.g. Plummer, 2001). However such data cannot be generalised statistically and applied to wider populations. Moreover, certain qualitative research techniques have their own advantages and limitations. For example, while biographical interviews can reveal individual stories, their content can be highly subjective and contain personal bias. Other employed research techniques such as focus group interviews also carry strengths and limitations: participants might be reluctant to reveal closely guarded facts of personal biography in focus group interviews, however they can engage with participants and express opposing or complimentary views (Larsen et al., 2005). Semi-structured interviews may overlook individual nuances, but can assist in identifying specific mechanisms, policies, facts, etc. Finally, ethnographic notes may be too closely associated with personal styles of researchers, however they add insights which participants may not be willing to express. These are known generalities of labour migration research (see for example Boyle et al., 1998). More specific examples have been identified in my own experience of fieldwork.

The largest segment of empirical data has been generated through biographical interviews. The biographical method was particularly useful in reconstructing migrants’ life stories: learning why participants arrived to Northtown, how their experiences in Northtown have changed, etc. During biographical interviews, I
have always tried to encourage participants to speak about migratory living and recollect events and episodes meaningful to their stories of settlement in Northtown. Although the questions were not asked in a strict linear chronological order, i.e. using the departure from home countries as a starting point, their overarching aim was to reconstruct individual biographies paying specific reference to the migration process, arrival to Northtown and socio-economic experiences which followed the settlement in this locality.

In contrast, focus group interviews with other participants could not reveal similarly rich level of biographical information and thick description. However, focus groups interviews were suitable to cover specific issues such as the views of employment relations, the manifestations of racism in Northtown and the access to public services. Furthermore, bringing Northtown’s migrants together and posing them questions, facilitated in stimulating the generation of negotiated and interpersonal data, where participants would agree and disagree, compliment and reject the views of others. Hence while lacking the richness of biographical data, the focus group interviews allowed participants to debate and share their perceptions and experiences, which in turn complimented the data gathered through biographical interviews.

The third key research technique was semi-structured interviews. This technique was particularly useful with the representatives of statutory and voluntary agencies; the main purpose of those interviews was not to reconstruct biographical histories (although it eventually happened in the cases of two migrant representatives), but to learn how their organizations were outreaching and providing support to migrants as well as to get more general information on migrants in Northtown. Notably, some of those interviews have had also an explicit biographical angle: in the case of two support groups I have asked their representatives – a Kosovar Albanian and Georgian men, to talk about their biographical experiences of migration.

The fourth technique was represented by ethnographic observations. The observations were undertaken in various public, private and community sites: the Catholic Church during the Easter mass conducted in Polish language, the meetings
of migrant mothers/children in a local community centre, the visit to a shop stuffed with CEE goods and run by Russian-speaking migrants. Moreover, following the logic of grounded theory and the call of Charmaz (2006) to report and code everything relevant to data gathering, I did not limit myself to recording observations in enclosed community environments. I took notes over the conditions of migrants’ homes, reflected and took notes on public space, etc: for example, paying attention to numerous posters directed against racism, which were displayed in the hallways of a local secondary school.

While the study’s methods and sampling technique evolved, theoretically it maintained the intention to examine how individual migrants and their family members were dealing with the challenges of living and working in a particular locality in the UK. It firmly positioned the study within the various frameworks tackling the relation between agency and structure. In this study, the dimension of agency referred to individual or family based actions, whilst the dimensions of structure covered migration regulatory regimes, the labour market segmentation and the ethnic divisions. The understanding of agency adapted here goes back to the tradition of symbolic interactionism, where actors are seen not as isolated individuals, but conscious agents embedded within social reality surrounding them (Emirbayer and Mische, 1998). This understanding allowed treating individual biographical narratives as storylines which contained elements both associated with individual autonomous choices and structural impositions. Such perspective is in line with the debates on agency and structure: among social theorists of various persuasions there is an explicit recognition that agency and structure are inter-dependent: for instance, in Giddens’ (1984) theory of structuration, agency and structure are mutually constitutive and inseparable, while Archer (1996) argues that the relation between structure and agency should be seen in terms of autonomous interplay. Archer (1996) argues that such understanding gives greater value to both properties, particularly to agency: actors not only form an indispensable unity with structure, but they can change or/and transform structures.

Those considerations in social theory could be linked with the practicalities of the research process. The literature on the relation between research methodology
and migration studies suggests that qualitative techniques, particularly biographical method are the most suitable in understanding the interaction between structure and agency in the migration process (Boyle et al, 1998).

More generally, Plummer (2001, p.40-41) argues against what he calls the amputation of structure and agency in sociology and makes a broader point suggesting that ‘the perspective (or point of view) of life history research, however can be the totality of the biographical experience...It is quite mistaken to see life histories as thoroughly individualistic – lives move persistently through history and structure’. Echoing Plummer (2001), Erel (2009, p.5) suggests that ‘life-stories are important vantage point for exploring the links between subjectivity and social structure’. Various forms of interviewing adapted in this study allowed to see how individuals were engaging and responding to social structures, when it came to ethnic segmentation in the local labour market or historical patterns of migratory regimes privileging ‘White’ European migrants. While authors such as Plummer (2001) and Erel (2009) spoke primarily about biographical method as a way to explore the agency-structure interactions, other techniques also contributed to understanding how individuals act within the structurally conditioned fields. For example, participants of focus group and semi-structured interviews were speaking about biographical experiences – their own or of the people whom they knew. A quick look at the examples (biographical, semi-structured and focus groups interviews, and observations) coming from gathered data provides useful illustrations.

Malgosia’s biographical story has multiple twists illustrating agency and structure’s inter-workings. Malgosia was encouraged to take a degree at a Polish University in English language and literature – not her own preference, but a result of pressure coming from her parents who believed that her ideas of studying arts and drama would be impractical in terms of jobs prospects in post-communist Poland. She was in a long-term relationship with her boyfriend who struggled to find any formal and legal kind employment in Poland and saw the opening of the UK labour market in 2004 as the only way to escape the vicious cycle of informal work, unemployment and underemployment in Poland. Subsequently, he migrated to the UK and settled in Norhtown. To preserve this relationship, she made a
decision to exercise EU mobility rights and joined him in England. In Northtown itself, she was not satisfied with her job in the service sector and opted out for setting up an informal English language school for Polish migrants. Moreover, she and her boyfriend managed to secure a student loan (available to them as EU citizens) and enrolled into UG programme run by the University of Huddersfield.

Reading from the perspective of agency and structure, it was possible to identify following several biographical junctures in Malgosia’s story: the exercise of agency vis-à-vis the shortcomings of Poland’s labour market – both in her choice of the type of University degree and her boyfriend’s decision to migrate. The structural change in mobility rights associated with EU enlargement and individual/family migration. Furthermore, the choice of teaching English locally could be explained by structural factors such as the difficulties in accessing statutory English language courses and her personal abilities (good knowledge of English) as well as her preferences (independent home teaching versus unfulfilling work in the call centre). Finally, the enrolment into a higher educational institution was facilitated by the availability of structurally underpinning opportunities represented by EU citizenship rights.

In terms of semi-structured and focus group interviews, the interactions between agency and structure can be deduced not only from linear stories woven into the narrative, but from certain interviews’ fragments. For instance, Gazmend referring to the arrival of his own group - the Albanian migrant group from Kosovo, stressed that at the time of departure from Kosovo, this group faced two choices – either to be subjected to the violence of the Serbian security forces or to accept the support of the British state and be sent to a place chosen by the British authorities. This is an example of where the exercise of agency was severely restricted by dramatic and violent circumstances; however even in such case it would be possible to identify an element of agency (the decision to go to the UK) bounded by a highly restrictive structural configuration (violence of one state versus controlled resettlement policy of the other). On the other hand, focus group interviews were helpful in showing how migrants exercised their agency and positioned it against other migrants deemed to be less assertive or open minded. For example, during one of focus group interviews there was a discussion over the access to social
housing. In contrast to a Polish female participant who argued that it was simply impossible to get social housing in Northtown for childless migrant couples, an Estonian interviewee argued that persistence and continuous reminding of personal requests to local officials could help in securing public housing. The logic of this exchange might be interpreted in this way: individual actions do matter even in the encounters with highly bureaucratic organizations.

On the first glance, it could appear that using the concepts of agency and structure is much more difficult in ethnographic observations. However the experience of fieldwork contradicts such assumptions. When I walked through the halls of the local secondary school, I have noticed numerous posters directed against racism. It revealed how acutely the school’s teaching staff felt the urgency to campaign against any forms of ethnic intolerance. In this case, individual teachers reacted against local manifestations developed within broader structural context of exclusion by displaying anti-racist posters.

On other occasion, while observing a drop in meeting of migrant mothers with preschool age children in a migrant community centre, I noticed an ‘invisible’ wall separating ‘White’ European migrants from CEE and non EU African migrants. The CEE women were on one side of the meeting room, while the ‘Black’ African women were gathered on the other side of the room. I was not the only observer, who noted it: the centre’s director (a woman from ‘Black’ South African background) pointed to it and told me that ‘White’ European women saw themselves as being different when compared to non European migrants. There is another example of the interaction between human agency (CEE migrant women’s self-imposed distancing) and social structures (EU migration regime and ethnicity). In this case, by distancing themselves from non-White, non EU migrants, CEE migrant women were reinforcing and reproducing the divisions built into EU citizenship and the historically privileged construction of ‘Whiteness’.

It also should be added that my interpretations of the structure and agency interactions (or participants for this matter) could be seen as contentious. However this particular form of subjectivity is epistemologically and ontologically acceptable of the interpretivist philosophy of social science research: I, as a
researcher, would privilege particular interpretive lines – the interpretations which reflected my theoretical interests, disciplinary perspective and personal standpoints.

The subsequent chapters containing data interpretation will develop ideas over the interplay between agency and structure in participants’ narratives at greater length; for now the focus will be on concluding the review of research design. It is going to be done by looking at the issues surrounding the selection of participants.

The issue of sampling in a narrow sense - participants’ recruitment for the study had two overlapping dimensions: a practical one and a theoretical one. Before the start of the fieldwork, I had developed initial sampling strategy: a set of ideas of whom I would have wanted to interview (migrants and the representatives of local statutory and voluntary support groups). However, Charmaz (2006, p.100) stresses that such kind of thinking ‘provides a point of departure, not of theoretical elaboration and refinement’. As it was stressed earlier, theoretical sampling in grounded theory is understood not as a collection of pre-set ideas over the characteristics and the size of respondents’ group, but as a strategy embedded within the analysis of emerging data. As such, it requires from researchers to look for data suitable for saturating analytical categories.

In practice it meant that although my initial intention was to interview only migrants from CEE background (EU citizens), emergent analytical categories (such as those linking manifestations of ethnic intolerance and local social dynamics) led towards the choice to interview migrants who at the point of arrival to Northtown were not EU citizens. There were also practical considerations: in technical terms sampling strategy relied on snowballing. Individuals who were approached in their capacity of being leaders of voluntary community groups were all migrants from non EU member states (some of them came prior to 2004 – the year of EU enlargement). Moreover, some of semi-structured interviews with those participants developed from being focused on fact finding exercise concerned groups’ activities to becoming, at least partially, biographical in their character. Snowballing also meant that interviewees would provide their personal contacts and persuade their acquaintances to take part in the study. For instance,
interviewed ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) teachers would advise their students to get in touch with me or one interviewed Polish and one Polish/Latvian families would give me phone numbers of their friends (securing their permission beforehand). On some occasions, representatives of statutory groups would refer to their relatives from migrant background. This might appear to be chaotic and methodologically inconsistent, at least from the first glance. However it was an internal logic to it: as soon as I decided to move away from looking exclusively at CEE migrants, a strategy of incorporating other migrants (e.g. non EU, dispersed, etc) was a natural and theoretically justifiable choice.

Another potential criticism levelled against the study’s sampling approach might derive from randomness of participants’ national backgrounds (for the detailed breakdown of participants’ profiles see the table below). However such criticism can be rejected by drawing from methodological ideas advanced by social scientists sharing interpretivist philosophy (Silverman, 2013): the sample’s representativeness is conceived not in terms of population distribution, but in terms of its ability to meet researcher’s theoretical assumptions, which in grounded theory’s terms are attached to the interpretation of emergent data. As a researcher, I developed the interest of exploring migratory dynamics of Northtown – the interest broader than the study of experiences of one particular group, e.g. CEE migrants, hence I approached non EU dispersed migrants coming from a number of national backgrounds.

Moreover, a significant proportion of non EU interviewees came from the countries belonging to the geographical area which was part of the Soviet Union (till 1991). This also could be justified methodologically: throughout the study the preference was given to interview migrants in their mother tongues and in the languages which they were felt more comfortable to be interviewed in. Those interviewees, e.g. Azeri and Kyrgyz female participants, asked to be spoken in Russian (though they obviously knew Azeri and Kyrgyz languages, they came from post-imperial urban centres such as Baku and Bishkek where Russian was the lingua franca).
Looking from the perspective of interpretivism (Plummer, 2001), researchers not only have a right but an obligation to study social phenomena which is biographically meaningful to them. I have been born in Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic – a pseudo-autonomous republic which existed within the USSR between 1940-1941 and 1944-1990 after CEE was partitioned by Nazi Germany and Stalinist USSR in 1939. This premise explains the composition of sample: the bigger segment of interviewees came from the countries which were under the Soviet sphere of control. A common denominator of post-Soviet and migrant backgrounds helped to establish a relationship of trust and understanding.

It should be noted that it also allowed some participants to make historically contextualised jokes as the one made by the Ukrainian interviewee Taras. When I talked about my interest in Northtown’s migrants, he jokingly asked me in Russian if I was ‘also going to talk to’ the White’ migrants’. After initial confusion I realised that he was referring to anti-Bolshevik exiles, who left the territories controlled by new Soviet government after the end of civil war in 1921. My initial confusion gave him a visible degree of satisfaction. In this sense the inclusion of such individuals into the sample matched both the study’s own theoretical criteria (looking at migrants from wide range of backgrounds) as well as methodological sensitivity which prioritised the use of language preferable to participants and also taking into the account the researcher’s interests and his/her socio-cultural background.

Finally, the study’s sampling approach, in particular its approach of including migrants from diverse national backgrounds, reflects its overarching framework – the study looks at a distinctive and localised geographical area. It also fits within certain migration studies’ preoccupations in the context of Britain: such key scholars of migration to the UK as Vertovec (2007) speaks about the new super-diversity associated with the rapid and unprecedented increase in ethnic heterogeneity in various parts of the UK. In this sense, having a Slovak male interviewee alongside a Kyrgyz female participant and an Iranian female interview alongside Polish male participant speaks not only about the diversity of the sample but contributes to the study of multi-diversity at a local level. For more information on the backgrounds of the study’s participants see the tables in the Appendix.
After outlining the issues related to research methods and the profiles of participants, it would be necessary consider ethical issues related to the fieldwork.

2.4 Research ethics: challenges and responses

There is a universal recognition across social science disciplines that fieldwork is not only a technically challenging endeavour for researchers, but an undertaking involving a variety of moral challenges and dilemmas. Moreover, data collection cannot be reduced to a set of predictable situations demanding from researchers standardised responses. As Punch (1994, p.85) suggests, any kind of fieldwork ‘represents a demanding craft that involves both coping with multiple negotiations and continually dealing with ethical dilemmas’. Punch (1994) points that ethical uncertainty is a key variable of what can be described as the politics of fieldwork. Those uncertainties are associated with the practice of conducting research, the choice of research techniques and the background of participants involved in the study. The latter is particularly relevant since one of the objective strengths of this doctoral study lies in its inclusivity: participants came from a very diverse range of gender, national, ethnic, class and linguistic backgrounds. Moreover, multiple techniques were employed ranging from interviews to ethnographic observations.

It all created ethical challenges, which demanded from me to show considerable degree of reflexivity throughout the research process. There have been situations when I was faced with explicit moral dilemmas to which I did not have straightforward answers. I continued to question ethical choices which I made during the fieldwork: I managed to find clear responses and justifications to some, while some ethical controversies were too ambiguous to be brought to some kind of straightforward closure. In such instances, through personal reflections I have aimed to acknowledge moral complexities and articulate them in my writing. Finally, some ethical dilemmas had a comical dimension. All of it is going to be covered next.

In all occasions when it came to direct (face to face interviews) or indirect (e-mail exchanges or phone conversations) contacts with participants, I made a maximum effort to be respectful as well as explain clearly the purpose of inquiries.
Participants were never pressured to take part in the study: it was always up to them to make an entirely voluntary choice whether to talk to me or decline to take part. Moreover, the research participants rather than myself proposed the time and place of the actual meetings. In all occasions, the permission to record and take research notes was sought beforehand, i.e. in the first minutes of the meeting alongside the reassurances made over anonymity. I have always introduced myself as a doctoral researcher from the University of Leeds.

Notably, the affiliation with the University of Leeds was very helpful: most participants showed a degree of respect to me as a representative of the institution of learning. Moreover, my willingness to undertake a doctoral research project was also met by some sort of approval. Multiple questions have been asked about my relation to this institution: from the funding arrangements related to the doctoral thesis to the courses which I was teaching as a part-time member of staff at the University of Leeds. Some of migrant parents were interested about specific matters such as student fees and loans: they hoped that their children would enter UK’s higher education institutions. I tried to answer the questions in open and clear way, that is in the way I would answer those questions outside of the research process. Some of the questions over the University had recognizable ethnic and class connotations: for example, I was asked how I (as a foreigner) was treated by British students and British members of staff. Migrants, many of whom were subjected to implicit and explicit forms of ethnic intolerance, wanted to compare mine and their experiences. The issue of class also came out in the University related questioning. Two of interviewees asked over the ways British academics behave: the interviewees said that in their own daily lives they were surrounded by British working class (their claim) and hence wanted to know how the members of different social groups, e.g. the academics whom they saw as the members of professional middle classes, acted in everyday interactions. On the other occasion, I was asked whether I was paying for my doctoral degree: it seemed that this interviewee was curious about my own socio-economic background and financial opportunities.

I have tried to answer those specific questions in an open and specific manner. Those questions also highlighted certain socio-economic distance between me and
many participants. While I had been enjoying relatively privileged academic/professional lifestyle in a supportive environment, most of interviewed migrants were less protected from arbitrary managerial actions, unpleasant working conditions, and insecure employment futures. It always acted as a reminder that the trajectory of international migration is shaped among other things by social stratifications in sending societies, which can be manifested, for example, in the (in)ability to pay fees for master’s programme, the undertaking of which is a prerequisite for PhD.

On the other hand, interviewees would stress that my own migrant background was psychologically helpful for our conversations: there was a feeling that they felt obliged and willing to share their experiences since I could understand them better by being a non UK national myself. While the issue of socio-economic distance came out only in two interviews, the feeling of migratory commonality was present throughout. However, it should be also noted that the feature of socio-economic distance inserted itself into the research process not only through the inequalities related to pre-migratory and post-migratory experiences, but also in the form of cultural capital. The way I have used Polish and Russian languages had a clear hints of my identification with CEE cultural intelligentsia (e.g. always addressing participants by using second person plural), which is in turn underpinned historically by social differences. Whilst it once again pointed to my own social background, it had also allowed me to maintain an authentic conversational style without me trying to cover up my own conscious or imagined socio-cultural background. That said, I was conscious to avoid forms of subjectivities which could be seen as posturing or even disrespectful: a sense of simplicity, humility and gratefulness to participants guided my manner of questioning and wider interacting. Sometimes the stereotypical notions of proper manners affected my behaviour in a different way: since most of interviews took place in migrant homes, before departing to those interviews I felt compelled to shave, wear clean and modestly looking clothes, to wash my hair and always be on time (all of it certainly had not been a part of my PhD life-style routine). I was afraid that if confronted with my ‘natural PhD self’, participants would feel disrespected and offended.
Those personal concerns are far from being original – they are intrinsic to qualitative data gathering. As Plummer (2001, p.206), stresses, ‘the social researcher is not a mere medium through which knowledge is discovered; he or she can also be seen as a ‘constructor’ of ‘knowledge’. We need to look at how the researcher’s personal and social worlds lead to these constructions and how such constructions are subsequently used in the social world’. The recognition of the researcher’s personal and social characteristics does not mean that social and economic inequalities between participants and the researcher can simply disappear: notably, the researcher is gone with the gathered data allowing her/him to advance her/his career (as it happened in my case), whilst many participants still have to confront the realities of low-wage and low status employment. However it shows that both parties share an awareness of the research process and actively negotiate their roles within it. As the researcher, I was aware of ambiguity associated with my professional role and my social background. On their side, migrant participants have found acceptable and meaningful to talk to me about their migratory experiences.

One of the bigger dilemmas was associated with the disclosure of additional research purposes to participants. The main purpose of qualitative interviews and observations was to collect data for my PhD thesis. However, simultaneously to collecting data for the doctorate, some of material was also expected to be used for the report prepared together with Dr. MacKenzie and Dr. Forde for Northtown Metropolitan Council. Together with Dr. MacKenzie and Dr. Forde, I prepared an (unpublished) report on migrant experiences in Northtown for which I supplied some segments of the data gathered for my PhD thesis; the findings of the report were presented on two separate occasions to the representatives of Northtown statutory agencies as well to a Yorkshire-wide forum on social integration of migrants. The aim of those presentations and the report itself was to reveal difficulties faced by migrants in the local labour market and wider social sphere. It also looked at the issues of social support. Moreover, I contributed with the data gathered in Northtown to a co-authored publication with MacKenzie and Forde (MacKenzie et al., 2013). In addition, I used the data gathered in Northtown for my own publications Ciupijus (2012a) and Ciupijus (2012b).
While interviewing migrants I made a decision that I would prioritise my role of the research student and would inform them that the purpose of my study was to examine their lives in order write my doctoral thesis. From the first encounter with a migrant family, I felt that in order to establish a personal relationship I should act as an individual researcher, independent from any potential use of gathered data. I felt it was important in order to establish a relationship of trust and allow migrants to speak freely about their lives from a biographical perspective rather than to limit it to more functional interests expected from the report. I thought it would also allow migrants to be more open in criticising local statutory agencies. I struggled with this decision, because it was only a half-truth.

However, I felt it was essential for me to act and to be seen as an independent researcher rather than someone affiliated with local statutory agencies. The questions, which I was asking, and the topics which interviewees were touching, were not dictated by the needs to produce this report or other publications, but by the dynamics of interviews. Those statutory agencies did not receive transcripts and recordings of interviews, they also did not learn about the identities of interviewees. Statutory agencies were advised and informed on general issues surrounding migrant living in Northtown (e.g. in which part of metropolitan borough area migrants tended to live) and the problems associated with paid employment and the use of social services.

Nonetheless, the decision not to inform participants over the report and other future publications is a contested one and could be open to criticism. However I strongly believe that a complete disclosure of the ways research findings could be used (e.g. presenting them in anonymous form for practitioner or academic audiences), would be detrimental to the openness of conversations which I had with participants and would decrease chances of learning in-depth biographical knowledge of about migrants’ lives in Northtown.

First of all, participants would potentially perceive me as an investigator sent by statutory agencies and treated me with distrust, particularly when it came to such sensitive issues like criticising the local health services or talking about local manifestations of ethnic intolerance. Secondly, they could have over-focused
themselves on articulating their views on statutory social services rather than revealed their migratory experiences from a biographical perspective.

In defence of my choices I would point out that a situational approach to research ethics and described dilemmas is common: for example, Punch (1994, p. 91) argues that qualitative researchers should be permitted to seek a compromise between what they say and what they do not say to participants: ‘one need not always be brutally honest, direct, and explicit about one’s research purpose...some dissimulation is intrinsic to social life, and, therefore to fieldwork’. However Punch (1994) argues that it is important to ensure that participants won’t be exposed to any harm or backlash; I felt that I could certainly ensure that – this reflection was very important to me, without it I would not have chosen to go ahead with the interviews.

In order to ensure interviewees’ privacy and confidentiality I decided to hide the name of this locality. I have chosen to refer to this area as Northtown since on one hand, this helped to hide the locality’s real name and on the other, it indicated its broader geographic (the North) and demographic (the town) dimensions. Obscuring localities’ names is a common practice in sociological research, particularly in the case of community based research (Punch, 1994). While it is also acknowledged that it is impossible to avoid some kind of recognition, but it is still advisable to follow the strategy of anonymizing in order to protect identities of interviewees (Punch, 1994). It is significant in practical terms – Northtown is a relatively small locality in terms of its population size, hence a chance for people to be recognised would be much stronger if the locality’s real name had came out in PhD thesis. There is also a philosophical rationale for choosing to obscure the locality’s name: the study’s findings and interpretation are intrinsically linked to participants and my own subjectivity. The findings concerning migratory lives in Northtown are the results of participants and my own interpretations and reflect lived experiences of participants narrated often in a very subjective manner on one hand and personal positions of myself as a researcher on the other side. In other words, it is only one of potential versions linking migration and the chosen urban locality and it is far from being free of personal bias whether coming from participants’ testimonies or the interpretations of their narratives. The PhD thesis
are typically being expected to be publically accessible, hence by indicating the locality’s real name, there would be a danger that some readers would take the exploration of migratory dynamics in a selected locality not as an example of grounded theory approach, but as a definitive representation of social reality. It would contradict the interpretivist philosophy underpinning the study’s epistemological standpoint.

As a researcher, I was positioned in relation to Northtown in a certain way. I did not know much about it before going to do interviewing. My first interviews there were somewhat opportunistic and relied on the availability of gatekeepers – the contacts accumulated by my PhD supervisors Dr. Robert MacKenzie and Dr. Chris Forde. Gradually by travelling to Northtown on regular basis, by trying to find various general historical material about Northtown and simply by spending time on the streets, in people’s homes and in public spaces I learned much more about Northtown and its residents. However, in many respects I remained an outsider since I would always return to Leeds after the end of the interviews. It should be noted that by many (but not all interviewees) Leeds was seen a preferable locality when compared to Northtown, particularly because of its greater ethnic diversity which they associated with greater tolerance to migrant newcomers.

Moreover, there was a dual transitory element to my research: as any piece of research my visits to Northtown were a temporary affair, and secondly, in the light of geographic proximity between Leeds and Northtown I was always able to return to Leeds (just once when I left the interviewees’ home very late, it took around 2 hours rather than usual 35 minutes to get home). In this sense, I had gained participants trust and permission to enter their social worlds, while simultaneously I remained detached from it. While I had an opportunity to return to a locality (i.e. Leeds) which for many was seen as preferable to Northtown and to work in a supportive University environment, while the majority of interviewees had to continue to face less benign socio-economic surroundings. Such observations pointed to a recognition that even at the time of fieldwork, the distance between myself and participants was both spatial and social.
Those distances were in many ways unbridgeable, which made my position as a researcher (and as an individual) ethically problematic. After all, I have not decided to move to Northtown even on a temporary basis while doing research – a decision which could have made my relations with participants more equal. Instead I was a temporary visitor. It does not undermine the nature of fieldwork or the credibility of findings per se; however it reminds that geographical boundaries of research may have an ethical dimension.

Was there anything that could provide partial justification to my choices? I would argue that to a degree the answer to this moral question can be positive: by presenting experiences and testimonies of interviewees to wider audiences and turning their experiences into written narratives, which other people could read, listen and empathise with, the study had not only solely contributed to personal advancement (getting the doctorate degree), but performed a publically valuable function. More personally, I have started to feel a sense of commonality with some of participants. This sense emerged gradually. While, in early stages of interviewing in Northtown, I would travel to interviews quite reluctantly because I did not know whom I would meet and what kind of interactions we would have. Moreover, I would be emotionally detached or even irritated prior to departing for interviews. The facts that conducting the interviews would seem to be so much beyond my daily routine and that potential participants were totally unknown to me, made me feel frustrated. My predisposition has gradually changed. Participants’ openness and willingness to help me in my doctoral inquiries and my own greater confidence in interviewing had changed the interviewing process: I would feel eagerness prior to the research trips and the satisfaction afterwards. In this sense, I overcame personal insecurities and personal distrust. In other words, I have not only developed research skills, but I have became more matured as an individual and citizen.

The politics of research ethics have not ended with the completion of fieldwork. As a researcher I have tried to be consistent in ensuring that the identities of interviewees would remain confidential: whether presenting findings in conferences or seminars, using it in articles or talking about my PhD informally, participants’ names were changed in order to protect their identities. In relation to
the post fieldwork stage, it is also important to stress that the data presented in various PhD drafts, journal articles or conference papers came from the empirical material. It was not faked or invented, but firmly based on real participants’ testimonies and my own ethnographic observations. This can be treated not only as a basic subscription to ethical guidance and requirement to produce original piece of work based on actual research in contrast to plagiarised or fictional inventions, but also a morally necessary stance to ensure that all factual opinions and experiences can be traced back to relevant interviews and attributed to participants. Participants’ narratives were not re-written, misattributed or changed; all interviewees mentioned in data interpretation have taken part in the study. In this sense, the analysed data is based on the fieldwork, which took place in a certain time and space – it is authentic in its entirety and its fragments.

All interviews were based on participants’ willingness to talk to me; monetary rewards were not offered or asked (there was only one exception, when the head of local migrant umbrella group asked for payments in return to being a gatekeeper and help to find migrant interviewees – the offer was not taken). Similarly I have not received any payments from migrants. However, when I was offered non-monetary gifts such as food and drinks in participants’ homes, I had always accepted in order to demonstrate my respect and appreciation of their hospitality. Showing respect (and feeling it) was my key concern in settings outside of migrants’ homes. When, for instance, I attended the service in the local Catholic Church, which was conducted in Polish language and coincided with the Easter festivity, as a non-Catholic I was unsure of how to behave in a Church during mass, a religious ritual which I had never directly witnessed or experienced. My instinctive reaction was to ensure that my behaviour, particularly my body language would not stand out in a provocative or disrespectful way. For instance, when everyone would stand up, I would stand up, when everyone would kneel or sit down, I would do the same. At the end of the service, when the worshipers started to shake their hands, I had also done so. At the same time, I would act in a slightly different way than others to indicate that I was not a Roman Catholic: I would not recite/repeat prayers or make the sign of the cross over my body. The people around me noticed it, but remained calm and friendly, and extended their
hands after the end of service. Hence through my participant observations I did not pretend to be an observant Catholic Pole; instead through a variety of signals coming from my body language, I indicated I was not part a member of the congregation, but still respected the worshipers and tried not to single out myself as much as I could.

Although maintaining calm, respectful and neutral attitude towards participants was one of key principles guiding me throughout the fieldwork and data analysis, some exchanges between me and participants could challenge such predispositions. On one of such occasions, a Polish male interviewee was displaying political views, which could be described as far-right: he had attacked social attitudes towards homosexuality in Britain as immoral, he referred to global warming as a myth (for some reason he touched this issue, although he was not asked), he pointed to the existence of global government controlled by cosmopolitan Masonic lodges and dangers associated with it. Germany’s aggressive plans towards Poland were a concern to him. He also was not impressed by natural scientists whom he described as corrupt and manipulative. At some point in the interview, when asked about the ways he would typically spend free time, he replied that he would read political publications on the Internet – both liberal and conservative, as he claimed. It appeared that one of most personally important topics, which he was interested to read about, was the role of Polish Jews and Jews more generally in communism and their alleged historical dominance of the Polish Communist party. He was so interested in this issue that he travelled to participate in a public meeting with the author called Stanislaw Michalkiewicz, a self-styled national-religious ideologue of Polish anti-EU far right, who was also known for his ultra-nationalistic, homophobic and anti-semitic views, which he regularly distributes in right wing nationalistic media outlets.

My first reaction was to switch the topic, but it was difficult to stop him. Hence I entered into some kind of dialogue: I suggested that only some Jews were members of Communist Party, but not all. I suggested that the committed communists constituted a small minority among a traditionalist pre-war Jewish population of Poland. He recognised that, but suggested that there were numerous non-Polish Jewish communists sent to Poland by Stalin. This kind of
conversation affected me emotionally: being Jewish from my mother side I am understandably sensitive to the manifestations of anti-Semitism. At the same time, I was reluctant to reveal my identity – I was getting too nervous and I felt that I was not obliged to participate in this personally upsetting conversation, which in any way was not directly linked to my research questions. It also evoked strong negative emotions and thoughts towards the interviewee. On other hand, I thought that I had to maintain a degree of respect to my interviewee and his family: even though he had political views, which I found to be prejudiced, confused and irrational as well as personally irritating, he and his family had opened doors of their house to me and agreed to take part in the study. They gave me some delicious food. At the end I compromised, tried to calm down myself and eventually managed to move a conversation to a different subject. But this exchange, its nature and my reactions, left me with a sense of unease.

A month later, I had been reading the works written by one of preeminent scholars of Poland’s post-communist transformation David Ost. The analysis of Ost (2005) among other things was concerned to the existence and even increase of ultra-nationalist, including anti-Semitic rhetoric after the fall of communism in Poland. Ost (2005) partly explained it as a form of collective emotional labour. The anger is directed not against socio-economic failures of neo-liberal economy, but is partly directed against imaginary ethnic enemies. In his shorter, journalistic piece, Ost (2003) described how he once entered a book store in Cracow, which due to its black external decoration he mistook for an Anarchist one. However, it appeared that the shops owners were not anarchists but ultra-nationalists who displayed a large number of anti-Semitic in their store.

His first reaction was to walk away, but then he returned and told the owners that he was a Jew and found their collection to be offensive and insulting. The exchange had a surprising result: the booksellers were shocked and surprised to see a ‘real’ Jew, a Jew who would not hide his identity, and adapted a more conciliatory style. Moreover, they started to treat him as some kind of friend: the real person as opposed to being treacherous figure rooted in conspiracy theories. While some of Ost’s (2005, 2003) interpretations are contentious, e.g. the reduction of ethnic stereotypes to the problems in the economic sphere (for more
criticism of economic scapegoating as the root cause of anti-Semitism, including in CEE context, see Jaspal, 2014, p.43), they highlight the role of unexpected encounters which can affect deeply social scientists and possibly shape their interpretations.

My reaction was very different from Ost’s (2003): I did not reveal my identity and repressed my anger. It might be a case that a greater openness from my side, including an open recognition that I found certain views of interviewee upsetting, would have a different impact. But at the end, my unpleasant exchange ended in a different way than the one experienced and described by Ost’s (2003). I thanked participants for the interview, the interviewee’s wife, who also took part in the interview, but did not speak about identity politics in a similar extreme way, had driven me to the train station.

What is important to carry from this encounter is to recognise that fieldwork had stimulated reactions which were highly emotive and contradictory. Researchers enter the field with their own subjectivities, which are often difficult to reconcile with abstract ethical principles. Certain encounters can lead to controversial reactions. This contradictory side also came in a different setting: in one occasion interviewee spoke patronisingly and unpleasantly of people whom he described as the British working classes. They were blamed for not working, but ‘smoking marihuana and drinking beer’. On another occasion, an interviewee spoke about the incompetence of doctor and explicitly linked the doctor’s competence to his (allegedly) Pakistani origins.

On both occasions, I felt a degree of unease in listening to those stigmatizing and stereotyping comments, but this sense of unease was nowhere as emotional in comparison to the incident when I was confronted with an openly anti-Jewish discourse. It clearly indicates that as a researcher and as a human being I have my own subjectivities and prejudices: when confronted with bigoted remarks which offended my own sense of belonging, I felt indignant. In contrast, while the ignorant and insulting remarks directed at the people from different class, ethnic and religious backgrounds made me uncomfortable, it took me time reflect in order to realise the full scale of derogatory meanings hidden in these remarks.
It would be also important to add that encountered prejudiced and intolerant views were isolated and exceptional. On the contrary, the majority of interviewees irrespective of their ethnic and national backgrounds stressed their opposition to ethnic prejudice. Moreover, when it came to local British interviewees from statutory agencies, they were vocal in criticising prejudiced attitudes among members of local ‘White’ community.

On a different note, it can be argued that personal evasiveness towards politically problematic statements and my intention to downplay some of my own views (at least in direct encounters with participants) are methodologically justifiable. Valentine (2001) points to theoretical developments in human geography, which aim to examine exclusionary ethnic and racial views of individuals from the point of view of psychoanalysis. It is argued that various forms of social prejudice can be partly traced to identity formation which individuals undergo in their early age. It should be reminded that biographical interviewing method is strongly indebted to psychoanalysis (Plummer, 2004). One of the main principles of psychoanalysis puts the expectation for the interviewer/analyst is to be neutral and personally detached and allow participants to openly express views which can be deeply troubling and problematic. A similar logic can be applied to my interviewing process.

Moreover, when it comes to the interpretivist approach, some authors (Hassard, 1991) ask researchers to engage in emotional distancing and bracketing of their personal views and convictions, while conducting interviews. This is done in order to understand inner social worlds of participants, allow participants to express themselves freely and prevent researchers from imposing their own views. Such approach certainly featured in the research process, however as the examples above indicate, I could not maintain total emotional neutrality.

A different kind of moral hazard in interviewing was associated with gender politics. Gender played a noticeable role in all encounters: for example, there was a degree of ‘male to male’ trust, when some of male interviewees would talk about the hardships of their daily life as well as their accomplishments at work and at home. In the interactions with some female participants, there was a feeling that I
was seen as someone who needed support and it resulted in participants’ willingness to be as helpful as possible. Moreover, such kind of attitudes were reinforced by the questions over my family, particularly whether I was living alone: after learning that I was single and have been living without a family in the UK, some female participants would show even greater personal sympathy, would reveal invaluable information related to personal experiences of migration and would volunteer to help with the fieldwork.

On other hand, the encounter with a female interviewee who was slightly younger than me has a different dynamic: she was very flirtatious at the start of interview, and kept touching me, enjoying my visible embarrassment. However my embarrassment and the lack of reciprocity (or both) eventually cooled her down. On other occasion, while conducting interview with another female interviewee, I was inquired whether I was married and had a girlfriend. Upon hearing that I was single, she suggested me to help to get in touch with her female friend, who as she assured, was very pretty and truly feminine because in her words, ‘she was a true Asian woman’. A couple of days later, she texted me the contact details of her friend. I thanked her for this, but did not get in touch. However I thought about it and questioned my motives (why I did not respond – was it because of the difference in ethnic, family and cultural backgrounds?). Notably, I would first think about it as a person, and only later reflect it as a researcher.

To conclude, such research encounters had an unexpected and touching human side. It was not easy for me emotionally to reconcile being half native (i.e. a single, male migrant with his own doubts and contradictions) and an aspiring social scientist, who was expected to follow certain professional principles. That said, my instinctive reactions were to be polite and accept such treatment as a compliment, but still to remain remote and focus on data gathering rather than unintended intra-personal developments.

The other issue which had an ethical dimension was related to the translation of participants’ testimonies. Its scale requires a separate sub-section.
2.5 Translating as an issue of research methodology: techniques and theories

Earlier it was suggested that interpretivist researchers are expected to pay close attention to the ways participants express themselves through language, to their phraseology and even to sentence construction (Charmaz, 2006). In the study of migration and migrants, this communicative side of research and data is often complicated by the language barrier between researcher and participants. In this study, this barrier was reduced, at least in relation to some participants: my competency in Polish and Russian was helpful and allowed to conduct most of biographical interviews in migrants’ mother tongues or at least in the languages which were commonly used by participants in their home countries and continued (e.g. with friends and relatives) to use in the UK after migrating to this country. However the fluency in the use of different languages created another problem – the one of translation. The PhD is written in English language; hence the translation of empirical material into English was a prerequisite for data presentation and analysis. Furthermore, it raised questions over how to translate data without distorting it or simply making linguistic mistakes. If translating is recognised as a part of research process and data analysis, the discussion of issues associated with it is not only desirable but it is methodologically significant in understanding the interpretations of findings.

Three languages have been used in the study: Polish, Russian and English. All individual and family interviews with Polish migrants with only one exception were conducted in Polish. The exception was an interview with Ludmila, a Northtown based social worker: she was extremely fluent in English, started to use this language from the start of our interview. I did not feel that it would be appropriate to switch to Polish. However, even in this conversation, the knowledge of Polish was valuable: while trying to explain a controversial example of relations between Polish migrants at the workplace and beyond, she used a Polish noun ‘zawiść’ for which she could not find an adequate English word. Fortunately, I could understand what she meant: she was referring to anomie and personalized resentment in intra-personal relations. Following up on this point she explained
how the competition between migrants in trying to earn higher wages and find better jobs could lead to tensions and resentment.

It would be difficult to underestimate the relevance of using Polish language in biographical interviews many of which were conducted in migrant homes: it allowed participants in a comfortable way to relate their stories without forcing themselves to speak English, the language in which not everyone was fluent (the participants worked long working hours and were often surrounded by fellow migrants, which affected negatively the possibility to improve English language skills). Even when Polish native speakers were fluent in English, the possibility to switch to their mother tongue was welcomed: young people of Polish origin, who chatted initially in perfect English, when I first met them in the secondary school in Northtown, could not control their joy and surprise, when I offered them to speak in Polish.

Moreover, social workers who accompanied me at school and were present in the room, where the focus group took place, expressed their surprise that I managed to keep children attention for the whole hour. It would be probable to assume that the use of Polish language played a role in helping to conduct this focus group interview. Moreover, it resolved the issue of confidentiality and removed any kind of pressure associated with the presence of social workers in the room since those workers could not understand Polish.

Russian was another language which was used in biographical and semi-structured interviews: a Ukrainian man from Russian-speaking background (the Donbass region), Russian-speaking woman from Latvia, Kyrgyz and Azeri women, and partly with a Georgian man was conducted in Russian. In all occasions, the decision to use Russian language was based on interviewees’ preference – I have never asked them to speak Russian myself. Notably while interviewees came from post-Soviet space, they were not Russian citizens or ‘ethnic’ Russians (with an exception of Irina from Latvia). However all of them spoke Russian fluently and preferred it to English (with an exception for Georgian interviewee), at least in terms of communicating to me. Some Polish interviewees in their mid 40s also spoke a couple of words in Russian during interviews – it was important for them to show
that they could speak this language since they met a couple of Russian speakers in Northtown’s workplaces. It is important that the language was not imposed, but chosen by interviewees themselves. It would be relevant to note, that although I am myself fluent in Russian and that this language is my mother tongue, I speak it with a noticeable influence of Lithuanian and Polish (two indigenous languages of South East of Lithuania and the capital city of Vilnius/Wilno). Hence my choice of this language derived not from some kind of historical and cultural allegiances to the Russian Empire or the Soviet Union, where Russian was the language of the state, but from common post-imperial and post-Soviet history which I shared with the participants.

Finally, English was also used in data collection. I spoke in English with representatives of local statutory agencies and with migrants whose languages I did not know. Two semi-structured interviews (one of them biographical) were conducted entirely in English: with a Kosovar Albanian man and a Slovak male participant. English was also used in two focus groups conducted with English language learners: at the start of the first focus group I asked which language would be preferable for the participants (the majority were Polish, but two Estonian and one Brazilian female interviewees were also present), the choice rested on English. The composition of second focus group was much more linguistically and ethnically diverse (Congo, Liberia, Iran, India, Pakistan and Poland) so English was the only reasonable as well as consensual choice enabling all focus group participants to take part in the discussion. Importantly, participants understood me and had a very good command in spoken English.

Recorded biographical and focus group interviews constituted a source text which was transcribed, translated, edited and interpreted. All translations of the source texts – migrants’ narratives, were conducted by me personally without help of interpreters. Epistemologically it was important to do so: according to the interpretivist vision of research, qualitative data is being seen as a unique exchange between researcher and participants (Plummer, 2001). Moreover, the same author argues that the researcher is involved in the process of reality construction not as a neutral and objective observer, but as the actor shaping the material which is being generated. In effect, a research encounter is being treated
as a dialogue between researcher and participants; the exchanges which take place during the dialogue have meanings mutually shared by two parties. Thus the nuances of such exchanges might evade the attention of those who have not been directly involved in interviewing. Hence even a professional and well-trained interpreter would not be able to capture the content of interviews in a way which would allow them to be represented as texts rooted in a complex dialogue between myself and participants. As Spivak (2012) emphasizes, when it comes to translating the voices of people coming from the global economic periphery to the language of the global economic core (i.e. English), the translator should have in-depth knowledge of their literary culture and oral traditions; arguably, when one translates not a literary text, but a text stemming from an interview, the translator should be also immersed into social worlds of participants. Through the ethnographic component of the fieldwork, I, as a researcher, had the best situational capacity in transforming the source text – original interviews’ content in Polish and Russian into the target text - interviews’ translations into English language (Munday, 2001). However the decision of translating research material in this way presented its own challenges.

First of all, the choice had to be made over the style of translation. In translation studies (Munday, 2001), two approaches are usually being distinguished: the literal or ‘word for word’ versus the free or ‘sense for sense’ translations. The strategy adapted for the study represented the ‘sense for sense’ approach: the aim was not to recreate identical structures and automatically reproduce word order of the source text, but to allow English language readership to get a sense of what migrant participants and myself were trying express in the interviews. This strategy is very much in line with interpretivist philosophy which informed this study – the purpose is not to recreate reality in scientifically objective sense, but to try to understand individual subjectivities. Following Munday (2001), the aim was to ensure that the translated text would be faithful to original text whether it came to facts, emotions or situations described by interviewees or the researcher. The purpose was to maintain the equivalence between the target text (English) and the source text (Polish and Russian): it meant that when the sentence structure was modified, e.g. word order was changed in translated sentences or if some
sentences were compressed into one (or split into fewer ones), the substance of their emotions and lived experiences were preserved.

Simultaneously, I was aware that any kind of translation constitutes a political process. As Venuti (2008, p.14) stresses, ‘translation is the forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text with a text that is intelligible to the translating-language reader...Translation is not an untroubled communication of a foreign text, but an interpretation that is always limited by its address to specific audiences and by the cultural or institutional situations where the translated text is intended to circulate and function’. Prior to considering those politically and ethically charged issues, it might be worthwhile to say a few words about how the use of different languages affected the interviewing and translating processes.

In terms of pre-translation stage, interviewing in Polish went relatively well: when I did not understand a specific colloquial term, I would ask participants to rephrase it or provide an English word when possible. For example, one of interviewees referred in Polish to ‘oszczędzanie’, while talking about budgeting; when I asked him to explain, he translated it as ‘savings’. This was an exceptional but also interesting example from the point of view of research ethics because it illuminates the social distance between Polish participants and me. This participant was describing his personal economic strategy through the use of the word unclear to me. My confusion could be explained not only by the lack of familiarity with certain words, but my prior experiences: I studied Polish as a language of culture and literature rather than an idiom to express migratory experiences, including those related to personal economic strategy. It further illustrates the difference of my own migratory trajectory vis-à-vis the migratory trajectories of interviewed participants: my personal experience of migration was linked to education rather than to the imperative to find work.

More generally, there have been a small number of unknown words, which I missed in the interviews, but picked up while going through transcripts and tapes. For example, the Polish word for such a relatively rare illness as jaundice. In such
instances, referring to Polish-English dictionary helped in translating such specific terms.

There were some mistakes made in the first drafts of translation, which were noticed and corrected at later stage. For example, one of Polish interviewees talked about moving kitchen boards from the production line to the storage room from where products would be eventually shipped to consumers. He used a plural form of Polish word ‘deska’ to describe it: the similarity to the English noun ‘desk’ pushed me first to translate it in English as ‘desk’, but after re-reading it and checking with a dictionary, it was apparent that the right translation should use the word ‘board’, not ‘desk’.

Sometimes interviewees did explaining work for me using non verbal tools. For example, one of Polish male interviewees told me that he worked as a fork lift driver. He actually used the English wording to describe his job but it wasn’t clear to me what he meant – I have not came across the English language signifier for the forklift truck before the interview. To help to understand it, he showed his own video of the forklift saved on his mobile phone, the video he took while at work – it allowed me to learn a new English word.

On a different occasion, the difficulties were related not to the understanding of a particular expression, but finding a precise translation. Some of expressions, for example, the Russian adjective 'chelovecheskoje' (Человеческое) can be both translated into English as human and humane. Some of interviewees would use both terms interchangeably, mention one of them or would say that they should be seen and treated as humans, not as animals by local employers. Hence in the translated text, the adjectives 'human' and 'humane' (as well as 'inhuman' and 'inhumane') are used as mutually complementary.

The other issue was related to the use of English phrases and words in the interviews conducted in Russian and Polish. When the participants’ vocabulary was analysed in-depth, it appeared that the incorporation of English language words into the narratives constructed in Polish and Russian languages was a relatively uncommon practice. Neither Polish nor Russian speaking interviewees would frequently insert English words into their sentences. Still English words appeared in
a number of contexts. Migrants would use English words ‘managers’ and ‘supervisors’ when referring to the people who had hierarchical authority in the organizations. This should be seen in the context of ethnic divisions of the employment relation experienced by migrant participants in Northtown: in the majority of cases, managers/supervisors came from ‘White’ British background. In this sense, the use of English words in describing employment relations pointed to the ethnic division existing in the local labour market and in the workplace level. The range of English words used by interviewees in non-English interviews included the terms associated with migrants’ contacts with statutory agencies and welfare institutions: interviewees were using such English words as ‘GPs’, ‘benefits’, ‘council house’, ‘national insurance’, etc. Such words would refer to official terminology, which interviewees did not bother to translate or were not sure how to express in different languages. It did not mean that the situations in which they were using those terms were neutral. Contexts in which those words were uttered were often associated with the problems experienced by migrants in exercising social citizenship, for example in accessing public housing and receiving NHS treatment.

Finally, verbal racist abuse to which migrants were subjected was orally documented in English: interviewees would stick to original insults, and the pejorative and offensive phrases like ‘fucking Polish’ or ‘Paki’ would be repeated as heard.

The use of English words when referring to the encounters with the state and employers or the literal reproduction of racially abusive English words can be seen as the language practices common to individuals living in between different national cultures – the practice which, according to Bhabha (1994), is common to international migrants. While the narratives representing social interactions with family members or fellow migrants tended to exclusively rely on non-English expressions, the narratives of the labour market (see corresponding empirical chapters) and housing experiences were influenced by English language. My approach to English language words which appeared in non English language narratives was to translate the whole sentence in which they were used but to integrate the English words literally, not to rephrase or change them. Notably,
while migrant interviews demonstrated a degree of cultural hybridity (Bhabha, 1994) in expressing themselves and mixing different languages, none of representatives of local statutory agencies, trade unions or voluntary groups from ‘White’ British background spoke or used Polish, Russian or borrowed terms from those language.

On the other end of the spectrum was the use of Polish and Russian obscenities by migrants themselves. It was noticeable for its absence, which eased my workload and prevented headache over a puzzling question: how does one authentically translate obscenities? Even when there was a reference to some kind of ‘soft’ obscenities and swearing, e.g. a Polish female interviewee Malgosia inserted a profanity ‘kurcza’ in a couple of her sentences, it did not provide any significant meaning to the narrative overall. Only on one occasion, a female Kyrgyz interviewee Aziza has referred to obscenities while remembering giving birth in the maternity unit of the hospital in Bishkek (the capital of Kyrgyzstan). She told how nurses were swearing at pregnant women in Russian: she only indicated that by the first letter of the obscenities: ‘They call you a b… and a w…’. After some thinking which included in exercising in trying to convey and translate the Russian obscenities into the English ones, I’ve decided to recreate the sentence in English following the syntax of original (see the quote above). This was done for ethical reasons: Aziza was subjected to abuse and wanted to tell how it happened, but she did not resort to reproducing profanities in full, instead indicating them by initial letters. Thus the indication of profanities in full in the translated version would be inappropriate.

As it was indicated earlier, some interviews with migrants were conducted in English. It was done only when migrants have chosen to speak English themselves. For participants of two focus groups, students of advanced ESOL course in a local college, having a conversation about their migration experiences in Northtown was also an occasion to use English in describing their migratory lives in the language of receiving society. All migrants interviewed in English were fluent and understood questions without any difficulties. Similarly, they could speak English easily and had a rich vocabulary. However it did not mean that they were not making minor grammatical mistakes while speaking. My position was not to correct entirely the
transcribed text, but to bring it more in line with conventional English. The minimal changes aimed to clarify the written text and bring it closer to the conventions of standard English without distorting ideas expressed by interviewees. It was also strived to reduce any editorial changes to the minimum. Thus, the main effort was focused not on a full domestication of migrants’ narratives through attributing them artificial fluency (make them sound as if participants were expressing themselves in most fluent English) – a tactic rejected explicitly by translation studies theorists (Venuti, 2008) on political and ethical grounds, but on making quotes interesting and understandable to readers.

The literature on translation studies is not only concerned with the accuracy of translation, but raises broader political and cultural questions over the translation process. The translation of texts from the languages of developing countries into English has been partially seen as the continuation of neo-colonial power relations (Spivak, 2012). As Spivak (2012) reminds, translators have to be aware that English language has been a communicative tool of the state (the UK) known for its imperial past and racial discrimination. Under such terms, translations into English are seen as a part of homogenizing tendencies inherent to modern world where English language is associated with militarily and economically powerful nation states. This status quo was reinforced by the collapse of the Soviet bloc: as Steiner (1998) pointed out, the dissolution of the Soviet Union, which portrayed itself as an alternative to the Anglo-Saxon dominance, had further enhanced the position of English language globally. None of the interviewees expressed any explicit sadness over the collapse of Soviet communism (though there were, for example, references to high quality and free University education gained under communism), however it was possible to identify an implicit link between the changes in post-Cold War order, migration from the former Soviet bloc to the UK and the switch to English. Many of interviewees would stress that they have not studied English while at school because English language learning was not prioritised under the communist system. It was after the socio-economic change of the 1990s and migration after the EU enlargement when they started to acquire fluency in this language. For some interviewees, there was an explicit link between
migrating and studying English: a Slovak and Kyrgyz participants came first to the UK as language students.

From the perspective of critical post-colonial studies, Spivak (2012) argues that translations into English language tend to homogenise and blur boundaries between identities of various groups and obscure and dilute agency of speakers of non English languages: ‘the literature by a woman in Palestine begins to resemble, in the feel of its prose, something by a man in Taiwan’ (Spivak, 2012, p.315). In Spivak’s (2012) view, such distortions are particularly acute when it comes to translating the narratives of women from the Global South. Spivak’s (2012) argument was criticized for ignoring the potential of subversion inbuilt into translations: texts translated into English can be used to challenge hierarchical relations between the colonizer and colonized or between non English speaking migrants and receiving societies. Drawing on the ideas developed by Bhabha (1994), Munday (2001, p.134) argues that ‘the discourse of colonial power is sophisticated and often camouflaged but its authority may be subverted by the production ambivalent cultural hybridity that allows enunciate space for the disclosure of the colonized to interrelate with it and thus undermine it’. In practical terms, it means that even after undergoing translations into English, participants’ narratives have not lost a potential to contest structures of social exclusion.

There are additional arguments which can support the assertion suggesting that the translation of migrants’ narratives should not be seen as a form of entrapment which strips participants from their cultural identity and imposes monolithic English speaking narrative. Firstly, the texts of translations whether in direct quotes or paraphrases, tend to challenge some negative stereotypes of migration. The dominant discourse in British mass media depicts migrants as health tourists, law breakers, in other words as people of inferior culture (Fox et al., 2012). Fox et al. (2012) contend that those demonizing discourses perform a political role by advocating migrants’ exclusion from the UK labour market and/or the welfare state. In contrast, the translations revealed that migrants were low paid workers, who in spite of their low earnings tended to rely on their own (very limited) financial resources rather than on the welfare state; moreover, it was uncovered
and told through translations that they tend to be victims, not perpetrators of crime. Secondly, the translations were not done solely from one language but two; moreover a consistent effort was made to maintain a relation between translated texts and migrant identities by indicating migrants’ ethnicity, nationality, religion and gender. In doing so, I tried to address dilemmas highlighted by Venuti (2008), Steiner (1994) and Spivak (2012): to distinguish and give individuality and agency to migrants’ narratives in their translated form.

Paradoxically, my own status of an outsider in relation to English language (it’s not my mother tongue) diminished the chances of translations turning into what Steiner (1994) and Venuti (2008) described the fluent domestication: the translated material becoming totally anglicized and sounding as if it originated from the testimonies of native English speakers. My cultural background of a non-native English speaker, who has been facing challenges in adjusting to English speaking environment, inadvertently helped to avoid producing perfectly fluent account of migrants’ narratives. Linguistically and culturally I share commonalities with research participants, who were interviewed in Russian and Polish: the commonalities would range from using similar syntax and making similar mistakes in English. Thus the supposed imperfections of the translations in terms of fluidity of English language can be seen as a form of foreignizing translation, a translation which maintains traces of target text (Venuti, 2008).

The final issue of translation studies’ theory relevance to the broader context of this study relates to the concept of translators’ invisibility introduced by Venuti (2008). Venuti (2008) argued that the publishing industry obscures the identity of the translator: the overwhelming attention is given to author(s) of source text, while translators are marginalised. The reverse could have happened for the in this study: since all translations were conducted by myself, the voices of study’s participants could have become silenced by the researcher/translator. In order to avoid such distortion, data analysis and interpretation used multiple quotations from interviews. Although the interpretations and comments are provided by the researcher, through the introduction of substantive quotes readers of the dissertation should be able to ‘hear’ and ‘feel’ migrants’ voices. Moreover, the quotations from the interviews or even from indirectly paraphrased and re-told
fragments aim to capture the subjectivities of interviewees’ narratives, in other words, the effort is made to show that interviewees were co-creators of research material. At the same time, the transcripts are not solely translated and reproduced, but are subjected to interpretations, which give me as a translator a degree of explicit visibility.

To conclude, it should be stressed that it would be unrealistic to claim that translated interviews’ material is methodologically objective and technically flawless. As a translator, I was bounded by disciplinary and personal limitations. The translation was guided with a particular agenda of producing research material complementing and leading to interpretations; in this sense, it is subjective by definition. At the same time, a consistent effort was made to represent interviewees’ experiences and opinions in written English language without completely losing meaning of original oral non-English narratives. This was not an easy undertaking; it could be reasonable to assume that over time my own view of translation nuances could have changed and evolved. However even in the context of objective limitations, the bringing of the issue of translation into methodological discussion should be seen something both innovative and necessary: more commonly, even in qualitative research, the problem of translating interview material from one language into another is not mentioned at all or mentioned only when it involves the use of technical interpreters, who, as it is argued, can alter the dynamics of interviewing (Jentsch, 1998). This is hardly a justified stance given the interactive nature of the interviewing process and the process of interpretation. For this study, the process of interpretation was inherently linked to translation. Such recognition suggests that the reflections over technical and theoretical issues surrounding the translation process had an integral value to this PhD project. Without it, this study would not be only theoretically flatter, but would overlook a substantial ethical issue.

On a final note related to research methodology, I would like to introduce the geographical context of this study.
2.6 Norhtown in brief

As it was stressed throughout the discussion of this section, the methodological and philosophical underpinnings of this study belong to the grounded theory approach and are embedded within the interpretivist philosophy of social science. Among other things it meant that the priority was given to the collection, interpretation and theorization of primary qualitative data. Nonetheless, it would be logical to provide a concise socio-historic overview of Norhtown as well as to complement it with recent data on the local labour market statistics. This is done not in order to compare secondary data with primary qualitative one or to use secondary data to back up my interpretations, but to set the context, whose aim would be to show the locality’s past and present. It is relevant in terms of understanding various structural contexts, which has influenced local dynamics of migratory experiences. The analysis begins from a background historical review, then looks at the impacts of economic restructuring – paying particular reference to the studies discussing the closure of the mining industry, and concludes with the review of labour market statistics. The presented material aims to reveal changing socio-economic patterns and to show how Norhtown was affected historically by migration.

Norhtown appeared in historical records and was subjected to quantitative mapping as early as in 1090 in *Domesday Book* – the first national survey of England. Ironically, this first statistical record was produced by invading migrants – the Norman conquerors, who sought to legitimise their power over England (Wood, 1988). Norhtown in *Domesday Book* was assigned to its own Norman overlord Ilbert de Lace. Subsequently, the ownership was passed to the monastery of St John at Pontefract, the institution which administered Norhtown for the next four centuries. The monastery was part of the Cluniac movement (Elliott, 1988), which placed it within a pan-European transnational network of exchange of ideas, people and goods. This transnational side is important since it placed Norhtown within the circuit of European exchange throughout the Middle Ages; those processes of exchange could have included migration. While in later periods, non
metropolitan areas in England started to be described as primordially homogeneous in their ethnic composition (Darian-Smith, 1999), the transnational signs going back to the Middle Ages point to the forgotten traditions of diversity and migration. When it came to local activities, the monks had started searching for coal, which led to the foundation of the industry which eventually became dominant locally in the modern period; the monks also turned this locality into a market town, which again could be seen as a stimulus for migration (Elliott, 1988). After the dissolution of monasteries, Northtown was taken by the Crown and continued to expand in terms of economic importance and population size. Apart from the mining, Northtown’s economic activity included such trades as wiremaking, glassmaking, tanning, nailmaking and even gardening; prior to industrial revolution all work was undertaken in small independent workshops (Elliott, 1998).

One of instrumental factors in developing Northtown was its inclusion into the national transportation and mobility network: from 18th century, one of national stage coach routes passed through Northtown (Doggett and Thornton, 2009). Moreover, some travellers were taking notice of Northtown. Trades associated with iron and steel were perceived to be central to Northtown’s economy and social life by visitors: Daniel Defoe in his book *A Tour Thro’ The Whole Island of Great Britain* (first published between 1724 and 1727) referred to the town as a Black Northtown, the description stemming from Defoe’s impression that everything in Northtown was covered by smoke coming from the industries associated with metal working. Defoe also noted that Northtown was among the most populous localities of South Yorkshire.

Another industry which took hold in Northtown was related to textiles. Interestingly, its development was facilitated by inward migration of both capitalists and workers: employers typically came from Quaker background and sought to establish businesses in the areas where their religious practices were tolerated, while many workers came from Scotland and Ireland (Elliot, 1988). But it was the mining trade which became Northtown’s main industry in the Victorian era. The expansion of the mining industry in the middle and second half of 19th
century in Northtown relied on internal mass migration and was facilitated by the newly built rail network (Walker, 1993).

By the beginning of 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the central urban area of Northtown and the network of rural mining villages around it constituted an important economic area particularly in terms of the coal production; it has also undergone social change with rise of labour movement. Ordinary miners as trade union members contributed to establishing a variety of welfare and educational groups, e.g. creating the first mining college in the UK (Doggett and Thornton, 2009).

As other localities in the UK in general and the North of England in particular, Northtown was affected by the economic crisis and political turbulences of the 1930s. Northtown was one of the localities visited and described by George Orwell in his political travelogue \textit{The Road to Wigan Pier} (first published in 1937). Orwell in many ways acted as a middle-class ethnographer observing working class life (which could be seen as a limitation of his account): he shared a house with a mining family and even visited one of the pits. Orwell provided an account of how extremely difficult conditions of work impacted on physical appearance of working men and their health. He also recorded evictions conducted by private landlords.

Yet he also noted more positive aspects of life in Northtown: public showering facilities adjacent to the pits built on miners funds (an example of collectivism, which he admired greatly) and lesser degree of poverty when compared to other localities which he had visited in the North of England.

However Orwell did not idealize mining communities and recorded the manifestations of social attitudes which he condemned: Orwell spent considerable amount of time on describing the visit of Oswald Mosley and his brownshirts. Orwell noted a generally positive reception given to Mosley’s demagogical speeches, which attributed everything from local poverty to low wages to the malicious plots of foreigners and the Jews. The support given to ethnically intolerant rhetoric was not driven by any form of noticeable migration on a local level: Orwell did not note or at least had not written explicitly about foreigners and Jews while staying in Northtown. On the other hand, it should be added that Orwell’s account of Northtown received criticism: for example, the review
published in the local newspaper *Northtown Chronicle*, just after the book’s publication, attacked it for negative generalizations and the failure to record positive developments such as improvement in housing (Doggett and Thornton, 2009). Subsequently, it was also criticised for reducing Northtown’s economic life to coal mining at the expense of describing other industries and trades (Elliott, 1998).

While mining was not the only industry to be found in Northtown after the end of the Second World War, it was the most important one: e.g. in 1981, 24% of workforce was employed in the mining related activities (Elliott, 2011). In response to the labour shortages in the mining sector and other nationalised sectors, the Attlee government recruited Eastern European refugees as a part of European Voluntary Worker scheme. Migrants from this scheme come and eventually settle in such areas as Northtown (Kay and Miles, 1992). However, in contrast to other parts of Northern England which attracted New Commonwealth migrants (particularly Pakistani men) to work in the textile industry (Kalra, 2000), Northtown did not become a significant migration destination area in the post-war Britain.

The coal mining industry was nationalised after the Second World War. While the nationalisation improved workplace safety, industrial relations remained antagonistic, particularly because the state as employer pursued policies of wage restraint (Allen, 1981). However, the area’s traditional (and main) form of employment has started to decline following the miners’ strike and the state’s policies directed against the National Union of Mineworkers (Winterton and Winterton, 1989). Most of mines were closed in the decade following the 1984-1985 strike. In order to address the vacuum created by the destruction of traditional form of employment, the local public policy makers tried to re-model Northtown’s image from the one of ‘mining town’ to being ‘market town’ or even a new University town after the branch of the University of Huddersfield was opened in the former building of the mining college (Doggett and Thornton, 2009).

The mining industry played one of the most central roles in structuring social and labour market experiences of Northtown’s residence. The decline of mining had a deep impact on residents of such communities. A number of sociological studies
conducted in (post) mining communities in the UK bring light on the realities of economic restructuring. While they do not necessarily focus specifically on Northtown, they identify the pattern of socio-economic change in communities which had been dominated by the coal mining since Industrial Revolution. It is important to have a background discussion of this subject since migrants, who were interviewed for the study arrived in the late 1990s and early/mid 2000s, would also face a changed socio-economic landscape. Economic restructuring could be seen as one of many influences affecting new arrivals. Notably, the narratives of migrant participants contain multiple references to the coal mining history of Northtown and the consequences of restructuring.

One of the issues identified by qualitative researchers relates to the ways post-mining communities are being conceived in public discourses. Strangleman et al. (1999) identify two main strains: a positive and negative one. The positive one tends to portray former miners as hard working people who espouse a culture of self-reliance and team-working. In Strangleman’s et al. (1999) evaluation, the positive discourse is mainly aimed at attracting potential private sector investors into former mining areas. However this positive discourse is often counterbalanced by a negative rhetoric which describes mining communities as inflexible, insular and suffering from disproportional level of unemployment. The negative discourse is particularly problematic when it comes to finding new employment: biographical interviews with former miners show that employers from those new industries which are attracted to substitute mining are reluctant to hire former mine workers because of their association of trade unionism and high expectations over workplace safety (Strangleman, 2001).

Moreover, the negative stereotyping is also reinforced by public policy. Following the large scale mines closure in the late 1980s and early 1990s, many workers were offered either earlier retirement or incapacity benefits by the Conservative government. In other words, they were pushed out of the local labour markets altogether, while the employment structure moved towards the dominance of low wage work (Fieldhouse and Hollywood, 1999 and Parry, 2003). Fieldhouse and Hollywood (1999, p.499) note, ‘the lack of alternative employment for miners has led to a situation whereby the most rational option for miners is to register as sick
or to take early retirement’. The mines’ closure had devastating impacts on local communities, particularly in wiping out mining as an occupation passed through generations. However, the impacts of closure were differentiated. As Strangleman (2001) points out, the worst affected group were men who were in their 30s when mines had closed. The members of this group simply did not have an option to choose early retirement or get incapacity benefit. They had to find another form of employment, which almost universally meant accepting lower wages, fixed term contracts and commuting; in some cases, wages were three times lower when compared to those earned prior to the redundancy in the mining industry.

The older men did slightly better: although they had to accept early retirement or invalidity, many of them still maintained social networks of support going back to the work in coal fields. Strangleman (2001) found out that the politics of labourism was still pertinent: redundant, retired miners tended to organise their social life around occupational solidarity networks, including through the National Union of Mineworkers. There was also a differentiated impact on women. Following the closure of mines and the demise of gendered division of labour associated with it, many wives of former miners had to look for paid employment. In almost all cases, the available paid employment was concentrated in low paid and low status jobs (Parry, 2003). According to Parry’s (2003) study, the majority had accepted low wage employment in order to support their families.

However some local women followed a different trajectory, which broke the pattern of paid employment in low wage sectors. The option was prominent in households where males could bring sufficient amount of income, whilst giving their female partners a greater room for individual choice. Those women ‘were consequently able to take the pragmatic decision that the low wages associated with unskilled labour were outweighed by the quality of life they could achieve through voluntary work’ (Parry, 2003, p.236). These women would involve themselves in various forms of unpaid labour which included caring for family members, volunteering in organizing communal leisure activities and participating in local social activism. This switch from paid employment in the local labour market into various forms of unpaid and/or informal labour exercised by women is worth noting: as the findings of this study will show, some migrant women
followed a similar trajectory, i.e. moved away from paid employment in the formal labour market to informal paid and unpaid work.

To conclude social, historic and economic mapping of Northtown, it would be worthwhile to look at recent labour market statistics specifically linked to Northtown. The data presented next reflects the up-to-date administrative structure of Northtown. The collected data set of Official Labour Market Statistics (OLMS, 2013) is being used (note that although the presented data reflects the figures provided by OLMS in 2013, the available figures refer to the periods between 2011 and 2013). Thus, it closely coincides with the timing of the fieldwork.

Looking at recent numerical figures, Northtown’s population is estimated to stand at 231,900. In terms of administrative organization, Northtown’s division consists of traditionally urban town centre and rural areas (the former mining villages) which were integrated into one metropolitan borough. According to general picture, the unemployment rate was around 10.2%, compared to 9.5% in the rest of Yorkshire and Humber region and 7.9% in the UK. The rate of economic inactivity was 25.1% versus 24.1% regionally and 23.3% nationally. Both indicators point to a comparative tendency of lagging behind in socio-economic terms both in relation to regional and national comparisons. Even greater patterns of inequality are observed also when it comes to the figures related to the absence of vocational qualifications: in Northtown 15.1% of total population do not have any kind of qualifications versus 11.9% regionally and 10.6% nationally. The figure for out of work benefits was 5.3% versus 4.9% regionally and 3.8% nationally. Northtown has also a greater percentage of non-standard employment – 33.7% of jobs are part-time versus 32.9% regionally and 31.2% nationally. In terms of occupations, Northtown’s figures for high-skilled and managerial occupations stand at 32.8% versus 38.9% regionally and 43.7% nationally. In contrast, process plant and elementary occupations constitute around 24.9% versus 20.3% regionally and 17.2% nationally.

It also should be noted that although Northtown’s Metropolitan Borough includes rural areas, the official statistics does not record any significant number of jobs
associated with the agricultural sector; while social geography of Northtown’s area can be seen as a mixture of urban and rural, its employment structure is more closely associated with the urban type of economy. Northtown has a large proportion of jobs concentrated in the public sector, which is indicative of reluctance of private sector employers in investing locally: 33% versus 28.6% regionally and 27% nationally. The picture of distribution of gross weekly pay for full time workers was 460.1 pounds compared to 464.7 regionally and 507.6 nationally.

What those figures demonstrate is a consistent pattern of social and economic inequalities: being part of the North of England, Northtown is affected by the inequalities which could be attributed to the inequalities associated with the North and South divide. Moreover, multiple indicators put Northtown in a more disadvantaged position when compared to the average social and labour market indicators of already marginalised region of the UK. Human geographers stress the persistence of the North and South divide in which London and South East of England are positioned against others parts of the UK (Dorling, 2011). Moreover, the scale of the gap and its widening in the last decade are attributed to the closure of traditional industries such as coal mining in Northern England (Dorling, 2011).

The statistical data sets pointed to the patterns of economic restructuring and socio-economic divisions. However, its relevance to a study which adapted a grounded theory approach and an epistemological stance of interpretivism cannot be extended beyond the scope of providing a contextual background. It should be stressed that this statistical data is only a snapshot of local social reality: the ways by which individual migrants and migrant families manage to cope in the context of those structural divisions is an all together different issue, which should be explored through an in-depth biographical analysis of social and labour market trajectories.

Conclusions

The main aim of the sections presented above was to show philosophical premises of the study and outline its methodological approach. Moreover, the review
strived to show why certain research techniques were employed for the purpose of data collection and how it related to the grounded theory approach. The review of grounded theory was instrumental in showing how empirical data was organised and interpreted. The effort was made to go beyond abstract theoretical models developed in social science philosophy and the theory of research methodology. The analysis aimed to reveal how theorisations informed choices made in data gathering and its interpretation. When it came to the examination of empirical material, a particular attention was given to the notion of narrative analysis. On the other hand, the discussion touched on more specific issues: general ethnical concerns and the practice of translation.

All research encounters carried some kind of ethical dilemmas; many of them did not end with the completion of the fieldwork. The discussion aimed to show reflections over those dilemmas and explain how they affected the processes of fieldwork and data interpretation. The review of the issues related to the translations from Russian and Polish into English sought to show that the question over which language is used during the fieldwork is not a trivial and neutral matter. Moreover, it was also shown that the process of translation acted as a stepping stone for the interpretation of empirical findings. Significantly, the discussions of ethics and translation are linked to other sections on methodology, particularly to the review of interpretivism and grounded theory. It demonstrated that the research encounters should be seen as complex social interactions in which both participants and the researcher, exhibited personal subjectivities and contradictory impulses. Finally, the chapter was concluded with the discussion of Northtown – its socio-economic profile and migratory traditions. This was important in order to highlight local particularities – the realities in which participants’ everyday existence was embedded.

The upcoming chapters will move away from the discussion of conceptual and methodological issues to the analysis of empirical findings.
Chapter 3

On the way to Norhtown: lengthy journeys to a medium-sized Northern English town

Introduction

As it was outlined in the introduction, the study aimed to explore social and labour market experiences of migrants in Northtown. Thus, from the first glance it could be assumed that its coverage would be restricted to the analysis of migratory experiences which took place only in Northtown itself. However, the analysis of empirical findings led towards the formulation of a more inclusive operationalization of what can be considered to be a part of migrants’ experiences. The biographical character of interviewing included questions related to participants’ social and economic experiences which took place prior to their arrival and settlement in Northtown. More specifically, while interviewing I asked questions over the type of employment activities in which they engaged prior to migration and the role of family in the migration process.

The purpose of those questions was to understand why participants decided to migrate in the first place. Moreover, I made an attempt to learn more the migration mechanisms and identify routes used by participants in migrating to Britain, the processes accompanying their arrival to Northtown and the strategies of finding work in the local labour market. This interpretive process resulted in the articulation of two major analytical categories: the first one examined the pre-migratory contexts affecting individuals and families, while the second one covered the mechanisms which facilitated participants’ arrival to the UK and Northtown. Those analytical categories contained rich data on such diverse issues as socio-economic contexts of sending societies which affected individuals and families, on the role of migration regulation regimes and individual trajectories of migration. It felt logical to articulate interpretations based on those categories.
There was also a theoretical case for including it into the analysis. Exploring exclusively Northtown related experiences has obvious drawbacks. While it acknowledges that migrants have been living in Northtown for a period of time, it does not explain why and how migrants have settled there. Hence, somewhat ahistorically, Northtown acts as a starting and ending point of migratory experiences. Such position would rule out a systemic examination of causes and reasons of migration. Similarly it would overlook biographical experiences of migration: the questions of how migrants arrived to Northtown and what kind of mechanisms and entry routes they used would have remained unanswered without reconstructing the arrival process. What happens at this stage is important because it not only helps to reveal pre-Northtown migratory experiences, but enables to understand the migration process itself. As Urry (2003, p.156) notes, ‘diverse forms of travel between peoples, places and events are important. Many do not involve getting from A and B as quickly as possible. Such mobilities are organized into complex patterns that transform the very social relations that the social sciences seek to explain’.

The context of family living prior to migration and socio-economic circumstances characteristic to sending societies are also important: the practices of mobility and migration could be understood as individual and family responses to structural dynamics of sending societies. Without the examination of participants’ lives before the departure from home countries, the study’s approach could be accused of methodological nationalism. Contemporary scholarship of migration vigorously contests any manifestations of methodological nationalism by which it understands the exclusive focus on receiving societies. Instead there is an explicit call to look at the contexts of sending societies as well as on transnational experiences of migration (Vertovec, 1999).

Following theoretical sampling of the gathered data, the analysis in this section will focus on, firstly, the ways socio-economic conditions at home (i.e. in the countries of origin) affected participants’ decisions to migrate and, secondly, examine various mechanisms which participants used in migrating to the UK and Northtown.
3.1 Between inter-personal dynamics on one side and structural patterns on the other: bringing the context of sending societies into the perspective

The initial act of migration could be seen as a response to structural developments such as EU enlargement and the opening of the UK labour market. However the choice to migrate could be at least partially explained by the difficulties experienced in home countries in such areas as employment. The perceived shortcomings of sending countries could be as important as new possibilities created by EU enlargement: participants from CEE countries would explicitly state that unfavourable circumstances at home, particularly the unsatisfactory level of pay, had pushed them to migrate. This pattern was particularly prominent in the case of interviewed labour migrants from CEE. The context has been different for Northtown’s migrants originating from non EU countries. Many of them came as a result of ethnic conflicts and personal as well as collective (often violent) pressures. The analysis will primarily focus on EU migrants and discuss how structural conditions in sending countries impacted on their decisions to migrate. Alongside those macro structural factors, it will show how interpersonal relations within the family influenced participants’ reflections over the act of migration. It would be argued that structural socio-economic problems such as unemployment, underemployment and the unsatisfactory level of pay intertwined with family relations. The discussion will conclude with the review of migratory motives of Northtown’s migrants from non EU countries.

Participants’ narratives suggest that although the opening of the UK labour market has created the potential for legalised paid employment, the personal decision to use this opportunity could be seen as a response to unfavourable employment and wider socio-economic conditions in the new EU member states. While national, gender, age and social backgrounds of interviewees had differed, the theme of low level of pay in sending countries as a push factor in migration was shared by most CEE participants. The personal experience of unemployment and underemployment were also cited as the key reasons for migration.
Alina, a Polish labour migrant, claimed that for Polish migrants, whom she met while working in Northtown, the main motivation for migrating was the possibility to secure any kind of employment which could give a chance to earn higher wages when compared to the level available in sending countries:

*If not for the money you get from work – the pay is better here, no one would come here at all...*

This can look like a generalised assertion: the narratives of other participants have been more nuanced than such sweeping statements over the relation between the need to earn higher wages and individual causes of migration. At the same time, the importance of finding paid employment or any kind of employment was very high. For example, a Polish female interviewee Ludmila, who got MA degree in history, but could not find stable employment in Poland and eventually decided to migrate with her boyfriend, who found himself in a similar position, to Britain. It was a necessity to find paid employment which has determined her decision to leave her home country. This was not an isolated example, but a reoccurring theme to be found in the narratives of other participants coming from Poland. Even when participants had a stable and professional job – e.g. a job in such sectors as health and education, they would complain over the level of pay. For instance, a Polish interviewee Tadeusz, who undergone five years of medical education and training, started to work as a qualified nurse, and later as a manager with the public healthcare institution in Poland. However, neither his high level of education nor work experience could guarantee a desired level living for him and his family. It all came down to the unacceptably low level of pay. Hence Tadeusz decided to move:

*I had worked for six months in a hospital as a male nurse. After that I worked as a manager in the department of public health. I worked and I worked, but work was so badly paid – I could not afford anything. So we decided to emigrate*

Upon arriving to the UK, Tadeusz became an assistant to a carpenter rather than a health professional. From the retrospective point of view, the reality of low-wages and high living expenses could not be compensated by a successful career in health services in Poland. Subsequently, it resulted not only in the withdrawal from the
chosen profession but also in leaving the country of birth. The issue of family is also important – Tadeusz did not feel that he could act as an adequate breadwinner so he made the decision to move to the UK.

Similar trajectory was observed with other participants: for example, Jan, who was a physical education teacher, found the level of pay in Polish schools to be unacceptable and decided to move to Britain and look for any job which could bring higher income than those attainable in Poland. Jan was not tied by strong family obligations at the moment of his departure from Poland: he was divorced and made the decision to migrate on his own, though he continued financially to support his family from the first marriage. It should be noted that while the family status of participants was different and that the participants would bring it up while discussing their decisions to leave the country of origin, low wages in Poland were commonly cited by participants irrespective of their family status.

While prior to migration Tadeusz and Jan could still work in the occupations for which they were trained in Poland, this was not a route available to others. Witold, also from Poland, completed a university degree in transport studies. Whilst at the university he worked part-time to support himself. After graduating he could not find a job which would suit him in terms of pay and education. Similarly to Tadeusz, Witold turned to migration as an alternative:

*I studied transport, the management of traffic in transport, but the job which I had didn't allow me for any kind of development. It allowed me to survive on the minimal level without any career perspectives so I eventually quitted my job and became unemployed and I had to live on the unemployment benefit. Since I couldn’t find a job in my profession I had decided to go to England*

This narrative points to the problems associated with low pay or complete exclusion from paid employment as the contexts in which the decision to migrate has been made. Witold also added that his family status – he was single and did not have a partner – in his own words he ‘was an old bachelor’, made his migratory decision-making more flexible. Though for him the elements of wider socio-economic context such as the lack of employment opportunities were central, such
reflections suggest that having or not having a partner and/or children is also important when it comes to individual acts of migration.

Tadeusz and Witold’s migratory trajectories are different, but one pattern is common, i.e. the unsatisfactory level of pay. For them, it failed to guarantee a desired level of living, whether they worked in the professions for which they were trained or not. In this sense, migration was not simply about the response to the opportunity created by Poland and other CEE countries’ entrance to the EU, but rather as a combination of the introduction of new mobility rights and the paucity of opportunities in the country of origin. However, while participants’ decision to migrate was affected by those structural contexts, it was also mediated by the nature of family relations. Tadeusz and Witold exemplify the type of migration conducted and initiated by men. But a reverse scenario also was possible: Karol also from Poland arrived to the UK after his wife found accommodation and employment. Karol, a former Polish language teacher, recognised that the level of pay was one of the main factors, but also pointed to the specific circumstances: he and his wife sought to generate funds for their daughter’s wedding.

When examining the narratives of non-Polish interviewees from other CEE countries, it was also possible to identify the interaction between structural (e.g. low wages) and family based underpinnings of migration. For instance, a Slovak migrant Vaclav came to England to study the language and stayed with his sister who already was living in a city closely located to Northtown. The decision to migrate can also be influenced by the encouragements made by friends: Irina, at the time of migration a single woman from a small town in Latvia was encouraged to go to the UK by a close family friend who told her about higher wages in the UK.

The role of family was particularly felt in chain migration, when participants would join their partners already working and living in Northtown. Being in a relationship had a strong impact on migratory decisions: those who were not single felt emotionally compelled to join their partners and spouses. The women were particularly affected. In the words of Regina from Poland:
Well, I came mostly because I was missing unbearably my husband, who came here simply in order to earn to feed the family. So one day I just grabbed our daughter and came here

Regina’s motivation was driven primarily by psychological distress caused by the separation. However it should be remembered that her husband migrated because of socio-economic reasons – the level of pay in the home country was not satisfactory. Moreover, while she emphasized that her decision was emotionally driven and to a degree spontaneous, she also said that she migrated with the daughter only when her husband found stable paid employment and accommodation, and when the level of his earnings was considerably higher than in Poland. From such examples it appears that the unsatisfactory level of pay pushed one of the spouses to migrate as well as contributed to chain migration of other family members. The unsatisfactory level of income and personal relations created the context in which the decision to migrate was made. This example alongside others suggests that individual acts of migration are formed in the process of interplay between the mechanisms of structural regulations such as migration regimes – EU enlargement, the dissatisfaction over the level of income in home countries and the relations within the family.

The stress on the importance of pre-migratory situation to the departure for the UK was not limited to the married couples with children, separated and single migrants. Younger people, single and cohabiting interviewees reported similar challenges. For some migration was also seen as the last resort: when all attempts to find relatively stable and decently paid work had been exhausted, only then one of partners would chose to leave for the UK.

The recollections of Malgosia about her partner Olgierd provide a vivid illustration. This is how Malgosia talks about Olgierd, his struggles to secure any kind of work and painful experiences he had to go through prior to migration:

Unfortunately, the reality in Poland was very cruel... Olgierd tried very hard, he even worked in physically demanding jobs... He did not want to return to Poland because he could not find work there... he could not see any future in Poland
Back in Poland, Olgierd was disadvantaged by being an orphan: the weakness of family network obstructed the access to the labour market. According to both of them, Olgierd had a chance to find paid employment only with the help of acquaintances. However, because he did not have parents or extended family, he faced a vicious circle of unemployment and underemployment. It meant that he could find work only on a temporary basis (sometimes for days rather than even weeks or months) and the nature of his employment contract was almost always informal. Such employment conditions led to all kinds of unending problems in employment relations which included the withholding of wages by employers and the dismissal without prior notice. Moreover, the type of work her could on temporary basis was primarily in the construction sector, where the work was physically difficult for him.

Olgierd said that he did not see for himself future in Poland. As a result, he considered migration to the UK to be a preferable alternative to the unappealing perspective of staying in Poland. His exclusion from the formal labour market and his desire to leave Poland affected his partner Malgosia. In Malgosia’s words, she was very much in love and did not want to be separated from him. As a member of a household she was affected by her partner’s exclusion from the labour market and any legal form of paid employment. Here again one can notice the set of complex interactions between structural domain and personal relations within the household.

Even when participants could rely on extended family network back in sending countries in finding employment, they still could feel dissatisfied and could choose to migrate. Even when there was a possibility to find employment via extended family network, some participants would still choose to migrate. The reliance on family as the exclusive option in finding employment could lead to the formation of personal tensions, as it happened to one Polish couple – Alina and Lech. In Alina’s words,

*My husband worked for a couple of years in my parents’ company – they have a family business. He had enough of it, you can imagine how difficult relations within*
the family can be. He said that he needed to find something different or to wait for any other opportunity.

Such opinion would suggest that the decision to migrate could be explained not simply by the availability of work or the level of pay but by interpersonal dynamics within the family. While Alina did not say it directly, she implied that her husband could not find work outside the family network. The sense of dependency and family pressure made the work in the wife’s family small firm psychologically distressing for Alina’s husband. Moreover, Lech was not content with the idea of Alina to move to the capital city of Warsaw from their city of Bydgoszcz. Lech felt that while Alina because of her education and skills had a reasonable chance of finding work in civil society organizations, for him the access to the capital’s labour market would be more complicated. So when their family friend proposed to work in a retail store in the UK, Lech decided to take the offer. His wife and their two children have joined him later after his employment situation became more stable. Similarly to the narratives of other participants, the decision to migrate was a complex combination of family and work related reasons rather than a monocular casual process of movement of people exercising EU citizenship rights.

The discussion so far points to the following interpretation. The interaction between the macro context – severe employment problems in CEE countries such as Poland and the possibility to migrate to high income country and the meso-context - the relations within the family and extended kinship networks (e.g. friends and co-ethnics), which led to the departure for the UK and settlement in Northtown. Participants have been often joined by their family members after they have managed to secure paid employment and find accommodation in Northtown. The narratives show that family ties and personal affections were very important influencing factors, when it came to the subsequent migration of family members. The narratives also indicate that there was a gendered dimension: female interviewees felt compelled to join their male partners. While men in relationships left home countries because of socio-economic reasons, at least three Polish female interviewees stressed the emotional aspect. They felt that they had to join their partners in order to preserve personal relationships.
The other influential factor prompting families to migrate was related to the price of living; participants repeatedly mentioned that the level of pay in sending countries was not acceptable to them. It was also pointed out that, while the wages in CEE countries were considerably lower than in the UK, the cost of consumer goods was often similar or even sometimes higher. The interviewees noticed higher prices for food, but also the absence of affordable high street retailers such as Primark in home countries. For instance, Ludmila from Western Polish city of Torun, said that one simply could not purchase new clothing items such as jeans in Poland for the prices existing on the UK high street – it was more expensive in Poland. This daily realities of inability to afford to purchase basic consumption items combined with already low level of pay acted as principal structural factors creating outward migration from CEE. The difference in income between CEE countries and the UK was also felt during migrants’ short-term trips to home countries: participants told that they were viewed with the resentment by some friends and relatives who stayed behind and were jealous about higher income achieved by migrants in Britain. Two female participants from Poland – Ludmila and Alina were particularly adamant in expressing their frustrations with such attitudes; they would also say that people demonstrating such attitudes did not have any idea of what kind of sacrifices migrants had to make by taking low status jobs in the UK and spending long working hours performing jobs which they found inferior in terms of status when compared to their pre-migratory working experiences or the level of their education.

The analysis of narratives of Polish participants, but also some testimonies of participants from Latvia, Estonia and Slovakia suggests that they have left their home countries for a number of reasons: while the paucity of socio-economic opportunities (the level of pay being the central one) was not the exclusive motive of migration, it was noticeable for its commonality – migrants either directly cited it or mentioned it in relation to migration of their family members.

Some participants not only limited themselves to describing the push factors of migration, but made broader judgements over the state of societies left behind. Interviewees have shown a deep-seated sense of bewilderment and frustration with social, economic and political system of governance relevant in sending
societies. When it came to the narratives, this sense of unfairness was reflected in the criticism of corruption and widening social inequalities. This is quite distinctive from other pieces of research on Polish and CEE migration (e.g. Krings et al, 2013): migrants’ narratives gathered by those scholars put the emphasis on individual choices rather than on socio-economic problems and political dissatisfaction with the countries of origin. Interviewees would mention various aspects of sending societies, which they found to be extremely negative. It included corruption and social polarisation. A Polish interviewee Jan was very critical towards what he described as the ruling elites and their control of power:

*Our country is only good for those who are at the top and belong to some kind of ruling class. Those people have the money but they do not think about an ordinary person*

Such general criticism of structural inequalities existing in the sending societies was found in the narratives of other participants. Participants described themselves as belonging to the squeezed middle and argued that the existing divisions in society have prevented in reaching aspired level of living in Poland. Anger and deep sadness were evident in the way Polish male interviewee Tadeusz answered the question over his perception of life in Poland:

*What is in Poland? The richer are getting richer, poor becoming poorer. And there is not almost anyone left in the middle, the middle class is squeezed*

Notably this testimony came as a direct response to the question on the situation in Poland. It suggests that participants reflected on their experiences not only through personal and family angles, but in terms of wider socio-economic and political structures. Such interviewees as Jan and Tadeusz would see themselves as part of the squeezed middle – denied sufficiently well paid employment or excluded from stable paid employment altogether. Those kinds of narratives reveal the experiences of people who feel to be part of the medium social strata, and do not ascribe themselves either to extreme disadvantaged or privileged parts of society. They also share a sense of being ‘out of place’ vis-à-vis existing structures of the sending society and see migration as the most realistic way in improving their and their families’ material well-being.
Participants would not only attack the institutions of state, political and business classes, but expressed negative feelings over some institutions of civil society. It was related to other concern – the corruption present in everyday life. It not only manifested itself in the distribution of power and wealth, but in other social interactions. Another Polish male interviewee Witold asserted that such influential non state institution as the Roman Catholic Church in Poland has been corrupted by economic self-interest and forgotten about the role it should play in society. He argued that the basic rituals such as baptisms and burials are turned into money making events by priests. He claimed that if fees are not being paid, the priest would not take part in the burial service.

There were more examples going beyond Poland. The quoted earlier Polish interviewee Jan visited together with his Latvian wife (whom he has met already in the UK) her country during holidays. He was deeply affected by the trip. However it was not by the richness of historical monuments or beautiful landscapes of east Baltic littoral which impressed him, but by the extent of socio-economic polarisation. He tried to make sense of it in a following way:

*When I was there you actually could see those people who are getting rich on this crisis. It is full of the most expensive luxury cars, which I have never seen in my life even in England. And it is not only in Riga, the capital, but in smaller towns. So I started to ask questions, for example, where do those people get money for these luxuries? Apparently they are establishing firms, hiring people who are desperate for work, but then not paying them wages.*

Arguably, these are observations and perceptions of one individual, hence they might be not particularly representative, but they still reveal how some CEE migrants residing in Northtown feel about socio-economic problems engulfing their home societies. The signs of conspicuous consumption which co-existed with the increasing socio-economic disparities further contributed to the feeling that CEE countries such as Latvia and Poland did not create chances for improving the personal level of living, at least in socio-economic terms. The quoted Jan’s narrative refers to his impressions of visiting Latvia. Jan is himself Polish, but this narrative is remarkably close to his criticism of social polarisation in Poland itself,
which highlight similarities between post-communist CEE countries from the point of view of this interviewee.

Some interviewees would go beyond criticising corruption and socio-economic disparities of sending societies and tried to identify positive aspects of living in Britain. For them the perceived difference was not just about unsatisfactory political order and living standards but on the level of everyday interactions. Witold would say that in contrast to the UK, where daily interactions were mostly easy-going and friendly, in Poland he felt that he was constantly observed and judged by others. An Estonian female interviewee Helle, who took part in one of focus groups, claimed the relations between people in her country were less civil and more confrontational when compared to the UK. Others would praise greater ethnic tolerance in the UK: a number of interviews spoke about manifestations of racism in Poland, while Slovak Vaclav recognised that Slovak Roma migrants received greater acceptance in Britain than in their home country. A Polish interviewee Pawel mentioned that for LGBT migrants from Poland whom he knew, much greater acceptance of their sexuality in the UK constituted a very important factor in the decision to leave Poland.

All of it illustrates that migrants can be affected by a variety of broader social factors in the ways they perceive sending societies and explain their decisions to leave for the UK. However such observations were isolated and did not form a coherent theme as the one associated with high costs of living, the low level of pay and problems with employment opportunities. The references to the discontent unrelated to employment opportunities were scattered throughout the study, however they were isolated. In contrast, the dimension of employment intertwined with the one of family formed a consistent theme re-occurring in the interviews. It points to the centrality of this sentiment to the social worlds of Northtown’s residents coming from post-communist CEE.

The bigger part of empirical data comes from interviews with CEE and particularly with Polish participants. The interpretations so far were focused on this material. However, non EU migrants, who were also interviewed as the representatives of support groups and as individuals, were asked questions about causes of
migration. They also mentioned the contexts of sending countries. The majority of non EU interviewees came to Northtown as dispersed refugees. Moreover, prior to coming to the UK and Northtown they often fled military conflicts, ethnic violence and extreme intolerance. For example, Gazmend, while discussing the context of his arrival to the UK as a member of Kosovo Albanian group, said that all potential uncertainties of migration were outweighed by the desire to survive. In his words, for him and his fellow refugees it was better to leave Kosovo for good in 1999 because they were subjected to ethnic cleansing and had to live in the context of war. The UK in general or Northtown specifically were not seen as a preferred destination for socio-economic reasons. Instead migration was the least dangerous option available in the face of repressions in Kosovo carried out by the authoritarian Serbian government of Slobodan Milosevic and the confrontation between Serbia and NATO alliance. In Gazmend’s narrative, he and his fellow Kosovan Albanians were escaping military and ethnic conflict rather than responding to the lack of socio-economic opportunities at home, as it was in the case of interviewed new EU citizens from CEE countries. Moreover, he stressed the national rather than the kinship aspect of migration: migration was seen as a route taken by a whole persecuted national group rather than by a single family.

The explicit openness of Gazmend in outlining the causes of migration and explaining the events in the sending country at the time of the departure was not shared by all interviewees who came to Northtown as dispersed refugees. Some of interviewees were reluctant to talk about the causes of migration – a very different stance when compared to the narratives of migrants from the new EU member states. The interviewees belonging to the later group have been generally explicit and open in outlining the causes of migration. In contrast, some non EU interviewees would demonstrate caution, when asked about the reasons for leaving countries of origin. An Azeri participant Zeinab was one of such interviewees. When inquired directly over the motives off migration, she replied:

Everyone has his or her own private reasons – we do not inquire about them

Only after being asked to provide an example she mentioned the persecution of Jehovah witnesses in Azerbaijan; according to her the Azeri migrants in Northtown
included people practicing this faith. Taras, an interviewee originally from the Donbass region in Eastern Ukraine, was also reluctant to speak about his personal causes of migration in terms of circumstances in the sending society. He also represented a Russian speaking group so when I asked him whether the reasons of migration for people he knew was the instability in post-Soviet space and the problems faced by the Russian speaking populations in newly established nation states, he answered positively, but did not want to elaborate.

However there were other interviewees who demonstrated greater openness. Moses a dispersed refugee from Georgia was very explicit when talking about his personal reasons of migration. For Moses from Georgia, it was a combination of political instability and economic corruption which at some point became personally dangerous and led to migrate: he claimed that as a political member of the Georgian social-democratic party, he opposed the authoritarian rules of post-Soviet leaders such as Shevardnadze and Saakashvili. As a businessman, he claimed to become a target of organised crime. While Moses was more open about reasons to leave and highly critical about the political regime in the home country, his trajectory was similar to the stories of other non EU migrants cited above. They did not stress the combination socio-economic and family related reasons as it happened to CEE migrants. Rather they pointed to the existence of some kind of involuntary mechanisms which forced them to leave. Those mechanisms could be associated with war, ethnic, political and religious intolerance and crime.

For migrants belonging to this group, human survival outweighed social-economic and family related reasons. In this sense, although non EU migrants and labour migrants from CEE resided in Northtown together and were seen as migrant newcomers by established residents (for more on this see the forthcoming section on ethnic intolerance), the background of their migration histories in terms of sending countries’ context was different. It is also notable that for most interviewed non EU migrants being displaced by military conflicts or facing persecution was the principal reason why they were allowed by UK authorities to stay in Britain and Northtown.
Only one of interviewed non EU participant came to Northtown not as a dispersed migrant, but as a student migrant. Aziza from Kyrgyzstan spoke a lot about social and political situation in the home country. Moreover, she directly connected it to her decision to stay in the UK rather than go back. Similarly to CEE interviews, Aziza pointed to the low level of pay and the rise in social polarisation, however the extent of this phenomenon was far greater than anything mentioned by labour migrants from CEE:

*Back home there is a total chaos, an economic and political one. People are so angry because they do not have work. The streets are full of homeless people and many children live on the streets. You see grandmas and granddads living on the streets because they do not have any place to stay or because their children have thrown them out of their homes. And there is no support if you live on the street – government does not help a bit. This happens particularly among the lower classes*

The poverty impacted on such social institution as family, particularly on households which were already disadvantaged. There was also a recognition that the state was absent when it comes to the provision of welfare. Aziza’s description is much more dramatic when compared to CEE participants: while the latter also spoke about socio-economic disparities, they did not do it by using such strong images and words.

Later in the interview Aziza referred to political change – the overthrow of the president Akayev’s government. While it has changed and reshaped the political and economic elites – in her opinion for the worse, it did not provide any meaningful social or political improvements for most citizens. According to her, the new leadership lacked even the type of charisma exhibited by the deposed president. Aziza was not sure whether the change of government became known as the revolutions of ‘tulips’ (it did happen in Kyrgyzstan) or ‘roses’ (the one which happened in Georgia). It could be explained not merely as a mistake caused by the confusion of the names for different flowers but the expression of scepticism over the possibility of change associated with those revolutionary events.

Moses pointed to a comparable situation in Georgia, where the ‘roses’ revolution took place. According to him, one authoritarian regime was replaced by a different
one. Such reshuffling of governing elites, which did not lead to greater political liberalisation and socio-economic inclusion made him to contend that ordinary citizens, not only new political elites, were responsible for the absence of politically and socially inclusive form of governance. As he put it, ‘*the people deserve their rulers*’. He positioned himself as someone different to the majority of people – he was not as conformist in contrast to the majority. Such rationalization helped him to explain his own migration.

The discussion in this section has revealed that individual decisions to migrate were shaped by structural conditions of sending countries. CEE migrants would cite low wages and the lack of employment opportunities in sending countries as the main reason for migrating. This structural dimension was mediated by the institution of family. Cohabiting and married CEE participants would make migratory decisions together. Moreover, participants would tend to follow the partners who migrated first. It allowed both to minimize risks associated with migration (unemployment or the lack of housing in the UK) and preserve interpersonal relationships. Moreover, CEE participants saw a relation between their decision to migrate and socio-economic as well as political problems in the sending countries. Such socio-economic and political problems as corruption, low wages, new inequalities or even daily discourtesy attracted criticism from participants.

The theme of socio-economic problems was founded in the narratives of most CEE interviewees; in contrast, the reference to EU enlargement was absent. It does not mean that participants were not aware of the ways EU citizenship impacted on their mobility rights. However they emphasized such day to day and personal concerns as the level of pay, the availability of stable employment and family relations. While EU integration provided a legal possibility for their migration, the decision to migrate itself was attributed to other factors. In contrast, when it came to non EU migrants dispersed to Northtown, it was the reference to the military conflicts and political instability which have dominated their narratives. Interviewed non EU migrants left their countries because emigrating was seen as a way to escape existential threats. In this light socio-economic problems were seen as secondary, when compared to political events.
After discussing the causes of migration, it would be possible to explore the ways by which migrant participants arrived to Norhtown.

3.2 On the way to Norhtown: a tale of many stops and different routes

The discussion so far has shown that many factors which affected participants’ decision to leave their countries of origin are related to pre-migratory experiences of work, family and broader socio-economic and political situations. The analysis of data connected to pre-migratory experiences suggests that personal relations within the family, national political-economic contexts or more often the combination of both are important in understanding why the decision to migrate has been made. However, the analysis of initial stages of migration would be incomplete without looking at how participants have migrated and eventually settled in Norhtown. Moreover, the discussion of the migratory mechanisms – the mechanisms understood as personal (e.g. family) and private (e.g. employment agency) intermediaries facilitating the movement from one country to another, can be seen as a logical step in reconstructing life stories of Norhtown’s migrants. By doing so the life stories of participants would not be artificially split between the points before and after migration, but they could be treated as a continuous social process.

Significantly, the reconstruction of individual arrival routes can show how the trajectories of migration are being shaped by structural contexts. When it comes to bringing the dimension related to structural contexts as well as maintaining the role for agency, the concept of the spaces of regulations introduced by MacKenzie and Martinez Lucio (2005) appears to be very useful. MacKenzie and Martinez Lucio (2005) argue that social processes are formed through the interplay of variety of actors: statutory regulators, private sector organizations and such social institutions as family. Those actors form the regulatory landscape, in which individuals and social groups seek to advance their interests.

This logic can be applied to the processes analysed here: the study’s participants moved according to the set of rules set by transnational (the EU) and national (the UK) regulatory bodies. Such policies as EU enlargement and UK dispersal policies
played a key role. Moreover, the migration processes were influenced by other actors such as labour market intermediaries and the existence of informal support networks. The institution of family was also central in understanding both the decision to migrate and the process of migrating itself. At the same time, the analysis will show that participants’ migratory movements were not structured by those mechanisms in a deterministic way. Participants would not only comply with the restrictions imposed by the spaces of regulation, but would take advantage of them and depending on the circumstances use them to benefit themselves and members of their families.

The central focus will be on CEE participants and their migratory journeys to the UK. The analysis will concentrate on the arrival routes of CEE (EU) migrants. It will show that many CEE participants arrived to Northtown after spending time in other parts of the UK. Through interpretations of their narratives, the analysis will uncover the role of non state actors and networks in bringing participants to Northtown. Finally, the analysis will look at the trajectories of non EU migrants.

Interviewed migrants have diverse migratory trajectories and experiences. It was particularly noticeable when the migration experiences more generally, as opposed to more strictly defined migration to Northtown, would be considered. Those forms of migration related to pre-2004 regime when CEE could access the UK labour market as temporary workers (e.g. the agricultural schemes) and as irregular migrants operating beyond the legal framework. It also could apply to participants who migrated to the old EU member states which after 2004 have opened their labour markets. Several participants interviewed for the study have had such kinds of experience. One of them, Jerzy spent a couple of months in the UK working before returning to Poland. Other participants have had experiences working in Southern European countries such as Italy and Spain. Germany was also mentioned by Polish interviewees.

The sectors of employment included agriculture and construction. Notably, this form of migration was experienced by male interviewees. It could be explained by the nature of the industry (the construction) and the risks associated with pre-2004 migratory movements. Because migrants could not exercise EU mobility
rights, most of the time the employment relationship was regulated informally, which created potential for such violations as non-payment of wages. Such experiences were identified both directly, when interviewees started to speak about their pre-UK/Northown experiences of mobility as integral parts of their migratory biographies and indirectly when they mentioned the knowledge of foreign languages. For example, Jan spoke about his fluent knowledge of German and when asked how he had learnt this language responded by telling of his experience of working in Germany:

_I had also worked in Germany for three years and spoke a good German, but obviously I did not pick up any English there. I lived in Hamburg, I also lived in Berlin. There is a great number of Poles working in Germany... They are doing the work in Germany quite similar to the kind of work they get here in England. The Poles work is such places where the German workers would not work, at least for the money they would get..._

Jan’s narrative depicts a picture of ethnically segregated labour market where workers from CEE are confined to the jobs avoided by local workers because of their low pay. What is also important is the fact that it took place either before EU enlargement and certainly prior to 2013 (the new EU citizens got full labour market rights in Germany) when CEE migrants employment in Germany was largely concentrated in the informal economy in such sectors like construction, hospitality and agriculture (Greer et al., 2013). In these sectors the working conditions were not always determined by the established forms of regulation but by informal relations between employers and labour migrants. It should be reminded that even after EU enlargement in 2004, Germany did not automatically open its labour market for the new EU citizens. One of the results of this was a proliferation of informal employment, particularly in the construction sector (Greer et al., 2013). For such interviewees as Jan such employment could only constitute a temporary option so after a period of working in Germany he returned to Poland. Because he could not find a better paid job in Poland or get a job with satisfactory level of pay in his profession (a physical education teacher), he decided to leave for the UK, where at the time of the interview he had spent already four years.
It should be noted that this form of migration, which mostly consisted of temporary trans-European mobility, was not restricted to low status/low pay work and old EU member states. There was a distinctive example represented by Vaclav, an IT specialist from Slovakia. This interviewee decided to quit his PhD studies in computer sciences in his home city of Kosice and decided to go work to the US. It was less than a year long work permit, which he did not manage to extend so he had to return to Slovakia after relatively short period of time. Vaclav’s pre-Northtown migratory experience represents the example of the recruitment of high skilled professionals and their placements on fixed contracts. It’s particularly widely used in targeting young, unmarried graduate and it is typically offered on a time restricted basis (Banerjee, 2006). Such migrants are seen as offering both functional and numerical flexibility to large US IT firms: migrants cannot bring their families to the US, hence they are more prepared to accept highly mobile lives styles, work on short term project and be ready to change geographical locations very frequently. They are also easily dismissed: if employer does not wish to sponsor new visa application, those migrants do not have any other legal choice than to leave the US. Vaclav’s trajectory reflects such structural patterning of individual migration.

The existence of pre-UK and pre-Northtown experiences of migration tells that migratory experiences of some of Northtown’s migrants cannot be always reduced to clearly defined starting and ending points. The trajectories of migration may include short-term settlements in other parts of the UK or migration to other countries. Prior to EU enlargement in 2004 and UK’s opening of its labour market, temporary, short-term and sometimes irregular (undocumented) migration could have been the most accessible channel for CEEs seeking work in more affluent Western countries.

Having identified and discussed the experiences of migration pre-dating EU enlargement as well as the examples of short-term migratory movements outside of the EU, it would be possible to move at the segment central to the main aim of this study – the analysis of UK’s and more specifically Northtown’s migratory experiences. The gathered data reveals a complex picture reflecting the
involvement of multiple actors sustaining labour migration between the UK and the new EU member states.

EU freedom of movement and the opening of UK labour market formed a general regulatory framework underpinning migration of CEE participants. However the undertaking of migration also relied on other actors: e.g. on the support of family and kinship networks or/and the use of services provided by such private actors as labour market intermediaries. Moreover, some participants would not arrive and settle in Northtown straight away, but spent some time in other parts of the UK.

Moving to the UK and entering the labour market were intrinsically linked: in contrast to sensational discourse of welfare tourism displayed in UK mass media (Fox et al., 2012), participants would stress that they moved to the UK in order to find work. However the migration process was not simply a matter of individual decision and effort: the process of arriving to the UK and finding work involved a variety of social mechanisms. One of the key mechanisms was associated with the extended kinship network. The reliance on family, friends and more broadly people coming from the same ethnic background was instrumental. A number of interviewees used this route and provided a detailed account of it.

Initially Jan arrived to the traditional destination for migrants – the metropolitan London area. His fellow Polish friends, who lived and worked there already, suggested that he could find work in a retail store. Jan could not manage to get a job in this London store: it appeared that his friends were over-optimistic. The informal offer was not fulfilled. However the same firm has offered a job in a different town - Northtown. Finding Northtown was not that easy, particularly since he was not advised on its locality and had not heard about it before. Instead he had to figure out everything by himself:

*They told me that there would be work in a different store owned by them in Northtown. In Northtown, not in Swindon, you see...But they told me not to worry since it would be close to Swindon, they told me that I could get to Northtown by bus. So I agreed...So I went to bus station. My English was bad then but by using Polish-English phrase book, I managed to converse with the woman who was selling*
the tickets and she explained me that a one-way ticket would cost thirty pounds. She told me that Norhtown is even more far away than Manchester, more than four hundred kilometres away. I went to that Hindu-owned retail store and told them that... They responded that they were confused, apparently there was another Norhtown closed to London... But at the end, I got to that second, to the far way Norhtown.

It might seem that Jan arrived to Norhtown by some kind of accident or simply because he was a victim of relying too much on informal promises and trusting his friends too much. However his story points to something else as well: the initial plan to find work in a traditional area of migration via friends did not work out because employer demand for migrant labour was saturated. In addition, Jan’s trajectory also highlights that entering the UK labour market is a complex social phenomenon for migrant workers rather than a simple rational act of selling one’s own labour: before Jan managed to find a job, he had to go through a variety of social, labour market and even geographical (in the sense of being spatial) experiences. Furthermore, the choice of Norhtown was not determined by any personal preferences, but by the availability of work and the lack of knowledge over potential alternatives. The narratives of other participants pointed to the differences but also to the similarities when compared to Jan’s trajectory.

Another interviewee – Tadeusz, came to Norhtown upon the invitation of his relative who already lived there. At the same time, he had a contact with a Norhtown based carpenter, who needed assistants. Hence the arrival was not solely predicated upon the reliance on family and kinship networks but on the availability of paid employment.

A similar picture emerges from the migratory biography of Alina and her husband. Their friend Jan, who already lived and worked in Norhtown, while visiting Poland during holidays, suggested them idea to look for work in the UK:

Jan was invited to stay with us for a holiday in Bydgoszcz, he came for the Easter. Jan told us about his work here, he worked in a store then. He told that it was not a great job, but at least something stable. He told my husband that there was one job vacancy and proposed my husband to go with him. But I said: listen Jan, how can
we go simply based on your promise, to leave our family, we need to be certain that there is going to be work. We called to that store and talked to the manager. He told, yes, that there was work, that we could come. Eventually my husband travelled with Jan. He started to work in that store, almost immediately after his arrival.

As this extract shows, in order to reduce uncertainty, Alina got in touch with the manager to confirm the existence of this job vacancy. Even more significant is Alina’s emphasis on the family – migration is seen not only as an individual endeavour but as something involving the whole household (this has been already highlighted in the previous chapter). The significance of the family dimension came out strongly in the migration process itself: initially Alina’s husband went on his own, found employment and accommodation, and only after that Alina joined him. This strategy echoes assertion made by Stark (1991) who argued that in the migration process households develop strategies aimed to minimize insecurities associated with international migration. Speaking about the migration to Northtown more specifically, the combined analysis of Jan and Alina’s narratives points to the emergence of chain migration enabled by inter-personal networks. It also explains how Northtown became a migratory destination for Polish migrants who did not have prior knowledge of it. Alina and her husband upon arrival to Northtown secured only low paid and low-status jobs below their level of education – the jobs available elsewhere in Britain’s low-wage economy, they did not go anywhere else in the UK or to urban centres known for its Polish Diaspora. Instead they went to the town where they had a personal friend whom they could rely and trust (albeit doing double checking themselves first).

The analysis of migrant narratives above shows the importance of personal ties associated with family and friends in facilitating migration and getting access to the labour market. It is also notable that in all cases discussed earlier, the interviewees mentioned the presence of acquaintances already living and working in the UK. Those individuals could offer help and advice, although the immediate access to the labour market was not guaranteed – migrants had to take risks and sometimes look for jobs upon the arrival to the UK. Nonetheless, the availability of personal contacts acted as an influential factor in undertaking migration particularly in
terms of providing reasonable employment prospects. However, not all participants had those informal contacts in the UK prior to their departure. To fill this gap they would rely on a different actor – the labour market intermediary.

As it appeared from the gathered empirical material, transnational employment agencies played an important role in connecting Norhtown’s employers and EU labour migrants. The interviews with several Polish participants contained some evidence on the use of agencies by migrants. While employment agencies’ motives to recruit migrants can be explained by the pursuit of profit and the utilisation of low cost labour, it would be important to ask why migrants used them in the first place. One of the potential clues is a degree of predictability provided by such labour market intermediaries. Those migrants who did not have friends or family members already living and working in the UK often did not have any other alternative than to turn to employment agencies. This was evident from the recollections of Witold, a single man from Poland who initially came not to Norhtown directly but, firstly, he arrived to a different Northern English town, Bury. The access to the labour market was based on the networks developed by the employment agency. Witold describes his arrival to Britain in a very emotive and positive way:

*It was June 2005. I arrived here with a group of Poles who also sought work. I have fallen in love with England from the first sight. England greeted as with a wonderful weather, in spite of all negative stereotypes. The English people welcomed as with open arms. I arrived with people from all over Poland, not with my friends, but with people who sought work like I, because of economic reasons...And I have fallen in love with this country because I had everything being secured – home and work. I had much more than in Poland. Also I had basic rights guaranteed by the European Union.*

Putting aside Witold’s atypical praise for the climate of the British Isles, the theme of assured paid employment is significant. As far as Witold was concerned, by using the agency, he did not have to worry about finding work or housing upon arrival to Britain. The agency had not only facilitated the access to the labour market, but it had also secured labour maintenance in the form of housing provision. However, it
was a depersonalized type of migration – Witold arrived not with his friends and/or family but with strangers, people united only by the urgency to find employment abroad. Moreover, even though Witold was initially content with the housing provision and employment – he felt that it was easier than looking for employment himself, he got later frustrated with the insecurity associated with such housing provision, which in itself was tied and controlled by this particular employer (for more of it see the section on housing).

While the use of labour market intermediaries seemed to be an alternative to the mechanism of migration driven by informal and family contacts, it does not mean that the dimension of family and friendship was absent from the route created by intermediaries. Sometimes they would be advised to approach agencies by partners and friends. Witold himself became an actor facilitating the movement between Poland and the UK – his family members came to the UK upon his invitation. Moreover, for other interviewees, the access to labour market intermediary was facilitated by the family member.

Malgosia explained how her boyfriend Olgierd left their hometown in Eastern Poland and started to work in Britain. It all began from the Internet search during which they accidentally saw an advert promising employment in Britain:

*We checked the website of the employment agency called Fire...This Warsaw based agency directly recruits Poles to work in the UK, they also transport them either on a bus or a plane. So my boyfriend Olgierd called them and later had to go to take an English language test. He passed it without any problems – it was an easy test and he knew English well, but even those people who had very little knowledge of English passed it*

Upon the arrival to the UK, he was moved to work in the distribution centre based near Northtown. It was a relatively straightforward migration, particularly in terms of reaching the destination and finding paid employment. Two factors are significant: similarly to the cases of Polish migrants discussed earlier, it appears that EU freedom of movement makes CEE migration relatively easy: participants with the help of family member can approach agency and use it for moving to the UK and finding work. However, it provides more detailed information on the ways
such intermediaries operate. There was a minimal barrier in the form of language test which was introduced not by state’s authorities but by the private actor – the employment agency. Olgierd half-jokingly said that his knowledge of English was very poor at the time, but apparently even candidates who knew English worse than himself managed to pass this ‘test’. It tells about the ways agencies are operating and their strategies in targeting potential labour migrants: language efficiency or any academic and vocational skills played a secondary role for the agency aiming to fill the low-skill niche in the local labour markets.

However, labour market intermediaries did not always guarantee paid employment which they promised. The story of Irina, a Russian speaking Latvian woman is illustrative in terms of unplanned and volatile migratory trajectory. Irina used a Riga based agency in trying to find initial employment in Britain. She trusted her friend and believed that this agency would secure paid employment. However, this agency, after charging a fee, did not fulfil its promise of providing regularly paid job:

*You want to know about my coming to England? It was a long story... A friend of mine encouraged me to go. Five years ago it was popular to go for a couple of months, to collect strawberries, and then to return home. So I had decided to go to an agency... but it appeared to be the fake one... I paid them money. They gave us tickets to London but the documents promising us work were fraudulent. No one waited for us in that farm. We got there, it was near Cambridge. They had too many people, they did not have work for us. I had earned just two pounds in one month.*

This was followed by a similar kind of insecure, temporary job, forcing Irina to consider returning to Latvia. It was a proposition of another friend from Latvia, who lived and worked in Northtown and promised to find her employment, which has changed her mind. She moved to Northtown and started to work in a bottle repackaging plant. Thus, in order to compensate the failure of this labour market intermediary in finding stable paid employment, she had to use her personal ties in entering the labour market. This account shows that although employment agencies can act as facilitators in accessing the UK labour market, it does not mean that CEE workers will automatically get paid employment. To use Irina’s own
words, getting something resembling normalised employment can be ‘a long story’. The agencies operating in sending countries may be simply unaccountable for what takes place in the UK. It also shows that while some agencies like those used by Witold and Olgierd can adapt a long-term approach and provide promised employment for labour migrants, others opt for short-term opportunistic or even fraudulent practices. Finally, the analysis also suggests that participants often rely on a variety of actors in finding paid employment: when labour market intermediaries fail to deliver migrants could turn to kinship networks.

The analysis of arrival routes created by CEE migrants shows the significance of kinship networks and the role of such private actors as labour market intermediaries in facilitating transnational relocations. However participants’ ability to use those actors has been underpinned by wider structural policies as EU freedom of movement and UK migration policy which has allowed CEE migrants to access its labour market freely since 2004. CEE migrants arrived to Northtown because they could exercise their EU citizenship rights in the first place: this dimension was determined by the regulations of the EU and the UK. The reliance on personal ties and the use of agencies should be understood in this context. In contrast, the trajectory of non EU migrants, who were also interviewed in Northtown was very different because of the UK migration regime and its policy towards non EU migrants.

In the interviews, most of non EU migrants were very explicit in explaining how they have settled in Northtown. The participants would say that they were sent to Northtown as a part of refugee dispersal policy administered by UK authorities. The act of migration is traced to the response of the UK to refugee crisis in Macedonia and Albania, which followed the conflict in Kosovo and the intervention of the UK and its NATO allies. According to Gazmend,

*The Kosovan programme in ninety nine....Kosovan Albanian group which were brought to Northtown by planes.*

The airlift to Leeds Bradford Airport was the starting point of British migration story for this group of Northtown’s migrants. Gazmend and his fellow migrants were settled in Northtown because of its close proximity to this airfield as well as
because it was consistent with UK dispersal policy in settling refugees in the areas located away from London and South East. The migration trajectory was directly shaped by the British state: firstly, as the participant in the NATO bombing campaign directed against Serbian forces, and secondly, as the actor which directed the flows of some refugees, Gazmend among them, to its territory. Northtown was not chosen by Gazmend because of the presence of family members or the existence of work opportunities. He ended up in Northtown because it was policy of British state to settle and house migrants like him in this locality.

Moses, who left because of the fear for his life Georgia for the UK, had ended up settling in Northtown. As with Gazmend, it was the policy of dispersal which determined his migratory trajectory. He firstly came to London, where he asked for asylum. From London he was sent to Northtown.

Moses arrival to Northtown was a direct result of the policy of dispersal, which was introduced in order to move way non EU migrants seeking asylum in the UK from traditional gateway cities such as London to places like Northtown. It also should be noted that in contrast to EU migrants, whose experiences were discussed earlier, Moses’ trajectory was shaped solely by one structural actor – the UK, as opposed to CEE migrants who navigated in the context of the UK and EU policies. The role of the state and its policies were decisive: he answered the question on his coming to Northtown in a straightforward way:

*Oh why I am in Northtown? Because Home Office move me here*

Other interviewed non EU migrants, e.g. a female interviewee from Azerbaijan or from a focus group participant from Congo talked about their move to Northtown using similar terms and pointing to the branch of the state (Home Office) as an actor which brought them to this particular locality. It suggests the primacy of the state’s policies in determining their trajectory. There is an explicit recognition over the limits of individual agency as well as the private actors and social networks when it came to the initial arrival to Northtown: it happened because migrants chose to use certain labour market intermediaries and because of the support provided by the kinship network. There are more analogous patterns when the
examples of Moses and Gazmend are compared: first, the departure (either individual or collective) linked to extreme existential insecurity, and, secondly, after entering the UK, internal migration is being channelled by the state. In the first scenario, state’s polices can be traced to the actions undertaken within sending countries – the border regions of Macedonia from where refugees were airlifted to the UK to Leeds Bradford Airport and settled in nearby Northtown. Alternatively, a refugee could arrive to the UK on her or his own (or with family members), typically to London and then statutory agencies would have asked them to go to Northtown as a part of its policy of dispersal. The important issue to notice here is the role played by the state in controlling migrants’ settlement in the UK: those non EU migrants did not get a chance in selecting the place of residence in the UK, at least while the asylum claims were processed. Their transitory experiences are tightly controlled by statutory agencies. In other words, there was a very little room for manoeuvre for individuals, families or labour market intermediaries.

The trajectories of non EU migrants are also different when it comes to first experiences in the destination. Labour migrants from the new EU member states had to start to work immediately – the explicit rationale for migration was to find paid employment. Moreover, their access to the welfare state was conditioned by active labour market participation. They could access certain services and benefits after one year of continuous employment. In contrast, non EU migrants could access social services if they complied with the dispersal policy but could engage in paid employment only then when a positive decision was made over their asylum requests.

There was one non-EU interviewee, whose arrival to Northtown was not related to UK dispersal policy. Initially Aziza, a woman from Kyrgyzstan, was sent to London by her government to study English. In other words, a policy aiming to increase English literacy led to her initial coming to the UK. However, when the government was removed following the uprising, Aziza was left without her scholarship. As a result of it Aziza had to find employment in London where she lived and studied. For her it was not an easy task even when it came to filling the necessary registration documents:
In London I could not get a national insurance, I worked only for twenty hours per week and my employers were telling: either you get a national insurance or leave. I did not know what was that national insurance ...they gave me phone number, but I struggled with English so how I would call? Once I went to this centre to get national insurance and they asked: have you got an appointment? I said no and just left. It was such a stressful thing.

Following the change in the political environment in her country of origin, she turned from being an international student sponsored by her home country to a migrant in need of paid employment to survive. Another difficulty was not structural but personal: without extended support network finding work or even sorting out basic documents can be a challenge. Without contacts in London Aziza struggled to adapt – the new circumstances, the difficulties with the English language and the fear of bureaucracy all acted as barriers. Instead of trying to stay in London, she went to an unknown medium sized town in the North of England. Her decision was based on the informal contact and support she could get from her Kyrgyz friend who was married to an Englishman living in Northtown. A strong tie with a female co-ethnic living in a different part of the UK in effect was more fruitful than all potential ties the global city could offer to her. Aziza’s trajectory highlights the role of the state: however in this case, it relates to her home country. The withdrawal of funding forced her to abandon the initial area of settlement in the UK and pushed her to go to Northtown. Her legal status of a student migrant was also important – she could move freely in the UK rather than was totally depended on UK dispersal policy for refugees.

Conclusions

The main aims of the discussion were to explore why interviewed participants have decided to leave their home countries and how they have eventually settled in Northtown. The analysis was concerned with the family and individual narratives of migration: those narratives formed a basis for the interpretations which tried to explain why and how participants have engaged in migration. At the same time, the interpretations pointed to the fundamental significance of various structural
underpinnings– from socio-economic conditions at home to UK migration policies. It was shown that although families and individuals exercise personal discretion when it comes to migratory decision making, their migratory trajectories were shaped and structured by wider patterns stemming from national policies, regional inequalities and citizenship rights. While participants have settled in the specific locality in the North of England, the migration process is much more complex and multi-layered than the stereotypical assumptions over the moving from lower income countries to the UK. As the analysis shows, migratory experiences have been firmly embedded within the changing regulatory landscape. The collapse of Soviet system in Central Eastern Europe and Eurasia, which took place between 1989 and 1991, had a profound and diverse impact on the people of this region. On one hand, CEEs gained in new civil rights, including mobility rights which were acquired in 2004. On the other hand, the post-communist transition created new forms of social inequality. The participants interviewed for the study felt that the new political arrangements failed to provide sufficient socio-economic and employment opportunities for a significant part of the population of former communist countries. This in turn, has contributed to the wave of mass migration since 2004. The interviewed participants from Poland and other CEE countries are part of this wave.

Hence the post-communist transformation created a paradoxical situation characterised by greater civil freedoms on one side and socio-economic struggles faced by many on the other. While EU enlargement in 2004 created opportunity for transnational mobility, the personal choice to exercise those rights was influenced by unfavourable socio-economic conditions in post-communist states.

The analysis has also revealed the difference between non EU and EU migrants: the former, refugees and asylum seekers in particularly, were pushed to leave their countries of origin because of violent and dramatic events. Some of them were directly and indirectly related to the fall of authoritarian communist system and the instability of regimes which followed it: the conflicts in Central Asia, Caucasus and the Balkans. Robinson et al. (2003) observed that the 1990s have been characterised by the increase in forced migration as well as the greater global inter-connectivity which allowed refugees to reach destination countries more
easily. However the freedom of movement within those countries, the UK in this example, has been restricted by the introduction of dispersal policies with which forced migrants had to comply.

The other main contribution of the section was related to the analysis of participants’ movements which led to their settlement in Northtown. It was done through the reconstruction of their journeys. Significantly, participants articulated their migratory experiences through the use of narratives with a point of departure rooted in the countries of origin. Moreover, they saw the act of migration as a phenomenon embedded both in the sending and receiving countries as well as shaped by private actors and social networks. Rather than being seen as a straightforward action of moving from the countries of origin to Northtown solely based on individual preferences, the movement was affected by multiple social actors – the regulations imposed by nation states, the family relations, the existence of social networks and the activities of labour market intermediaries.

Social theorists of contemporary migration have been critical of the attempts to describe migration as a process combining the departure and settlement with a typically invisible mobility in between (Appadurai, 1996). Empirical findings and their interpretation here support such standpoint. The review of pre-migratory experiences and migration trajectories illustrated that the arrival to Northtown itself was often preceded by the acts of geographical mobility in the UK, the country of origin or elsewhere. Moreover, using a geometrical comparison, it might be argued that for participants reaching of Northtown from countries of origin resembles a zigzag rather than a straight line. Whilst the majority of non EU migrants were affected by UK dispersal policies, labour migrants from CEE tended to find their way to Northtown by using the social networks based on kinship or labour market intermediaries as well as the combinations of both. Although their arrival to Northtown was voluntary in nature, it was primarily attributed to the need to secure paid employment.

On the basis of gathered narratives, it seems that Northtown became a migratory destination for interviewed participants not because it had a symbolical significance as a destination per se, but because of certain circumstances ranging
from the combination of unfavourable conditions in home countries, employment opportunities, family strategies, state’s policies and the availability of intermediaries and social networks. As the review illuminates, for most migrants (particularly for the family members who arrived first), Northtown, as a locality, did not have any personal meaning prior to the arrival: to use the term introduced by Auge (2008, p.63) it was a non-place – ‘a space which cannot be defined as relational, or historical, or connected with identity’. Northtown became a destination not because of its inherent qualities or attractiveness. Rather it was a combination of migration policies, family influences, socio-economic and political problems in home countries and the presence of networks and intermediaries which turned Northtown into a destination for migrant participants.

After discussing the causes of migration and arrival routes, it will be possible to explore Northtown based experiences of migrants. The analysis will begin from labour market experiences.
Chapter 4

The sphere of the labour market

Introduction

Paid employment constituted one of the most important aspects of Northtown’s migrants’ lives: the majority of interviewed participants have been active in the local labour market and spend significant parts of their lives at work. The issue of labour market participation has emerged already earlier when the analysis touched the processes associated with labour market entry mechanisms. The next step of the analysis would be to discuss directly the experiences of paid employment in Northtown’s labour market.

The study’s migrant participants spoke at length about their labour market experiences. Moreover, while they would tell about their individual experiences, their stories would also provide some light onto the activities of employers and trade unions with which migrant participants interacted in the workplace. Research material provides a collection of narratives which could be read and interpreted in many ways. The reflection over the gathered data led toward the articulation of three major analytical categories.

The first major analytical category relates to downward occupational mobility: participants would often work in the jobs below their educational level. Participants showed a great deal of willingness to reflect on this subject from various angles. By talking about their frustrations over being pushed to do the jobs which they resented for the variety of reasons, participants also provided some in-depth descriptions of workplace interactions.

The second analytical category covers structural divisions in the workplaces and in the local labour market. The gathered evidence suggests that one of the key features of migrant paid employment in Northtown was associated with the confinement to low status and labour intensive sectors of employment. Moreover,
migrants’ working lives were characterised by long working hours and exhibited the pattern of low pay. If viewed in structural terms, such configuration could be described as a classical case of migrant labour concentration in the secondary tier of the local labour market. The segmentation was not restricted to the labour market: the divisions had been also present in the workplace level, where migrants were affected by the vertical segregation. In other words, migrant participants faced multiple structural barriers in the sphere of paid employment.

The final category is concerned with the meanings attributed to workplace interactions. Participants spoke about employment relations from a normative rather than exclusively economic point of view. Participants would refer to human and inhuman (as well as humane and inhumane) relations at work. In order to strengthen the analysis of migrants' narratives theoretically, the concept of moral economy is used as an encapsulating construct, which frames the understanding of the sentiments expressed by interviewees. This concept is useful since it can help to understand 'how human connection persists even in 'vicious' work environments as people borrow from the norms and values of communities outside of the workplace or from their past working experience to render current practices as fair or unfair while searching for ways to improve the situation' (Bolton and Laaser, 2013, p.519). The social historian E.P. Thompson (1972) was first to formulate it explicitly in his seminal study of the food rioting in the 18th century England. The starting point in Thompson’s (1972) analysis was the critique of what he viewed as the dogmatic Marxist tendency to reduce all manifestations of rioting to the reaction to economic hardships. For Thompson (1972), the rioting of miners and weavers was not only a product of rising bread prices and stagnating wages, but a response to the dissolving of the moral economy of pre-industrial England. The rioters attacked and destroyed property of millers and bakers because they saw the increase of prices as a socially unacceptable practice which violated the norms of decency accepted in society.

Bolton and Laaser (2013) argue that the significance of the concept goes beyond the historical context analysed by Thompson (1972) and should be applied to contemporary employment relations. This notion is particularly sensitive when one considers low pay and low status jobs since it can be used to explore non-
monetary and emotive aspects of employment relations from the employees’ point of view – this is why it is employed as the labelling and analytical tool in interpreting significant parts of participants’ narratives. Finally, while the notion of moral economy can be applied to the analysis of individual subjectivities of labour market experiences, it can also incorporate the dimension covering interactions between migrant participants and trade unions.

The outlined organisation of the analysis is not the only possible frame of reference in interpreting the gathered material on labour market experiences (for a different interpretation of some parts of the material see Ciupijus (2012a); this specific paper (Ciupijus, 2012a) stressed one particular aspect – the use by CEE participants the expression ‘labour camp’ and it attempted to explain it as the manifestation of collective memory in contemporary European migration). In contrast, the framework of moral economy is the most suitable for this PhD chapter since in helps to ensure the inclusivity of the sample (both CEE migrants from the EU and non EU migrants) as well as showing different sides of the experiences of paid employment.

### 4.1 Downward occupational mobility: the migrants of Northtown and their experiences of low status work

Migrant participants interviewed for the study, including both CEE labour migrants from the EU and non EU migrants, tended to be employed in labour intensive, low pay and low status jobs. When asked to name their former and current employers in Northtown, participants would cite local employers involved in the food production, e.g. the meatpacking plant and the bakery, recycling, repackaging, furniture manufacturing and a car bearing plant. Some also had temporary experience of construction work and (less commonly) in the service sector. This was particularly the case of male interviews. The responses of female interviewees have been similar – they also had experiences of working in such sectors as food production and recycling, however they also recollected about their employment in other sectors: among other things they cited industrial cleaning, childcare work and service sector work. Such answers point to a gendered segmentation – the
employment of female participants was characterised by greater heterogeneity when compared to the employment of migrant men. At the same time, structurally, the employment pattern of both female and male was dominated by low wage and low status work. Moreover, irrespective of their gender, ethnicity and nationality, the study’s participants often worked below the level of their education.

The jobs performed by participants in Northtown required some form of manual/physical labour to which many participants were not accustomed prior to migration. Hence when it comes to the comparison between the level of education and/or the type of jobs performed prior to migration and the realities of work in Northtown, it would be possible to identify downward occupational mobility as a pattern structuring the experiences of the study’s participants. Significantly, even those migrants, who at the time of the interview worked in professional jobs, e.g. Slovak interviewee Vaclav, would still speak about broader impacts of downward occupational mobility on migrants and on their families. As an Ukrainian interviewee Taras, who worked as an administrator in a local college, put it, ‘the life is not sugar’ for Northtown’s migrants: irrespective of their education they had to reconcile themselves with the reality of low status work in local factories and hope that their children through their education and knowledge of British way of life will be able to have better opportunities. To sum up, downward occupational mobility was a structural framework affecting Northtown’s migrants. Migrants who have experienced this structural pattern directly spoke at great length about their feelings and reflections over working in low status jobs in the local labour market.

The feelings created by the type of employment experienced in Northtown were diverse. While some Polish and other interviewees said that they did not feel embarrassed to do any kind of work and that downward occupational mobility did not create of disillusionment when it came to migration experiences, other interviewees saw it in extremely negative terms. Some interviewees spoke how they felt frustrated over the move from what they called intellectual work, which they performed prior to migration, to manual work in Northtown. A number of Polish interviewees also stressed while in Poland at work they were surrounded by
University educated colleagues, in Northtown their British co-workers, at least in their opinions, consisted exclusively from the people coming from ‘White’ British working class. Hence it was not only the change in occupation and/or the need to work in the jobs which did not reflect the level of education, but the perception over social interactions in the workplace. The fact that they were primarily interacting with working class people rather than with University educated professionals, as they used in home countries, further highlighted their downward occupational mobility.

One of the most common descriptions related to downward occupational mobility included the references to monotony and boredom. One of interviewees, Tadeusz from Poland, when asked to describe his attitude towards his job (at the time of the interview, he was employed by a kitchen furniture manufacturer) responded:

*What about work there? It’s boring and unfulfilling. But what else one can expect from a factory work? One needs to manage to stay there for thirty seven hours weekly in order to get paid. That’s the reality...*

Similarly to other interviewees, Tadeusz experienced downward occupational mobility after migrating to the UK and settling in Northtown: in Poland he was a qualified nurse, but in Northtown he worked in the jobs which did not require higher education, e.g. the kitchen furniture manufacturing. The frustration associated with the profound shift from relatively high status work prior to migration to manual work in Northtown was psychologically challenging for other interviewed migrants as well. A participant of focus group interview Jasmine from Iran (at the time of the interview, she had full labour market rights in the UK), who prior to migration worked as a civil servant in a ministry, in Northtown worked as a packer for the retail chain. Jasmine said that it was not difficult to get used (in terms of acquiring skills) to new workplaces or working in the UK more generally. On the contrary, in her own admission, her Northtown job was straightforward, but it was extremely uneasy to accept the realities of manual, low status and repetitive work keeping in mind her pre-migratory status of University educated and white collar professional. A Polish female interviewee Alina expressed a similar
sense of occupational dislocation, adding that she felt exhausted by what she described as the factory work:

*I want to work in my occupation, which is work with children and organizing social events. I had enough of this factory work. Can you imagine? I even had to do manual work there. But I had enough of it.*

Notably, she did not speak specifically or solely about a particular workplace in Northtown, but emotionally responded to the reality of downward occupational mobility. In fact, she worked for different employers, however all of those jobs were considered by her to be of low status. In Northtown she had been employed in a repackaging plant, where she initially worked on the assembly line, but later managed to move into the administrative position. She also worked in an Italian restaurant in Northtown owned by a Bulgarian man. When she was speaking about manual work, she was referring not solely to her experience in a factory, but post-migratory employment in the jobs below her education and the decline in self-perceived social status more generally. She would also employ such collectively oriented statements as ‘*we, Poles had to go to work to the factories here*’ to describe her own experiences and those of fellow Polish migrants living in Northtown. Taking low status jobs was seen not as an individual choice, but as a social reality affecting migrant newcomers as a social group.

Northtown’s migrant participants saw their employment experiences as personally unfulfilling and socially unattractive. The main positive factor for interviewed CEE migrants was the possibility to earn higher wages than those available to them in home countries: it was a case of uneven exchange – from professional jobs to low-status jobs and from low pay to relatively higher pay (in terms of cross-national comparison) in the UK. Migrants with children would also stress that they had accepted low status work not because of personal and individualistic reasons to earn money for themselves, but in order to improve material well-being of their children. With higher wages in the UK, they could buy more consumer goods as well to afford to go on family holiday to Southern Europe, e.g. participants cited trips to Greece and Croatia. The flats of some migrants contained visible signs of the way Northtown’s migrants have spent their hard earned income: they were full
with incredible amount of children toys and expensive electronics such as big flat screen TVs. It shows that for the participants who came from such middle income countries as Poland and Latvia could afford to spend more on their family needs, while living and working in high income country - the UK, even though the type of jobs which they performed, generated low wages.

Some of interviewed families described life and work in Northtown as a form of personal sacrifice: earning comparatively higher wages would mean ensuring higher standards of living for families, particularly for the children. However there had been a hidden price for those sacrifices: an interviewed social worker of Polish background Ludmila, who in spite of her MA degree in humanities initially worked in the food processing plants, reported that in her opinion some of domestic abuse, which took place in migrant families with which she was working with, could be explained by the unsatisfactory working lives and the lack of opportunities of moving to better jobs. According to her, the frustrations over the unattractive and unsatisfying forms of paid employment pushed some migrant men into drinking, which contributed to the abusive behaviour directed against their female partners and children.

The interpretations provided so far indicate that migrant participants generally judged their working lives in Northtown negatively. However it did not prevent them from looking for some positive aspects of their employment experiences even in the light of downward occupational mobility which they, as it was elaborated above, strongly resented. One such aspects was discussed earlier – the possibility to earn higher wages when compared to sending countries. However participants also tried to find some non-monetary advantages which provided them with some kind of emotional compensation for downward occupational mobility. For example, Jan, who described his employment experiences in a discounted retail store in negative terms, managed to see something positive in this disparaging period of his life. The positivity lied in the possibility to hear and memorise English words and phrases:

*Before starting to work there I knew just a couple of English words. So I was grateful to God to have job like this. It was particularly useful because I had only*
Polish contacts beyond work and in any case I did not have time to socialise. But in the store there was a constant flow of people and I was learning to speak English.

For Jan, who was a PE school teacher back in Poland, the work in a retail store, gave a very narrow learning opportunity, which he still valued. He valued it because it had improved the chance of moving to better jobs. Another Polish male interviewee Witold, who had an UG degree in transport studies from a Polish University, worked in a distribution centre as a forklift driver. He had to work night shifts – the working pattern which was not easy both physically and psychologically. However it gave him opportunity to enrol into English language course at a local college. He stressed if he had to work full time day shifts in this organisation or elsewhere, the attending of English language classes would be impossible because it would clash with work. Hence, the opportunity to study partially compensated for less attractive features as working anti-social hours in the occupation below his level of education.

However many interviewees for variety of reasons, e.g. long working hours, could not enrol into the local college to study English. Some, similarly to Jan, had to improve their language skills at the workplace. The service sector work provided such opportunity. Aziza, with her University degree in economics and her work experience of an official in the Ministry of Economy in Kyrgyzstan, managed to find work in Norhtown only in a restaurant. A particular challenge in her introduction to waitressing depended on the understanding of the restaurant’s menu. Aziza with a help from her British co-workers managed to overcome it in a humorous and inventive way:

It was a small restaurant. They had a function room there as well, but the number of employees was very low. When I started to work there, I did not have a clue...I even did not understand when they were speaking about ‘tomato sauce’. It was absolutely horrible. But I started to learn, memorise menu at home and doing other things. I did not have any idea what ‘sirloin steak’ was...My friend was drawing a picture showing that sirloin steak was a big meat cut. In contrast, fillet stake looked small in the picture. It was so difficult during first days there. I felt like an alien, but people were helpful and patient with me.
As this interview fragment demonstrates, Aziza felt that it was possible to find positive sides even in the context of low status job. This positivity was rooted in social interactions in the workplace and it was achieved through the use of humour and interpersonal skills. At the same time, it also points to specific problems associated with work in this organisation: the understaffing and the lack of formal training for new staff. It also shows that although the service sector work can be regarded as low status because of low pay and the lack of career opportunities, the learning of specific skills associated with it can be a very prolonged process, even for University educated migrants such as Aziza who have not prior experience of such work and have not known the specific vocabulary associated with it. However the reality of downward occupational mobility and specific challenges at work did not prevent Aziza from forging interpersonal relations with co-workers, learning language and gradually starting to feel more comfortable. She also stressed the behaviour of British co-workers whom she found to be friendly and patient.

Aziza was not the only interviewee who put an emphasis on the possibility to exercise human agency even in the context of low status employment. Sometimes those relationships would go further than casual acquaintance or even friendship. Irina from Latvia recollects how she met her future husband in discounted items store:

‘Ohhh...He would follow me all the time, I could not do my shopping in a normal way

The reality of low status work did not prevent Jan from engaging in courtship which later led to marriage. Those examples suggest that although jobs were low pay and low status, and often unattractive and unfulfilling, participants would manage to find escape routes if not from downward occupational itself, then from the depressing emotional states created by it, through building personally meaningful relationships while being at work.

Aziza, Jan and other migrants demonstrated a great degree of personal resourcefulness in adapting to the workplaces which sharply diverged from their pre-migratory employment experiences. It was also below the level of their education. Learning language skills was generally perceived as something positive,
but it required continuous effort and for some it was accompanied by the feeling of embarrassment. Interviewed migrants valued any opportunity to learn English, which they saw as the way to improve their position in the labour market. However it was not the knowledge of language per se which was important for migrants, but better employment opportunities which they associated with it. An Indian female participant of the focus group interview, who worked in a fast food restaurant, when asked why she attended English language classes in a local college, responded that she hoped to find which she described as a ‘respectable job’. She mentioned it during a focus group interview, and her statement was met with the approval and confirmation of other participants, many of whom had also experienced downward occupational mobility.

The drudgery associated with work in low-status and labour intensive jobs was made more tolerable when there was at least some kind of opportunity to learn, which in itself gave hope to move to better paid and socially respectable jobs in future. In spite of being confronted with the reality of low status jobs in Northown’s labour market and downward occupational mobility, migrant interviewees expressed hope that in future they would be able to find personally preferable employment. Participants also associated those hopes with the improvement of English language skills. Significantly, participants did not speak about leaving Northtown and looking for better jobs elsewhere. It can be explained by the sense of pragmatism: participants understood that such patterns as downward occupational mobility and low status work were not an exclusive feature’s of Northtown’s labour market, but the part of broader structural constrains affecting migrants in the UK as a whole. Yet at the same time, they hoped to find better jobs.

Such narratives of work future manifested itself in a variety of ways. For example, when the group of secondary school students were asked to name the occupations of their parents, the most common occupation was, in their words, ‘the pigs’ killers’. They were referring to the employment parents (when I asked to clarify, it appeared in many cases both parents) in the Northtown based meatpacking plant. None of those teenagers wanted to work in such occupation themselves in future: the examples of preferred professions included social worker and restaurant chef.
Clearly they were distancing themselves from the current reality of their parents’ low status employment and associating their future with higher status jobs. This switch from the present into the future was also found in the narratives of adult interviews: Jan spoke about a potential of running a small business – selling cars, which in his words would be completely different from his current employment situations which made him feel (in his own words) as if he was ‘a nobody’. It can be seen as an individual strategy of trying to escape downward occupational mobility which has dominated his working life since the arrival to Northtown. It should be stressed that when it came to escaping low status jobs in the local labour market for the majority of interviewees it was only a vague expectation. While some participants managed to achieve it through informal work (see the next chapter), in the field of paid employment the majority of interviewees have been still working in low status jobs.

Only one interviewee has managed to improve her employment status and leave downward occupational mobility behind her: Ludmila who had to work initially in the food processing because of her good language skills had managed to get employed as a social worker. This position was designed specifically by a local voluntary migrant umbrella association to support Polish and other CEE migrants. It shows the reversal of individual downward occupational mobility for adult migrants requires institutional interventions rather than solely depends on individual efforts such as language learning. Moreover, it should be noted migrants believed in the context of economic crisis their ability to move to better jobs and reverse downward occupational mobility had diminished. This opinion was particularly strongly expressed by focus groups’ participants and the representative of a Polish trade union activist, who specifically worked with CEE migrants. In other words, the crisis of national economy had negative local implications for labour market mobility.

The analysis and interpretations of empirical content so far was focused on individual responses to downward occupational mobility. Moreover, it should be noted that while most of participants were affected by downward occupational mobility, in the local labour market they tended to be concentrated in certain workplaces where they worked with other migrants. In addition, they would rarely
occupy managerial or supervisory positions in those workplaces. In other words, paid employment of migrants structurally pointed to their confinement to secondary labour market jobs. It further suggested the existence of the labour market segmentation affecting Northtown’s migrants. The experiences of those divisions are going to form a subject of the next sub-section.

4.2 Migrants’ working lives in the context of structural barriers in the local labour market

As a social group, the study’s migrant participants have had to deal with various structural barriers when it came to the sphere of paid employment. For example, interviewed migrants (as well as their migrant friends and acquaintances to whom they referred in the interviews) tended to be concentrated in certain workplaces: when asked about their employment experiences, participants would point to a number of local firms in which they and other migrants had worked. Moreover, within those workplaces they would find themselves performing physically difficult work, had to tolerate long working hours and would rarely occupy supervisory or managerial positions. Moreover, when it came to the contractual arrangements, many participants were also employed by or through employment agencies. Moreover, the practice of long working hours was a persistent feature of Northtown’s migrants’ working lives. All of it can be seen as the examples of structural barriers which affected Northtown’s migrants. The participants’ experiences of paid employment in the context of such barriers are going be discussed next.

It was stressed earlier migrant participants tended to be employed in low status and labour intensive jobs. Moreover, when I asked questions over pay, the mostly commonly cited rate was the National Minimum Wage (NMW) or in some participants’ own words, ‘the minimum rate’. The same pattern was described by one local employer who was interviewed for the study (the manager of the local bakery): the starting rate as well as the pay of the majority of its migrant workforce was on the level of the NMW. Those migrants who stayed with the bakery longer and also acquired NVQ certificates would get higher pay. Such testimonies would
indicate that the study’s migrant participants were concentrated not only in low status jobs and experienced downward occupational mobility but that they were also subjected to low pay. Significantly, as the multiple studies of low pay in the UK and elsewhere have shown, low pay is not solely a matter of individual bargaining power, but the result of structural divisions in the labour market (Hall, 2004). Moreover, such situation could be described as a classic case of migrant labour being concentrated in the secondary tier of the local labour market. In addition, in spite of certain degree of heterogeneity in migrant employment distribution - migrants worked in various sectors, e.g. furniture manufacturing, distributions centres, food processing and recycling, structurally most of the jobs were located in secondary labour market.

In sum, the employment pattern of Northtown’s migrants was not dissimilar to employment experiences described in the literature in other parts in the UK, including traditional destinations such as London (McDowell, 2009). However, it was different from major centres in one sense: it did not have any significant section of migrants employed in highly paid and high status jobs such as law, finance, etc. The migrant employment in Northtown was not polarised between privileged professional positions and low paid service sector jobs; instead migrants had been overwhelmingly concentrated in low value added manufacturing and food processing. The concentration of migrants in low paid and low status jobs points to the existence of structural barriers in the local labour market which migrants had to face. The specific manifestations of it are going to be considered next.

The study’s migrant participants, as workers, created a distinctive social group in the local labour market. They were not only ones to be affected by structural barriers associated with low pay and low status work – in some cases (but not always) participants made references to ‘White’ British employees working alongside them, but unlike ‘White’ British residents of Northtown who would also work in various professionals jobs, e.g. as the teachers of ESOL classes which some migrants attended, there was a sense among migrant participants that when it came to their experiences of paid employment, they were confined to low status and low pay jobs as a social group. Since people working alongside them were
often fellow migrants, participants would see themselves disadvantaged both individually and collectively. Significantly, their grievances were not solely over the status of the jobs and the level of pay.

Participants felt that the confinement to certain jobs has limited their ability to socially interact with non-migrants. One of Polish interviewees Tadeusz singled out one of his jobs – the construction work done for energy supplier, as interesting and rewarding because he had worked with many ‘White’ British workers as well with people from other backgrounds. Another Polish male interviewee Witold pointed that working solely with fellow migrants prevented him from practicing English. At the same time, some of the grievances were more specifically associated with employment relations. Participants also suggested that at the level of the workplace they were subjected to an additional form of exclusion which could be also seen as a form of structural barrier: for example, one of interviewees claimed that he and fellow migrants performed the most physically demanding jobs. Furthermore, they were disadvantaged both in terms of contractual arrangements: temporary agency working, particularly at the first stages of settling in Northtown, was common. The segmentation also existed when it came to the position within the organizational hierarchy: participants would rarely work in supervisory and managerial positions.

So far the focus was on a general picture. However through the use of migrant narratives, it would be important to provide specific examples of the impacts of structural barriers on participants’ experiences of paid employment. There have been multiple examples of it. The structure of job distribution in a kitchen manufacturing plant which employed several interviewed Polish migrants represented one of those examples. When asked what kind of work was performed by migrant workers, Jan explained:

*Overall physically it is not a very difficult work. Most of the work is done by the machines. It is possible to say that the role of employees is reduced to operating and controlling those machines. It’s only the last stage of the process, when there is a need for a great physical effort from the workers. It requires the removal of boards from the production line and preparing them for distribution. Some boards*
are not too heavy, they might weight 5 kilos but some are up to fifty, sixty or seventy kilos. This is hard work, and this work is performed by the Polish workers...

Similar unequal distribution was present at the level of contractual arrangements – many migrants were not directly employed by the kitchen manufacturer but were contracted out to an employment agency, which specialised in recruiting migrants both locally but also in Poland. In contrast, there was a perception that the majority of ‘White’ British workers were employed directly. The same interviewee indicated that the pay and conditions of agency workers were inferior when compared to permanent staff. Thus, not only migrant workers had a greater chance to perform more physically demanding work, but the likelihood of being subjected to numerical flexibility in the form of agency working was greater as well. Most of migrant workers in this firm were employed by the agency, which also supplied them with a dorm type accommodation. They were living together, which pointed to the extension of structural barriers affecting labour market experiences into the housing arrangement. Since migrants depended on employer accommodation, they would be more cautious in looking for different jobs.

There have been more examples of structural barriers affecting migrants who worked for local firms. Another local employer, a bottle repackaging firm, had been even more extreme in terms of divisions it imposed on its migrant workforce. It had internal division of labour which explicitly reproduced the differences in citizenship status and ethnicity. According to the testimonies of several participants – the migrants from Poland, Latvia and Estonia, the managerial and supervisory employees of this plant were recruited exclusively from local ‘White’ British background. In contrast, line workers were overwhelmingly of migrant origin – from CEE and beyond. In the words of a Polish migrant Lech who worked there for two years after his arrival to the UK,

In reality, for checking those bottles they employed migrants, primarily Poles but also others. The English only worked as supervisors who would always tried to increase the speed of work....

According to two Polish interviewees, some of their co-workers, for example people from Azerbaijan, were more fearful for their job security because of their
socio-legal status (dispersed migrants could access legally the labour market only when they were granted asylum). As non EU migrants, they did not have full labour market rights and were more vulnerable to exploitation. Whist migrants from various nationalities seemed to be-friend one another and establish collegial relations, the interviewees said that managers and supervisors tried to exploit insecurities created by the difference in migration status. When, for example, EU migrants complained over working conditions, particularly over routine verbal abuse of employees, managers tried to position non EU against EU migrants, explicitly suggesting that the attempts to improve working conditions will force them to dismiss non EU migrants. It is illustrative of how wider stratifications in citizenship status can be passed down onto the level of the local labour market and can reinforce structural barriers at the level of the workplace.

While the mentioned plant in the participants’ words employed exclusively migrants, there were workplaces where migrants would work with local ‘White’ British residents. A Brazilian migrant Mafalda (she was a participant of one of focus group interviews) recollected that at a meatpacking plant between Mondays and Friday, the majority of workers, excluding supervisors, were migrants. However during weekends, the situation was different: the workforce included workers from ‘White’ British background and migrants. According to Mafalda, many of British workers were on unemployment benefits and took informal work because the pay rate was higher over the weekend. During weekdays migrants had to take pay which local workers perceived to be too low; however, the presence of a pool consisting of unemployed British workers provided employers with a greater flexibility to fill jobs over the weekend by paying slightly higher rates. For migrants such organization of work signified greater labour market competition, when it came to working over the weekend.

The discussion so far was focused on how migrants have to face structural barriers in the local labour market and in the workplace level. However it also should be added that Northtown’s labour market was shaped by regional difference when it came to pay and other conditions. The interview material provides one good example on how the local patterns of segmentation and the manifestation of low pay, were reinforced by regional differences. It can be seen in how the problem of
low pay was worsened by employers’ strategy to localise the level of pay. According to Jan, while Norhtown’s workers would do identical work to the one performed in a similar furniture production plant owned by the same company but located in a nearby city of Leeds, the level of pay in Norhtown’s subsidiary was lower. There was one pound difference in hourly pay, which is a considerable if one remembers that the amount of the basic pay for Jan’s co-workers was around £5.85 per hour.

Other conditions such as the duration of holidays and over-time pay were also inferior to those available in Leeds’ plant. Dissatisfied with such negative outcomes, Jan, who acted in his position of trade union representative, sought to equalise the level of pay between Leeds and Norhtown’s plants. It seems that employer strategy rested on the assumption that the scarcity of work in Norhtown would create a pool of local labour prepared to accept lower wages than in more affluent urban centres which had greater employment opportunities. Hence migrants were subjected to the additional barrier in the labour market: in this instance the barrier stemming from regional inequalities. Norhtown, as it was stressed in its demographic profile, was subjected to greater socio-economic disadvantages when compared to national and regional levels of unemployment and job opportunities. However, while pointing to broader structural barriers affecting Norhtown’s migrants (as well as other local workers), this example reveals the manifestation of workers’ agency: the level of pay is not accepted automatically but it is compared to nearby localities. When the difference was seen as arbitrary one, migrants showed willingness to demand improvements.

The other important structural barrier facing migrants was related to the temporal organization of work. The shift patterns adapted by local employers complicated life outside work, particularly for women with childcare responsibilities. A Polish interviewee Regina (she was interviewed with her husband in their home) said that Norhtown’s low-status and labour intensive private sector employers were the only places, where she could find work because both of the paucity of local employment opportunities and her limited language skills. Those workplaces operated on the basis of morning and afternoon shifts: the morning shift would start at 6am and end at 2pm, whilst the afternoon ones would cover hours
between 2pm and 10pm. Such working patterns made it impossible to allow bringing her daughter to or from the school. As a result of it, she had decided to work as a part-time cleaner for the local council because it provided a relatively flexible working regime: she worked from 5pm to 8pm.

This interviewee had a husband who worked full-time in a factory. According to Regina, they as a family negotiated a compromise of her having part-time work and having more time to look after the daughter. She also could follow a similar route into full-time employment, but was reluctant to do so not solely because of childcare concerns. Regina was a qualified mid-wife and regarded factory work in a very negative way: for her it meant loss in social status and personal self-respect. Thus moving into a non-standard part-time employment was not seen as a choice between traditional notions of motherhood and career aspirations, but as a family coping strategy in the context of barriers existing in the local labour market. The fact that this household had a member in full time employment had allowed to make this choice. But Regina’s choice also revealed another important structural barrier facing migrants in the local labour market: the organisation of working time.

Those migrants who were on their own, who arrived without families or partners, did not have the option available to Regina. Moreover, even when work was disliked, there was a pattern of working overtime. Low pay acted as a push factor influencing migrant participants to accept the working shifts determined by employers. Participants complained that they were never consulted when it came to the determination of their working time. Moreover, such organization of working time led to the practice of working long hours. There were some extreme examples of excessive working hours, which migrants were inclined to do in order to increase their earnings. The absence of family in Northtown also pushed to work long anti-social working hours. One of such migrants was a Polish man Jan, who upon his arrival to Northtown started to work in a discounted items store:

*I worked twelve hours per day, seven days per week. I worked for minimum pay no less than sixty hours per week. It's possible to say that I did not have any life besides*
working and it lasted a year and a half. It became almost utopian. I have left a part of myself, of my life in that shop and in return I did not get anything

What was particularly frustrating for Jan was the feeling that very little apart from accumulating financial savings was achieved through this kind of employment. Jan was not proud of his effort and hard work, he simply felt exhausted by it. Working long hours which went far beyond of what was considered to be a normal length of daily shift did not automatically mean that migrants working under such conditions received additional overtime pay. The same interviewee Jan said that the pay was the same, irrespective how many additional hours he would have worked. Other participants complained that when they would have been promised extra pay for working over the weekend or over-time, such verbal promises sometimes would not be fulfilled. On the other hand, doing over-time (paid or unpaid) work was sometimes expected by employers as a rule: a Brazilian interviewee Mafalda (a participant of focus group interview) said in a meat packing plant, her manager threatened to dismiss her if she did not accept working over-time.

A conclusion to be drawn from those testimonies points to multiple problems related to working overtime: even when it was nominally voluntary, and was chosen by workers to compensate for being paid a low wage (often the NMW), the pay rate for overtime would not be higher. Such testimonies contradict popular discourse of good work ethic, which is allegedly found among migrants: it treats migrants as enthusiastic workers, who are eager and committed to their jobs even at the expense of their free time (for more critique of such arguments see MacKenzie and Forde, 2009).

The gathered empirical material suggests that working long hours was not related to the sense of organizational commitment or even to the promise of higher pay, but stemmed from the desire to earn additional income. Moreover, participants would not always have a choice to determine the length of their working day because of the stance adapted by some local employers. Therefore the practice of working long hours should be seen as a barrier: it was imposed on interviewed migrants either by the low level of pay or because of employer preferences. Either way, it was not something which was chosen exclusively by migrants, but it was by
the labour market conditions, hence it could be also seen as a structurally constituted barrier. This barrier affected negatively the possibility of Northtown’s migrants to spend more time with their families, engage with local social groups or to study English. It also made it more difficult to look for better paid jobs – there was simply very little time left for extra work-related activities. Moreover, there were negative implications for migrants’ health: one participant complained about severe weight loss which she attributed to the practice of long working hours.

The participants provided testimonies which would support the description of working long hours as a structural barrier. While recalling their employment experiences, a number of interviewed participants asserted that they would have to assemble, typically, in early hours of the morning, sometimes as early as 4am, and endure lengthy journeys to work. Their Northtown based employer would cover the transportation costs: employer would pay directly to transportation providers and would not deduct payments from migrant workers’ salaries. However it was the only positive aspect which migrants saw in working outside Northtown under such arrangements.

In contrast, the negativities associated with it included the duration spent on commuting. Participants would complain over the physical and psychological fatigue caused by the requirement to spend four hours on commuting. One of participants spoke about such physical problems as a significant weight loss, which she attributed to this working pattern. In effect, working outside Northtown extended migrants’ working day without necessarily bringing additional income. There was also issue of what was missed because of spending so many hours on commuting. Participants would find it much more difficult to engage in English language learning (there was a clash between the timing of ESOL classes and the timing of work). Moreover, such long working and travelling day would prevent them from searching for better paid, more attractive local jobs. Moreover, participants spoke about the boredom and dissatisfaction associated with such working routine. In order to change this situation, one had only one option - to quit. Here how Irina from Latvia described her personal experiences:
Every morning we would leave at four o’clock in the morning and would return at eight in the evening. But they paid for the transportation – we would travel two hours one way and they would pay for four hours of travel costs. They would pay for the overtime as well. I did not like the work at all...but there was no other choice. I did not have time to find other work because we would return very late and also work during weekends, when everything was closed. At the end, I was so bored of working there... I just left.

Irina’s testimony (mirrored by a Polish interviewee Alina) illustrates why the practice of long hours spend at work or commuting to work acted as a barrier for Northtown’s migrants. Irina also noted the absence of better alternatives in Northtown which pushed her to continue with this routine till a point when she could not cope with it. Finally, among other things she points to the absence of voice mechanism at work: she could not alter her working hours so the only thing she could do was to quit.

To conclude, the concentration of interviewed participants in low-paid and low-status jobs points to the existence of structural barriers affecting migrant newcomers to Northtown. The analysis has also uncovered the existence of barriers within the workplaces: when it came to the positions, which participants occupied at the workplace level, participants faced multiple disadvantages ranging from the position in organizational hierarchy to the level of pay. In other words, many migrants in Northtown were subjected to a double-edged structural barrier: not only they were confined to low-status and labour intensive workplaces in the local labour market, but they had to face barriers at the workplace level.

Yet even in the context of those structural barriers, there was a space for social interactions between various groups of workers, and between managers and workers. Participants would attribute different meanings to social interactions in the workplaces, but they would be particularly concerned over what was considered to be acceptable in terms of human decency and what was not. In other words, they would speak not only about structural barriers they had to face, but view workplace interactions in normative terms. The material covering those social processes is going to be interpreted next.
4.3 The spectrums of humanity and inhumanity in workplace interactions

The study’s participants viewed their labour market experiences not only through social (the status of jobs) and economic (the level of pay) lenses but through the moral ones as well. They articulated their moral reflections and feelings through the narratives of inhumanity and humanity in the workplace. Such adjectives as human and inhuman as well humane and inhumane were used to describe social interactions taking place primarily between managers and workers but also in some cases between workers and workers. In the most straightforward way, it referred to the violation of employment rights by labour market intermediaries. However, the violations in pay or even low pay more generally, as negative as they were, formed socio-economic background of migrants’ grievances. In terms of the moral outrage, a greater stress was placed on the perceived disregard of participants’ human dignity.

Interviewed participants tended to view the realities of low status jobs in a negative but also in grudgingly accepting way. There was a sense that coming to a different country and finding a job, which brought greater income than the level of pay in home countries, in itself spoke about personal willingness to make sacrifices and the ability to adapt in culturally different environment. In the words of the Ukrainian interviewee Taras, low status work in the local repackaging plant and similar labour intensive workplaces were perceived by migrants as depressing and unfulfilling but also as something with which they could cope. In contrast, participants could not accept the manner in which employment relations was conducted from the side of some managers and supervisors.

A Polish interviewee Ludmila spoke about ‘them’ (Northtown’s employers whom she came across) treating ‘us’ - the migrants, in a morally unacceptable way. It could manifest in a variety of ways. Anna (she participated in a focus group interview) and her partner (both from Poland), who worked for the kitchen furniture manufacturing firm in Northtown, decided to get married and planned their wedding to take place in Poland. When they approached their manager
several months in advance, they were rebuked and castigated for daring to decide when they wanted to have day offs. It was even said to them that they had to coordinate their wedding plans with him. This kind of managerial attitude which both explicitly and implicitly denied migrant participants’ the right to make plans over their private lives was seen as something going beyond of what constituted a morally acceptable employer-employee relation. More generally, such manifestations of disregard to migrants’ individuality were often literally labelled as ‘inhuman’. Participants would associate it with the fact that they were migrants: firstly, because most of their co-workers were fellow migrants and secondly, they tend to believe that they were treated in such way because they were foreigners. This sense of indignation surrounding the narrative of inhumanity could be also explained by pre-migratory experiences: as it was highlighted earlier, many participants worked in professional jobs prior to migration – the kind of jobs in which they could have been used to more courteous and respectful relations when compared to low-wage employers in Northtown.

The references to inhuman and inhumane relations at work were made explicitly by a number of interviewees. One Polish interviewee (Jan) described one of the local workplaces as a ‘labour camp’. He and his wife Irina who worked there argued that the managers and supervisors behaved as if migrant employees were in their words ‘dogs’ rather than human beings. They specifically pointed to the ways managers and supervisors spoke to their migrant employees: the typical manner was very rude and commandeering.

Speaking about the same workplace, Helle, an Estonian migrant (she participated in a focus group interview), described the relations in the workplace as ‘inhuman’. For her inhumanity was associated with the lack of basic courtesy and the unwillingness to consult their migrant employees. Helle provided the following example:

*I think it is not human... They do not ask ‘can you work till six o’clock’? They just say it to you and you cannot say no... Nobody can say no...Everybody is worried about work especially now... Everybody is afraid to refuse because they’re afraid that they can lose work...especially if you are foreigner*
Other interviewees associated such treatment with ethnic intolerance: there was a feeling that managers and supervisors allowed themselves to behave in this way because they saw migrant employees as people who had fewer rights than local ‘White’ British residents. The mocking of those migrants who had weaker English language skills was particularly seen in this light. However, the participants were not only critical of British managers and supervisors, but of fellow migrants. Self-interested fellow migrants who sought to gain favours from management at all costs and those individuals who disregarded common interests were seen as the violators of moral norms. A purely monetary conception of paid employment was not accepted whether it came from British employers or migrants' alike.

The inhumanity of supervisors/managers or even self-interested acts of migrants were positioned against emotionally supportive acts of fellow migrants and other people whom participants encountered in the workplace. Significantly, the sense of commonality would overcome national and cultural boundaries. For example, when management tried to spoil the relations between Polish migrants and workers coming from non EU countries, the latter group supported the former both emotionally and materially. In the words of Polish interviewee Alina,

*We had a very cordial relationship with the Russian-speakers... The Russian speaking workers were grateful and they brought mushrooms and berries which they collected in the forest as a gift...I was very honoured.*

This testimony shows that migrant participants would go beyond purely economic self-interest and would look for symbolic gestures aimed to improve the morale of fellow migrant co-workers.

The moral economy of workplace relations was not only present in the interactions with co-workers of various nationalities, but it was extended to British managers and supervisors. For participants it constituted an opposite pole - the one of humanity. Migrant narratives contained references to what was described as human or humane attitudes of local employers. Participants recollected examples of humane relations between co-workers, including with local British people, but also between employers and migrants. How did it manifest? As in the cases of the inhumanity, it was not about pay or even the status of work more generally, but
about the attitudes displayed in inter-personal interactions. For migrants a more humane workplace was associated with the respect and courtesy extended to individuals irrespective of their nationality. When British managers were showing respect and attention to migrant workers’ needs, it was noted by migrants and recognized as examples of humane approach. This was something what migrants expected from their British employers: in the words of the Polish member of Yorkshire migrant worker branch of major UK trade union, he wanted to be treated as a human being, not as ‘a dog or a horse’.

There were a number of situations which were interpreted by the participants as the example of humane relations at work. One of them was retold by Irina from Latvia: while working for a firm packaging products of cosmetics, Irina felt that there was a good mannered attitude to employees. Irina stressed that when she was working while pregnant, her manager made sure that her workload would decrease and did not involve any lifting or other physically demanding activity. In Irina’s words, the attitude and treatment of workers by the employer was a respectful one, particularly when compared to her previous employment. However, there were also inconsistencies: in contrast to the benign approach of her manager, the supervisors were less sympathetic to her personal needs.

In spite of such contradictions, Irina still emphasized and appreciated the relationship at work, particularly stressing the flexibility demonstrated during her pregnancy. It suggested that when management had shown respect to workers, to their dignity and well-being - such interactions were remembered and valued. It’s notable that she had to bring it up during the interview: on individual level, the humane approach to migrant workers was seen not as a rule, but as an exception. Moreover, her testimony points to the limitations of individual managerial benevolence: the managerial support was complimented by much less forthcoming attitudes of supervisors, who pressured employees in order to meet packaging targets.

Irina was not the only one who spoke about positive relations at work between managers and workers. Other example comes from Aziza (a migrant woman from Kyrgyzstan), who also spoke about of what she referred as humane attitudes of
managers and co-workers. Her second job in Northtown was in a small hotel. In her words, she was highly respected by managers there, and the atmosphere in the workplace was one of politeness. When she had problems with transportation, managers would give her a lift to home and to work. Such gestures could be seen as an effort to retain a reliable employee such as Aziza by local ‘White’ British managers, but irrespective of mixture of managerial motives, Aziza appreciated it:

Managers respected me, they were very good people. They knew that I did not have a car, that it was difficult for me to commute to work particularly over the weekend. So the manager would come and collect me from home, and then will drop me back....I was surprised how good those people were.

Notably Aziza, by her own admission, was paid around the National Minimum Wage; however the level of pay was not the issue which she stressed in the interview, instead she focused on what she saw as the understanding and helpful behaviour of her managers. Aziza was also full of praise of her fellow British co-workers, who helped her to find an accommodation: a British woman with whom she worked persuaded her mother to take Aziza as a lodger without asking for any pay. Aziza stressed that for her it was an example of how warm and supportive the ‘English’ people of Northtown could be. Aziza also described such relations as humane. Other interviewees would also compare managerial attitudes in sending countries and in Northtown: for instance a Polish male interviewee spoke about greater respect to individual workers demonstrated by British managers, which was quite different from his experience with Polish managers in Poland. This tolerance manifested itself in greater acceptance of workers’ ways to dress, grooming style and other personal preferences.

The review of the narratives of humane interactions in the workplace would be incomplete without the discussion of the limitation of humane approach when it is based solely on the free will of employer. The disagreements over contestable aspects of employment relations such as timing of working shifts or capricious behaviour of employers could turn a humane relation into an antagonistic one. A good example of such turn was provided by Alina, an interviewee who contributed extensively in understanding the migration experiences of the Polish migrants.
living and working in Northtown. Alina after changing a number of jobs – waiting in a local Italian restaurant and working for a number of employment agencies both as a manual and clerical worker, managed to find work which was closer to her educational and professional backgrounds. She started to work as a child minder in a nursery. For her it was the first job in Northtown which brought her some personal satisfaction (even though it was also a low paid job). In order to improve her English language skills, she asked for a flexible working arrangement from her employer in order to attend twice a week an English language class in a local college. Initially everything worked well, including the arrangement for Alina to take language classes. However the relationship between her and her employer deteriorated after the employer’s relative was hired and started to work alongside her. Since that moment, there was a noticeable change in the employer’s attitude to Alina: from a friendly one towards the attitude based on the accusations which questioned her commitment to the job. In the end, the employer accused Alina of showing greater interest to her language classes rather than to her job in the nursery. Alina perceived those accusations as employer’s tactics of trying to get rid of her and fill her position with the mentioned relative. The fears proved to be correct: it was announced to Alina that she was fired:

She gave me one month notice. She also told me that I am going to be paid anyway for this one month and that there is no need for me to come to work at all. I went home and consulted my husband. We decided that I will go to work through the whole month. Let them show that we, Polish migrants, can behave in a proper and can leave employer with dignity. So I would just go there for whole month as if everything was normal. When the month ended and I came there for the last time, I was so surprised with the reaction which followed: all staff and children prepared a small event celebrating my work there and all wished me well

The announcement and Alina’s response provide a valid illustration on how the notions of dignity and self-respect are important even at the point when the employment relationship is effectively being terminated. She and her husband decided to show her employer in a very explicit way that even though they were migrants seeking higher pay in more affluent countries such as the UK, the moral economy aspect of employment relations was also important to them. She refused
to take a one month pay without working in order to show that even though she was a migrant, she did not need charitable hand outs from the employer. Their decision was not only based on the monetary calculation, but on the determination to show that financial motive was not the only factor affecting them as human actors. It can be argued that the moral economy of employment relations was as important as the cash nexus.

The bulk of data related to moral economy contained a personally and ethnically oriented perspective on employment relations: while participants spoke about themselves as individuals or members of ethnic groups, in the material discussed so far they did not make a reference to collective aspects of social interactions in the workplace and the role of trade unions. This is unsurprising since the interviewed Northtown’s migrants were pre-dominantly employed in the workplaces which did not have trade union representation. However, there were two exceptions which are relevant not simply because of their trade union dimension but because they also contribute to the understanding of moral economy.

Jan provided a detailed account of his involvement with the union. He stated that he became a shop steward at the workplace which recognised one general trade union. He did not want to be a passive member, but was eager to do something himself, particularly in giving voice and confidence to his fellow Polish workers. He argued that union membership among workers was of benefit for them, it gave them greater confidence at work and provided with communication channels related to the information on employment rights. He insisted that it had an ability to ‘protect and defend’ the workers. He argued that in his experience when unions were absent in the employment relationship, British employers generally were able to exercise greater control over migrants: new to the country, labour migrants would be hesitant to demand better pay and conditions and strict following of employment laws. In contrast, greater knowledge of employment rights which was gained through the membership of the trade union, strengthened workers’ ability to protect themselves from the violations. Moreover, he added that when the trade union was recognised by the employer and when migrants were members of it, the attitudes of managers was different in the issues going beyond the level of
pay. He claimed that management understood that they have to treat migrants in a more respectful way because of the support provided by the union. Hence not only union membership was beneficial when it came to improving formal pay and conditions, but also in a more informal sphere of interpersonal relations which can be also associated with moral economy.

However it also should be mentioned that attitudes to trade unions could be more ambiguous. It could be both related to the economic aspect of employment relations (the level of pay), but also the moral one. For example, when I asked one of Polish interviewees (Witold) whether he was a union member, he answered negatively, adding that his employer recognised trade unions and workplace had lay trade union officials. I inquired further on his decision not to join the recognized trade union. He provided a twofold explanation: firstly, he claimed he did not need to join trade union:

*I am not a member and I do not think there is a need for a trade union. I can help myself without resorting to trade union, and I know a couple of friends who joined a trade union and were not helped when they needed...Trade union simply complicates the relation between worker and employer*

At first, it might look like a purely Unitarist perception and approach to the employment relationship. However this was not a full picture: Witold added that the trade union recognised at his workplace, was inefficient both when it came to the issues around pay, but also to informal practices in the workplace which were nonetheless important to workers. The economic issue was related this union’s inability or unwillingness to negotiate increases in wages: Witold argued that although managers and supervisors got increases in pay and the firm was profitable, workers’ wages, according to him, did not increase correspondingly. He complained also about a non-monetary concern which he again linked to trade union’s weakness. According to Witold, he and his co-workers had a room allocated for 10min. breaks. This room was taken over by the management and the trade union was not effective in preventing it. It was relatively a minor issue, but for Witold it meant that the trade union was not prepared to stand for his and co-workers’ right to have more comfortable breaks. This also can be seen as
something belonging to moral economy: the infringement of employees’ informal practices could be seen as something contrary to what constitutes more humane employment relations, and when a particular trade union failed to address it, it became less attractive to labour migrants such as Witold.

In conclusion, it would be important to ask why participants found it important to speak about the moral dimension of the employment relationship. One of explanations could be that in making references to such positive attitudes of managers and colleagues at work, migrants wanted to articulate their vision of decent employment relations - a relationship which must include the respect for employees. Even when the jobs were remunerated poorly, the moral economy of the employment relations was recognized as important. Moreover, migrant participants wanted to acknowledge those Northtown’s ‘White’ British co-workers and managers who made them feel welcomed and saw them as newcomers who were entitled to respect and dignified treatment. It also reminded that a non-monetary aspect of employment relationship was extremely important: many of migrants could have come to Northtown because of higher pay levels when compared to their home countries, but they would not disregard broader moral issues, in the sphere of the labour market including. Participants did not want to be seen as voiceless labourers prepared to put up with any kind of treatment just in order to earn money, but as people entitled to humane and dignified treatment irrespective of the status of the jobs which they were performing.

Conclusions

The analysis of experiences related to paid employment offered insights on labour market experiences of migrants residing in Northtown. The analysis has revealed that working lives of interviewed Northtown’s migrants were marked by downward occupational mobility. In practice it meant that University educated migrants have to work in low status jobs, which did not match the level of their education or their personal expectations. This pattern applied both to EU and non EU migrants: irrespective of their arrival routes and citizenship status, migrant participants have found themselves employed in low status jobs. This created a
sense of unease and discontent manifested in the analysed narratives. At the same time participants would try to find something positive even when labour market outcomes were unfavourable to them. The possibility to improve English language skills was seen as a way to get better jobs and improve the position in the labour market. Finally, there was a generational dimension related to the reactions to downward occupational mobility: Northtown’s migrants hoped that their efforts would enable their children to avoid the confinement to secondary labour market jobs.

Most of interviewed migrants were employed in low paid, low status and labour intensive jobs. This pattern of employment in Northtown was consistent with the dynamics identified in the literature on ‘new destinations’ (Massey, 2008): major employers of migrants were low wage firms in labour intensive and low value added sectors seeking numerical flexibility. Northtown’s labour market has another local dimension: the structure of economy reflected the consequences of deindustrialisation (the closure of the mining industry) and the shift to more insecure forms of employment. Newly arrived migrants similarly to local residents, including those who had generational experiences associated with the mining, have to operate the changed local labour market which was formed through the industrial restructuring. Migrant participants were not only confined to the secondary labour market in Northtown, but also faced workplace segmentation. For interviewees this form of segmentation was associated with contractual insecurity (e.g. agency working) and ethnic division of labour – migrant participants would speak about occupying lower end within the organizational hierarchy. The findings suggest that Northtown’s migrants have been subjected to multiple structural barriers in the local labour market which made it extremely difficult for them to move to better jobs. In contrast to other studies conducted on migrant employment which described migrants in the UK as actors actively employing transnational mobility strategies, e.g. changing employers and planning to move for work to a different country (Alberti, 2014), the employment characteristics of participants tended to be stable. Participants were planning to move to more preferable jobs, but they were not associating those plans with new acts of transnational mobility.
The significant segment of the discussion of issues related to paid employment was dedicated to moral economy. Migrant participants were eager to stress their self-dignity and the desire for more humane employment relations even in the context of low status work. In doing so the analysis touched the issue of the moral economy of the employment relationship: while participants accepted low status employment as the inevitability associated with migration, they would explicitly contest the forms of employer behaviour deemed to be violating their human dignity.

The discussion of the narratives of humanity and inhumanity reveals a complex picture of participants’ experiences of paid employment. The analysis should not be reduced to the observation suggesting that the experiences of some participants were ‘humane’, while the experiences of others were ‘inhumane’. For most of interviewees it was a mixture of both: they came across managers whose actions they considered to be morally reprehensible, while they also encountered people at work prepared to show respect and courtesy.

To conclude, participants spoke about universal subjects: humanity versus inhumanity in the sphere of the labour market. Those subjects affect migrants and non migrants alike. However those narratives – the ways in which they were expressed and constructed, emerged from the experiences of migrants living in a particular locality. Hence those narratives represent both the universal side – the moral expectations of having certain relations at work but also those specific to Northtown– the experiences of paid employment in the local labour market.

Although paid employment was extremely important to interviewed participants, their experiences of work in a broader sense were not restricted to state’s sanctioned paid employment in the local labour market. The discussion of those work-related activities is going to be offered next.
Chapter 5

The sphere of the social

Introduction

The interpretations articulated in the previous sections have shown that the dynamics of local labour market played a central role in structuring everyday experiences of interviewed Northtown’s migrants. It was particularly influential for CEE labour migrants, who immediately sought to get access to paid employment in order to support themselves and facilitate the arrival of their family members. Yet even for this group of Northtown’s newcomers, state sanctioned paid employment and the participation in the local labour market constituted only one side of the totality of the experiences related to work. A different side was represented by informal work. It included various forms of childcare, informal work aimed to secure additional income and voluntary unpaid work.

The interviewing and (to a lesser degree) observing revealed work related activities which took place outside of the boundaries of the formal labour market. Moreover, there was a strong gender dimension related to the experiences of informal work. For example, when migrant women faced with the reality of high costs of childcare on one hand and the pre-dominance of low pay in the local economy on the other would opt out from state sanctioned paid employment in favour of various forms of informal work. Those situations reflected difficulties faced by women prior and after the childbirth - the moments when it was highly difficult to combine childcare responsibilities and paid employment.

However there was also an element of individual agency exercised by the study's participants: by engaging in informal work, those participants felt that they were expanding their networks of friendship and contributing to local social life. Some of those activities were conducted in exchange for untaxed payments, while some of them were undertaken for free and on a purely voluntary basis. The spectrum of such activities was diverse: the examples included the supply of paid and unpaid
forms of childcare at home, the privately based English language classes and preparedness to engage in voluntary work with both established and informal community groups. Such activities were located outside of the local (formal) labour market: whether private classes at home, organising community celebrations, voluntary work or informal childcare arrangements – all of those distinctive activities took place outside of state recognised sphere of formal labour market and paid employment. Migrants’ narratives of social activities which took place outside of the labour market complimented and added a new dimension in understanding both social and economic experiences of Northtown’s newcomers. Since female interviewees were particularly affected by such activities, the analysis of this section helps to bring greater understanding linked to the gendered dynamics of migratory experiences. As it was observed elsewhere (Gardiner, 1997), the linking of home based activities with the dimension of gender can help to understand better the realities of working lives.

In their totality, the experiences of informal work were organised around a separate analytical category, which was labelled as the sphere of the social. The category referrers to the activities which involved some form of work-related commitments made by individual migrants and their family members and represents the activities which took place both inside and outside of their homes. The stress on the ‘social sphere’ highlights the inclusivity of the category at large: the activities were not only aimed to achieve economic benefits, but were seen in a broader context of social interactions involving both individuals and communities. The activities might have been undertaken because of the necessity to fulfil family obligations, as an alternative to the state sanctioned forms of paid employment or/and for leisure purposes. Thus, those elements could be most effectively described as belonging to the sphere of the social. Those work related activities were practised in various locations: in local religious institutions, in community groups, but also at home. However, even when it took place at homes, it involved some form of labour, which brought it closer to the social sphere (e.g. social reproduction, when it came to childcare) rather than to more narrowly conceived private sphere.
This empirical category in some ways reflects the theoretical debates found in the work of Glucksmann (2005). Glucksmann (2005) introduces the concept of total social organisation of labour, which this author uses to expand the understanding of work. Glucksmann (2005) proposes to go beyond the focus on state sanctioned paid employment, and to explore how workers, women in particular, engage in other forms of paid and unpaid labour. Similar arguments have been made by Gardiner (1997), who from the perspective of feminist political economy argued for the inclusion of household activities into the analysis of work. However, while Glucksmann (2005) and Gardiner (1997) analyse it on a theoretical level, the discussion below will do it on the basis of gathered empirical data.

The discussion and interpretations will focus on a number of social activities associated with the identified analytical category. It will look at those migrant women who have stayed at home to provide childcare as well as engage in unpaid voluntary work outside the household. Subsequently, the analysis will discuss how migrant Polish women have been setting informal businesses at home; those activities aimed to provide childcare and English language classes constitute examples of informal work. The discussion is going to be accompanied by a review of leisure activity. Finally, the analysis will focus on the difficulties associated with unpaid voluntary labour.

5.1 The varieties of informal work

For the interviewed migrant women one of the key motives behind the switch from paid employment to unpaid work was associated with the pregnancy. Both Aziza from Kyrgyzstan and Irina from Latvia had worked in Northtown prior to their pregnancies. After the childbirth and maternity leave, both women, in spite of their preference to return to the local labour market, did not engage in paid employment. The main factor causing this behaviour seems to be related to the difference existing between the cost of childcare and the level of wages available in Northtown’s labour market. Both stressed that the earnings in the jobs which they had performed prior to the childbirth would be insufficient in covering childcare expenses. Hence the choice was to stay at home and to take care of their
children themselves. In both cases, their husbands were in full-time employment, one working for the police (he was from ‘White’ British background) and another (a Pole) for kitchen furniture manufacturer. Moreover, the changes in the family composition could provide their own dynamics: when Irina returned to work after the birth of her maternity leave, she realized that she was pregnant again. The childbirth and the decision to stay at home full time was not only associated with the loss of income coming from paid employment, but also with the losses of certain kinds of welfare support. Irina’s husband explained it in this way:

*When my wife lost her work, we also lost financial support in helping to pay for the nursery. It works here like this: if both of us are employed, then we can expect a help in paying up to eighty percent of childcare fees. But, when the wife was made redundant, I had to pay one hundred percent of the cost. One hundred percent means here a payment of £500 monthly or even more. This is almost the amount of Child Benefit she is receiving. It all looks like a bad joke to me since when she is unemployed, we need more support, not less. But here we go, she stayed at home.*

*When the second child was born, she continued to be at home, in any case she is the best carer for the children*

On the surface the decision to become a full-time home maker appeared to look like a voluntary choice made by Irina – Jan’s wife. However the conditions under which this choice was made were significant in understanding the switch from paid employment to full-time unpaid domestic work at home. Firstly, Irina said that the pay offered by her last employer (a packaging company of cosmetic goods) prior to second pregnancy was around the NMW. Continuing being a low wage worker meant that the large part of income would be spent on covering childcare costs. Moreover, although, in her words, this employer was helpful and accommodating during her first pregnancy, at the time of second pregnancy the firm went bankrupt. As a result of it, Irina was made redundant and left without the option to return to her workplace after statutory maternity leave. From the start her choice was affected by the structural duality in the form of low-wage composition of the local labour market and local repercussions of international and national economic crisis.
It also seems that structural economic contexts interacted with the relations within the family. Looking at Irina and Jan’s testimony from a different angle, there was a noticeable degree of compliance with some aspects of traditional division of household labour. In the cited quote, her husband assumed that Irina as a mother was the best person to look after their child and suggested that staying at home full time is something natural to do for a woman. Notably, he intervened while I was interviewing her and asserted this opinion. Although Irina nodded her head whilst Jan provided this explanation, none the less, it would be possible to identify something more than simply a mutually agreed decision of the household. Both Irina and Jan recognized that the decision to remove their first child from the nursery has hidden costs: their child was learning to speak English at the nursery – picking it up very quickly, as they noticed, while he could not do it at home since they spoke Polish and Russian (here once again the use of language pointed to uneven gender relation between the two: Irina, a native Russian speaker used Polish rather than vice versa). This example illustrates complex interactions between individual and intra-family decisions on one hand and the combination of such structural mechanisms as childcare costs and the predominance of low pay in the local labour market on the other. Furthermore, it might be argued that the gender based expectation acted as an additional factor in affecting the decision of Irina of becoming a full-time homemaker.

Neither Irina nor Jan had an extended family living in Norhtown (apart from Irina’s brother who was temporarily staying in their house). This fact is important because grandparents and other relatives often can act of as a source of informal childcare support. Another female interviewee – Aziza, who found herself in a position similar to Irina’s, with an exception that she could rely on extended family. This combination reveals both differences and similarities of challenges faced by migrant women. Aziza said explicitly that she would be much more content to have paid work outside home rather than to care full-time for her one year old daughter if the level of pay would be sufficient in terms of covering childcare expenses and allowing making basic savings. In this sense, she was in the same position as Irina. However, there was a significant difference: Aziza was married to an Englishman (a police officer) whose relatives lived in a close proximity to their house. It allowed
Aziza and her husband to get occasional assistance in caring for their child from other family members. It gave Aziza space to engage in the activities beyond home, for example she started to work in Northtown’s hospice as a volunteer. Working in the voluntary sector was something she enjoyed and also saw as useful in terms in acquiring communication (i.e. everyday spoken language) skills. However it was the possibility to develop social ties rather than pragmatic considerations which gave this experience the central significance:

*It is so interesting for me, I adore this thing. If would have more free time, for example, I was single and did not have to take care of the children, I would probably stay there day and night. It is enjoyable to talk to the people, they are so nice and interesting. At the moment, I go there once or twice a week depending how much time I have got*

What Aziza described as free time came from the periods when her mother in law could take care of her new-born child. It was also her mother in law who first brought her to the hospice and introduced her. This kinship tie was instrumental in finding this voluntary activity, which had a positive symbolic significance for Aziza, as well as giving her time to engage in it. While spending time in Northtown’s hospice, Aziza managed to draw positive emotions in spite of psychologically difficult nature of the environment present in this institution – the patients included people who had HIV AIDS and other grave health conditions. She claimed that it was particularly rewarding to share time with other volunteers, to be respected and befriended by them. Even though this form of work outside of home was unpaid, it gave her intrinsic satisfaction and helped to widen the circle of acquaintances in Northtown.

The experiences of Aziza reveal two issues related to informal work: firstly, staying at home and providing childcare full time can be explained not only by a personal choice, but by the level of pay available in the local labour market. Furthermore, the availability of extended family support can allow migrant women to engage in unpaid voluntary work, which in turn can be seen both instrumentally and symbolically meaningful for the individuals involved in it.
This function of informal work - the possibility to build broader interpersonal network among Northtown’s residents, has been also noted in the testimony given by an Estonian interviewee Helle (she took part in one of focus group interviews). She said that informal unpaid work involving meal preparation which she did for a local Pentecostal Church allowed her to interact with many people whom she would not met otherwise. She stressed that those interactions allowed her to feel in Northtown at home for the first time – in her words, even the ‘English’ food was good. It shows that some social activities involving unpaid voluntary labour can act as a bridge between newly arrived migrants and members of established communities. Northtown can be seen as a new destination for migrants not only because of the particularities coming from migration history or greater ethnic homogeneity, but because migrants such as Helle and Aziza are new to Northtown. Since they do not know many locally people, the involvement in social activities can allow them to develop emotional bonds with people coming from established communities and enable them to feel more comfortable in Northtown.

However, by looking at the narratives of other participants, it appears that the significance of informal work activities cannot be reduced solely to broader forms of socialisation. They can play an important economic role as well. While Aziza’s actions can be described as the representation of altruistic and non-financial approach to informal work, the gathered data points to the existence of grey area cases, when migrant participants have chosen to find a modus vivendi between their desire to help Northtown’s residents and get greater social exposure on one side and the need to generate additional income on the other.

The combination of the knowledge of migrants’ social needs in Northtown and the experience in certain occupations in the countries of origin could open venues for informal forms of work at home. Alina, who had long-term experience as the teacher of music in the religious school in Poland and worked formally in one of Northtown’s nurseries, spotted an opportunity to run her own pre-school childcare provision in Northtown. Her calculations were based on the dissatisfaction felt by local Polish migrant families in relation the quality and price offered by the registered private sector providers of childcare in Northtown. She also utilised the extensive network of contacts which she built as an organizer of Polish themed
events in Northtown. After she and her partner managed to secure more spacious accommodation in Northtown through local social housing association, she came out with an idea to turn their house into a home based nursery for the children of Polish labour migrants. Since she also became pregnant around the same time, staying at home and bringing some income appeared to constitute a zero sum game. From the start, it was an informal arrangement: she had not registered her home based nursery with any statutory body and the attraction of clients was based on the word of mouth. She called herself a ‘telephone nanny’. She explained the activities associated with this chosen role:

_When parents need to go somewhere, need to travel somewhere or are busy with work, they call me. Obviously I am taking care of their little ones, the children at my home. I am very content with it because now I spent most of time at home, moreover, I am pregnant and all of it is a good distraction for me. So I think it will go on this way for some time…_

Notably, she stressed that her activities were not only designed to accommodate working patterns of migrants, but also helped them to parents from childcare responsibilities when they were not at work. Alina’s activities could be perceived as controversial and problematic from the point of view of children safety and accountability, and, moreover, there are potential legal dangers for her. On the other hand, it was a way to bring additional untaxed income during her own pregnancy, when she withdraw from formal paid employment herself. She also perceived it as a way to serve her own migrant community locally by providing culturally sensitive services. Unlike her other, more ambitious ideas – she thought about opening a Sunday school, but could not convince local migrant parents to support this idea, the home based nursery had succeeded. Moreover, it should be noted that her scope to provide informal childcare also depended on the ability of her husband to earn stable wage in the local factory (the car bearings’ manufacturer), and also his willingness to help in setting the logistics of informal childcare provision. By their own admission, he would bring children to their home and would drive them back to their parents when he would return from work.
Alina could run the services relatively smoothly because both of her children reached the school age and were outside of the house at the time when it was used as an informal nursery. The combination of the factors ranging from children’s age to social networking and work experience allowed Alina to run the whole operation. During the interview Alina stressed that this form of informal work was preferable to the sort of paid employment she has experienced in the local labour market. In effect, the dissatisfaction with low status work available formally contributed towards the pursuit of informal work which gave her greater autonomy and satisfaction.

Alina was not the only interviewee who has chosen the path of informal work which led to the generation of financial income. While Alina’s informal work was built around helping migrants looking for alternative form of childcare, Malgosia dedicated her time to teaching adults. Malgosia was in her late 20s when she arrived to Northtown; she and her partner did not have any children. Significantly to her employment perspectives, she had a degree from a University in Poland in English language and literature. It gave her higher expectations in finding work, and unlike other Polish migrants in Northtown, many of whom had to start working in manual jobs because of difficulties related to the language, she managed to find an office based work in a call centre. However the job was not very well paid and, as she stressed in the interview, she found it to be extremely uninteresting. She simply did not see a long term perspective for herself:

_I do not want to work in some kind of call centre_

Eventually, she decided to give individual and group classes to Polish migrants at her home. The idea to engage in this activity occurred to her gradually: because many migrants heard about her education, she was approached on numerous occasions with pleas to interpret. Malgosia was keen to help, but eventually it started to irritate her and she begun to perceive those requests as something putting a heavy burden on her. But she did not want to stop helping out fellow migrants, instead she changed the nature of those interactions. She gradually realised that there was a need of the English language tuition for Northtown’s Polish migrants and her skills were in high demand.
While Northtown has recognised institutions of English language training for non-native speakers, e.g. the local college, it was oversubscribed and the timing was not always suitable for everyone, particularly for those migrants who worked afternoon shifts. It has occurred to her that teaching English privately in exchange for fees should allow to earn extra income. At the start, she began to teach migrants in a rented room in the town’s centre. However it was not ideal: significant part of income generated by teaching was spent on the rent. Eventually, it seemed more reasonable to teach at home rather than to rent special premises.

In their home (rented through public housing association), she set a study room or ‘a business room’, as she called it, where she run individual and group classes. In effect, she used the private space of her home as an informal workplace: the apartment became not only a place to live but a place where additional pay (outside of the formal labour market) was earned. Malgosia’s ‘business room’, which she showed to me, was a medium sized room with a desk, four chairs and some teaching material – a very cozy and welcoming room, which distinguished it starkly from bigger but much less attractive rooms of the local college (at least, in my ethnographic comparison). In total she had sixteen students: twelve came for one to one tuition, the remaining four constituted a separate study group. This was also very different from the type of learning available through mainstream public (the ESOL classes require payment of tuition fees, the classes consisted of twelve or even more students) sector provision. As in the case of Alina, however less controversially in terms of the age of participants (the classes were attended only by adults), Malgosia’s activities were undertaken beyond the boundary of the formal labour market.

One of the issues, which Malgosia mentioned during the interview, was the relation between her work, that is, the teaching of English to local Poles, and her interests. She valued her activities in for two reasons: firstly, it allowed her to earn extra income from the activity which she preferred to formal employment available in the local labour market, and secondly, as a way to help improve language skills of fellow Polish migrants. She spoke with pride about one of her students who managed to improve his language skills very quickly. She added that it was a pity that he had to work for a local kitchen furniture manufacturer – a dull
and low status job in her opinion. In contrast, she with her English language and organizational skills could avoid such kind of employment and run language classes. Moreover, she did it independently without the help from any local statutory or voluntary organization: this form of activity brought her income and a degree of autonomy which would not be possible if she worked for any formal group.

The analysis of activities undertaken and Malgosia and Alina brought together two different but also related examples of informal work. It was shown how two migrant Polish women have exercised their agency: the dissatisfaction with the jobs available in the local labour market, their own personal skills plus the demand for certain services among Northtown’s migrants led towards the development of informal work arrangements.

The informality could be explained by the lack of access to financial resources necessary in order to conduct their activities in a formal way. However, the discussed processes also can be linked to the dynamics of Northtown, particularly its characteristic of being a new destination for migrants. Northtown was a new destination for post-2004 Polish people who arrived as the new EU citizens. It did not have Polish-run institutions dealing with education and childcare. It allowed both Alina and Malgosia to fill this gap and successfully tap into the demand exhibited by local migrants, the demand which was not adequately met the formally recognised form of provision. The newness of migration can partially explain the informality of the discussed arrangements: it might be argued that for the establishment of formal community groups more time is need than the time interval which passed since the arrival of migrants after 2004.

5.2 Traditional sites, new social activities

The evidence discussed above provided insights into lives of Northtown’s migrants coming from very diverse national, religious and ethnic backgrounds. However, because of the thickness of the data (most of biographical interviews were conducted with Polish-speaking participants), the analysis is more potent when it comes to the exploration of social activities of Polish migrants in Northtown. One
of such ‘Polish-oriented’ data segments’ relates to the activities around the Northtown based Catholic Church. Similarly to other material presented and interpreted in the section, this data is relevant because it offers an additional perspective on social interactions taking place outside of the paid labour market.

When it comes to out of labour market activities of migrants, the Church can be seen as both theoretically and empirically important for social research. It’s well documented by social scientists that locally based religious institutions perform multiple roles in social life: they are not only transmitters of sacral teachings and practises, but informal hubs used by individuals searching for social engagement outside the private and labour market spheres (Davie, 2007). In the context of this study, there has been substantial amount of empirical evidence suggesting that this religious institution (in the case of Polish migrants – one of Northtown’s Catholic Churches) has been an important site for migrants. For example, a manager of social services for young people, who sought to outreach to people from ethnic minority and migrant background, said that young Polish migrants have shown greater willingness to get involved when events were coordinated with the local Catholic Church. Ludmila, a community worker with a local migrant umbrella group, said with a strong conviction:

*If you want to get in touch Polish migrants here, you need be in touch with a local Catholic Church, whether you like it or not*

She personally believed that the local Catholic Church, where Polish migrants met, was important site for anyone wishing to observe social lives of Northtown’s migrants. She suggested that those observations came from her experience rather than any personal affiliations with the Church. A testimony from another Polish interviewee provided some support to such claims, and even more significantly brought light onto social activities requiring some form of work from migrants, but which, in contrast to two cases discussed above, did not lead to the generation of additional income.

The activities of Alina and her role in organising celebratory event illustrates how the premises of locally based religious institutions have been used by Polish migrants, who were prepared to contribute through their unpaid voluntary labour.
Alina’s name first came out in the interview with Jan, who described her as someone committed to community organizing activities – he called, ‘dzialaczka’, which means literally ‘the doer’ in Polish. He explained:

*This means from the early age – I know her for a long time, she took part in organizing all kinds of events, for example, sport competitions. Now she together with her husband are organizing yearly New Year celebrations for the Poles here. And not only for the Poles, even a few Englishmen are coming, but of course the majority are Poles*

He got in touch with her, explained about the purpose of my research, and gained her permission to pass her contact details to me.

During the interview it appeared that she was extremely proud of the way she managed to organise a New Year celebration event for Polish migrants in Northtown, in fact one of the first things she talked when asked about her life in Northtown, was the story surrounding this event.

Although post-2004 labour migration brought a substantial numbers of Poles to Northtown, according to Alina there had not been any Polish themed leisure event. This was spotted by Alina, who realised that there was a potential of filling the gap when it came to the activities neither belonging to paid employment nor to the private sphere of the household. Her starting point was the informal group gatherings around the local Catholic Church:

*The only opportunity for the Poles to meet as a group after work is around the local Church. Around this Church groups are coming together, having chats after the Mass. But it did not last long, particularly if the weather was bad*

Alina used such group gatherings as a channel to spread the word about a Polish leisure event of a secular character. Her strategy was twofold: first of all, she aimed to promote her idea among Polish post-2004 newcomers, and secondly, to get support from the local Catholic parish in using the hall adjacent to the chapel in launching this event. She calculated that the celebration of the New Year’s Eve would bring a large number of Polish migrants resident in Northtown. In her words, there was a demand for leisure event for Polish migrants, which was not
met by any local statutory, private or formally recognised voluntary sector provider:

There is nothing much to do for leisure here, just go to a pub. But what kind of music do they play? From what I heard and experienced, it just techno and rap. I do not mean to say that we are old and do not understand this kind of music, but we cannot simply relax while it’s playing. The important thing about Poles is that they want to have fun. So for us, the New Year Eve can be a chance to listen to popular Polish songs, to the music we love...

In order to organise this ‘Polish’ New Year celebration, she first of all had to persuade local Polish migrant families to take part in it. Initially Alina’s proposal was met with a degree of reluctance and scepticism – local Polish migrants tended to distrust an idea coming from a woman whom they did not know very well. On the other hand, not everyone was excited that the logistics of this event were built around the Church. There was a suspicion that since Alina maintained a good relationship with the priest and used religious gatherings in advertising her ideas of the leisure event, the celebrations would have a strictly religious character. It explained the initial scepticism of some migrants. It took Alina time to persuade that the nature of the event would be secular.

Secondly, there was another barrier, which Alina described as the culture of fear among migrants. She explained that Northtown’s Polish migrants had come from different parts of Poland, did not know each other prior to migration, hence there was a certain degree of distance and distrust in social relations. There was also a fear of that the permission to bring alcoholic drinks would lead to unpredictable behaviour and possibly even some acts of violence.

Alina dealt with those concerns in two ways. The New Year Eve celebration was promoted as a family event: migrants were invited with their children rather than on their own. This mixing of children with adults was supposed to introduce a degree of internal normative control: the expectation was that the presence of children would encourage adults to behave in a restrained and responsible way and to be moderate in their alcohol consumption. To respond to any potential disturbances, Alina established a contact line with the local police and was assured
that they would come at once and deal with any potential issues decisively but respectfully. Although all those fears proved to be wrong, there was still a mechanism in place which kept migrant families reassured that everything would go smoothly and safely. Alina claimed that the celebration became more popular over the two years with the numbers increasing from sixty participants in the first year to around one hundred and sixty the next year. There was a clear pattern of returning party goers; some participants would even invite their family and friends living in other European countries to come to celebrate the New Year’s Eve in Northtown. Although Alina’s assertions might be treated with caution – after all she was an organiser and had interest in reassuring that the event was an unambiguous success, two Polish couples who participated in the celebration were very positive for a number of reasons: it gave them the opportunity to enjoy themselves in a Polish language environment, to bring their own food and also to make charitable contributions to social causes. Alina herself was praised for showing initiative and determination in carrying things through. Jan told that during the last celebration they were raising charity for children suffering from cancer in Poland.

Reading through the narratives it appears that the celebratory event has had multiple functions: on the one hand, it was a Northtown based event, which gave its participants a chance to feel that there were social activities in Northtown unrelated to paid employment. The social event was structured and organised by migrant participants themselves rather than by any private or public body, or even by a formally structured voluntary group. Polish migrants also contributed through their voluntary labour in preparing food and turned the celebration into an enjoyable family event.

On the other hand, few local English people and members of other nationalities came or were invited, it was an explicitly Polish event both in terms of its functions and activities. This event shows how migrants, particularly the interviewees such as Alina can exercise their agency in the social sphere: employ their organisational skills and launch not for personal benefit, but for collective enjoyment. It also shows how migrants can use the sites of international institutions such as the Roman Catholic Church (importantly, Polish migrants share this similar religious
background) can be used for staging local events. Norhtown is a new destination for post-2004 Polish migrants in the sense that it does not have any established Polish cultural institutions. The post-1945 Polish organisations ceased to function in this locality; according to the testimonies of local and newly arrived Polish interviewees, Northtown had Polish community group after 1945, there was even a Polish Social Club, which with the declining numbers of Poles was turned into a British senior citizens club. Even though Polish migrants could encounter people with Polish roots whose ancestors came around 1945, the sense of continuation was absent. According to Tadeusz (who also participated in Alina’s event),

_Here on the left from own house, there is a neighbour – his father was a Polish soldier during the Second World War. He had to stay here, he could not return to Poland because the KGB would capture him. I have also worked on a building site around here and there was a man with a typical Polish surname – Jankowski. There are a number of such people from that wave of migration, but they are dying out. That one is dead or the father of this is one is dead. But now there is a new generation who arrived here, like our family._

In this institutional vacuum and in the context of new wave migration, new arrivals from Poland could use the Catholic Church not solely for religious practices but leisure related activities as well. The events which they organised also depended on their voluntary unpaid labour rather from any formal employment in recognised community organisations.

5.3 The limits of unpaid informal work

The discussion so far discussed on the activities involving interactions between migrants and co-ethnics or between newly arrived migrants and the members of established communities. Those interactions were not sanctioned, controlled or supported by local statutory agencies. On a general level, among interviewees there were two employees of local migrant umbrella organisation. However both of them were formally employed by this organisation so their work cannot be described as informal and belonging to the processes covered by this section. However the fieldwork material contained one exception: it was exemplified in the
case of Northtown’s International Football Club (NIFC). It was run by a Georgian migrant Moses on voluntary basis. Moses himself came to Northtown as a dispersed migrant. His testimony shows that for those migrants, who were involved in officially recognised groups but were unpaid for their work, the ability in reconciling their inclinations to contribute to the community and supporting themselves financially was much more problematic. His experiences will be discussed in-depth below.

First of all, in the interview Moses outlined the activities of NIFC. The football club attracted young people from various ethnic backgrounds, as he said...

*From Algeria, Angola, Mozambique, Cameroon, South Africa, Lithuanian, there are Portuguese, Georgians... We are international team and we are twenty first century, our origins are different... We organise training facilities, equipment, travel, referees, everything, it is a very hard job...*

In other words, it was a truly multi-ethnic voluntary group, which contrasts it to the Polish centred groups discussed above. The club participated in a non-professional league, where it had achieved considerable success and it was featured in national papers. According to Moses, its aim was to give young migrant people in Northtown the opportunity to forge friendships as well as to enjoy themselves. There was a gendered side to it as well: the participants and manager himself were all males. Moses, as a manager, saw himself as a role model exposing a particular kind of masculinity. He stressed that it was important to present himself in a certain way, to be well-dressed and well groomed (e.g. while penniless, he would borrow money in order to go to a barber and have a proper hair cut). It was done in order to nurture the characters of young men and promote responsible behaviour instead of them following the path of ‘*drinking cider and smoking marihuana,*’ as he put it. A lot of time was spent not only physical education side and playing football, but on providing counselling to young people. Moses acted not only as a coach but as an informal counsellor of young people in psychological matters. Some of his players entered institutions of higher education, which made him feel proud and vindicated.
However, there was a fundamental problem in maintaining the club financially: after he got his legal rights to stay in the UK, he wanted to continue his work with the club on full-time basis. Since he was not paid and continued to do it on a purely voluntary basis, Moses did not have any other income and had to support himself only through the payments he got as a job seeker. In other words, while he worked for a formally recognised group, his work still was counted as informal by local authorities. He tirelessly struggled to get funding for this position, which would allow him to get at least a minimum wage rather than to survive on a job seeker allowance. As he emphasized, his work should be seen not only as a socially valuable activity of helping young people to feel at home in Northtown by playing England’s national game, but a job requiring a lot of time and effort from himself. But in spite of all recognition and verbal praise, including from former prime minister Gordon Brown who accepted club’s T-shirt, he had not received any stable monetary support for his work. It was just a general talk of support and praise, which as pleasant as it was for him, could not bring any sustainable funding. Turning the position of the club’s manager from a voluntary one into a salaried one was difficult because of the necessary funding was not denied:

_No no ... about money you must not ask because everybody’s crying when you ask about salary_

This inability or/and indifference put him into precarious state with no income apart from a job seeker allowance which in itself was conditioned by him actively looking for work elsewhere and thus side-lining activities undertaken with the youngsters. The choice was stark: either to leave the club and abandon the activity for which he felt responsible, and find a job elsewhere or stay in the club and survive on job seeker allowance, which draw him into personal debt and poverty. He had to borrow money in order to pay for everything from expenses on food for personal consumption or to have a hair-cut as well as paying for his accommodation. He stated that ‘_no one cared_’ and added that

_I know a lot of people who leave this volunteer job and who leave this community sector_
Clearly, the activity like running a youth football club on full-time basis needed state funding. The continuation of unpaid informal work was not an option acceptable to Moses. He could not rely on voluntary donations from individuals and families: he coached young people who at the time of training had not entered the labour market and some of whom came from families of non EU migrants who could not pay for their children since not all of them have full labour market rights themselves.

This is an example of how national migration policies and local reluctance to provide financial backing could restrict migrants’ access to social activities involving leisure and education. Migrants like Moses were sent to Northtown as a part of dispersal policy – the policy which directly contributed to making Northtown a new migratory destination. Moses saw Northtown in a personal light, as opposed to as a result of state’s policy: as a place which became the destination for various groups of migrants and importantly their children. However, in his eyes, the authorities through their failure to provide funding for his club abdicated from developing multi-cultural communities in Northtown more generally.

The unwillingness to provide the funding necessary for sustaining this group did not mean that the authorities did not have any connection to the club. There was also a peculiar police connection: the club’s main sponsor was South Yorkshire Police: as Moses jokingly said, ‘we are small Home Office’. Moses implied that there was a surveillance element to the sponsorship, at least symbolically: one of motive of police sponsorship could stem from the perceptions of young male migrants to be worrisome and trouble-prone. However police sponsorship did not go as far as paying Moses for working with young migrant people.

This example also highlights the difficulty of turning community work into paid employment and points to personal dilemmas faced by migrants willing to contribute to community but who without proper financing are pushed into despair and poverty. Finally, it shows that certain types of community work could not be run solely based on good willingness of individuals and be indefinitely depended on unpaid informal work but require the provision for stable and state funded paid employment.
Conclusions

The empirical material presented in this section covered a very diverse range of social activities: from unpaid domestic work to in-house forms of paid childcare and from the engagements with formal voluntary groups to the participation in informal events sustained by unpaid labour. What united those processes was, firstly, their positioning outside of formal labour market and secondly, all of them required from migrants personal investment of time and on many occasions labour. Paid or unpaid, those social activities can be seen as examples of informal work. Whilst all activities related to informal work took place in Northtown, they were also affected by broader structural contexts: the high costs of childcare in the UK, the lack of funding to migrant voluntary groups and the presence of such international institutions as the Roman Catholic Church. Yet these social activities were not solely determined by the structural contexts, but were also shaped by participants’ agency. Migrants would exercise their agency in a variety of ways: continue being managers of sport club in spite of the lack of funding, use the premises of the religious institution for a secular leisure event and act as informal service providers by setting home based childcare and language learning provisions. With the exception of the analysis of one family, for which the withdrawal from the labour market did not lead to work-related activities outside of the household, there was one general pattern across interviewed participants (individual, family and focus group): migrants were performing labour outside of the formal labour market, but also were willing to make contributions to local social life.

The latter is particular important if one decides to view Norhtown as a place of migrant living as opposed to more narrow perception of Northtown as a geographical locality where only paid employment matters when it comes to migrants’ lives. Some of those activities could be explained as the responses to the shortcomings of the local labour market – participants could not get higher quality jobs and break from the vicious cycle of downward occupational mobility. Another motive could be explained by the desire to contribute to Northton’s social life.
whether as the member of a particular national group (the case of Polish migrants in the New Year event) or more generally (like the last example of the NIFC). The interpretations of data allow arguing that alongside the participation in paid employment, the activities related to informal work constituted an important aspect of migrant socio-economic experiences in Northtown. The discussion also pointed to the difference between EU migrants and dispersed non EU migrants. While Polish migrants could organise festivities independent from local authority funding (they would collect and generate funds themselves), non EU migrants, whose access to paid employment was restricted, were much less flexible. In contrast, they were depended on good will of the representatives of local statutory group: for example, Zeinab, a migrant woman from Azerbaijan recollected how she managed to organise the celebration of Nowruz (the Persian New Year) in Northtown. She enjoyed the event immensely, particularly the costumes specifically tailored for this event, but she also stressed that this event was only possible because of individual act of kindness coming from the head of one of local statutory support groups. In contrast, the funds generated by Polish migrants in the local labour market allowed them to launch leisure activities independently from local statutory agencies.

To conclude, the analysis of this section revealed that while for the initial arrival of many interviewed CEE migrants can be explained by the need to find paid employment and structural demand for migrant labour in the local economy, migrant participants would exercise their agency and engage in other forms of work. The discussion also demonstrated the need of interviewed dispersed non EU migrants, specifically manifested in the interview with a Georgian participant, to able to participate in community groups – the need which was not fully met because of restrictive funding. The interpretations also suggest that when it comes to working experiences in a broader sense, migrants in such new destinations as Northtown are not a homogenous group. Significantly, women and non EU migrants face additional challenges in the sphere of the labour market which in turn makes them more prone to be active in a broader social sphere.
Chapter 6

Ethnic intolerance in local space: encounters and responses

Introduction

Throughout the interviewing process, when asked about challenges facing them in daily social interactions, migrant participants complained about hostile attitudes coming from established ‘White’ British residents of Northtown (participants would refer to those residents as locals or as the ‘English’). Moreover, the interviewees from ‘White’ British background, who were interviewed in their capacity of the representatives of statutory support groups, also acknowledged that migrant newcomers faced hostility because of their different ethnic background and nationality.

For the purpose of the analysis, the manifestations of such hostilities have been covered by the analytical category of ethnic intolerance. This category covers such diverse phenomena as ethnically motivated verbal abuse, unpleasant/hostile gaze on the streets and even acts of physical violence. The title of ‘ethnic intolerance’ has been chosen as the name for this category because it is more inclusive when compared to more widely used terms such as racism and xenophobia. While racism tends to refer to discriminative and abusive practices committed against the people of non ‘White’ European background (Solomos, 2003), the use of it is more problematic when it comes to the experiences of such social groups as CEE migrants who look overwhelmingly ‘White’. For some interviewed labour migrants from CEE, the use of the term ‘racism’ became associated not with biological/physical differences, but with xenophobic outbursts driven by labour market competition. Furthermore, unlike the notion of xenophobia which implies a degree of permanence when it comes to the hostility to foreigners, the notion of ethnic intolerance can be used in discussing the dynamics of change. The use of the construct linked to the notion of ‘tolerance’ allows a possibility for inter-ethnic relations to shift away from a deep hostility to greater acceptance, while xenophobia in its colloquial use is associated with more static and thus, unchangeable, manifestations of hostility.
Participants tended to see ethnic intolerance as a significant problem when it came to migrants’ lives in Northtown. Migrant participants would not complain about ethnic intolerance in the UK generally, but instead would focus on various local manifestations of this phenomenon and their direct experiences. The acts of ethnic intolerance in the public sphere, e.g. in the places of residence, led to unpleasant memories retold during the interviews. The reaction to ethnic intolerance was expressed in a highly emotive way: when migrant and non migrant interviewees spoke about ethnic intolerance in Northtown, it could create an impression that this form of intolerance dominated their lives.

However the dynamics of social interactions taking place in Northtown were far more complex, as both non migrant and migrant interviewees have acknowledged. The same participants who complained over ethnic intolerance would also point to multiple examples of mutually respectful interactions with ‘White’ British residents or with ‘the English’, as they referred to them. Moreover, some participants would claim that there were more tensions in the relation with fellow co-ethnics (e.g. migrants from Poland) rather than with ‘White’ British residents: when asked about the conflicts at the school, a Polish student responded that in his experience the relations between Polish students were more antagonistic compared to the relations between ‘the Poles’ and ‘the English’.

However, it would be also important to stress that the acts of ethnic intolerance did take place and its significance should not be underplayed: even when direct cases of intolerance were exceptional, those episodes would leave deep psychological scars on the participants affected by it. It would be also important to stress that those incidents took place in public space: on the streets, in front of migrants’ homes, etc. As such, those manifestations of intolerance should not only be viewed through the eyes of individuals directly affected by it, but would require analysing the responses of local statutory agencies. The narratives of migrants bring some light on this issue. On the other hand, the narratives of interviewees representing statutory and voluntary groups offered professional and personal perspectives on why the phenomenon of ethnic intolerance continued to be a problem in Northtown.
The analysis will initially discuss the perception of Northtown as an area with high level of ethnic intolerance and low level of ethnic diversity. The analysis will move on towards the discussion of specific acts of ethnic intolerance. On a final note, an attempt will be made to show that participants felt that there have been some positive developments taking place locally, including the move towards greater ethnic tolerance. It should be noted that ethnic intolerance was directed against all migrants – it did not discriminate based on socio-legal status, hence the experiences of EU and non EU migrants are going to be analysed together. Moreover, the testimonies of ‘White’ British interviewees are going to be integrated into the analysis. The unifying theme here is the perceptions and experiences of ethnic intolerance locally rather than a comparative analysis of views expressed by the members of particular social groups.

Two issues related to the discussed phenomenon should be distinguished: firstly, the acts of ethnic intolerance, and secondly, the perception of Northtown as a place characterised by high level of ethnic intolerance. The latter, on some occasions was linked by some participants to the alleged ethnic homogeneity of local population. While the analysis primarily will be dedicated to the actual manifestations and experiences, it would be also important first of all to look at the general perceptions of Northtown as a locality in which migrants for the variety of reasons felt unwelcomed. They are significant since they appeared in interviewees’ narratives on many occasions and because they affected the ways participants saw Northtown and its established inhabitants. Such approach would also link the analysis with the arguments articulated in the literature on new destinations (see the part on ethnic intolerance in the literature review section) which explicitly pointed to the link between social particularity of receiving area and the level of hostility directed against migrant newcomers. However instead of replicating or debunking the observations made by existing scholarship, the analysis will aim to construct a theoretical analysis of ethnic intolerance experienced by the study’s participants.
6.1 Encountering ethnic intolerance

The sense of Northtown of being a particular place when it came to ethnic relations in general and the issue of ethnic intolerance more specifically, was noticeable in the narratives of most migrant interviewees. Lech from Poland expressed the following opinion, the opinion which came out also in the interviews conducted with other migrant participants:

*In this area, in Northtown, there are strong manifestations of racism. People of colour, Black people are not tolerated. Poles are ‘Whites’ but they are perceived as people who are stealing jobs from the locals*

On one hand, Lech perceives Northtown as an inherently ethnically intolerant area where all migrants are subjected to hostile attitudes. For him, there is a clear ethnic dimension to the local manifestations of hostility – migrants are not tolerated because they are different ethnically. On the other hand, the insecurities in the sphere of the labour market which led to foreign newcomers being ostracised, point to strong economic rather than exclusively national roots of ethnic intolerance. Lech recognises that this particularly applies to CEE migrants like himself. Even though CEE migrants could escape explicit intolerance because of their ‘White’ European physical appearance, the tensions over employment spilled over into ethnically motivated resentment.

Other interviewees would also point to the specific local dynamics such as ethnic homogeneity, high levels of poverty caused by the closure of the mining industry and the competition over jobs as the reasons making Northtown a place where migrants felt strongly resented by ‘White’ British residents. The stress on the supposed ethnic homogeneity of local populations was particularly strong: many participants would compare Northtown to other localities in Yorkshire (e.g. Leeds and Sheffield), which, according to them, had greater ethnic diversity and, more importantly, were more tolerant.

Irrespective of overlapping explanations which was articulated by migrants while reflecting on the hostility which they faced, ethnic intolerance in Northtown
emotionally could be experienced as something overwhelming. For one of interviewees, Jan from Poland, everything appeared in a very grim light:

*I can tell you about something horrible. Maybe it is not a part of your research, but it seems to me that in Northtown there is a very deeply-seated racism. A very strong one, against all who are different, against all foreigners. For example, nearby, in Sheffield you can see a lot of Blacks and people of colour. Here they do not have it. If you are a bit different, they finger point you. Here, in Northtown, it is scary...*

Both Lech and Jan express a similar sentiment: Northtown is seen as an implacably intolerant place when it comes to attitudes to migrant newcomers. In the quoted interviews’ fragments, ethnic intolerance seems to cover all aspects of local living and it is inescapable. Participants felt that because Northtown as an area is new to migration and local people are not accustomed to ethnic diversity, the level of intolerance is greater than in more established migratory destinations such as Sheffield. In contrast, in Northtown ethnic homogeneity and ethnic intolerance reinforce each other and create a vicious cycle affecting migrants’ relation to Northtown in a negative way. However, what is also noticeable in the narratives of Lech and Jan is a generalised reference to the ‘people of colour’ rather than to someone specifically. The way the phrase has used in Polish can be also translated as ‘coloureds’, which has a strongly racialised connotation. It also points to an ethnic differentiation perpetuated by some migrants themselves – the experiences of ethnic intolerance are described by using racialised adjectives. This might be described as an example of the inverted power geometry (Massey, 1995): CEE migrants identify even more vulnerable social/ethnic groups (e.g. non EU dispersed migrants) present in Northtown’s spatial environment and position themselves against them.

Such rationalisations leads to a way of thinking in which visibly different migrants, non Europeans/ non ‘Whites’ are singled out and positioned as a separate group of people. This tendency is also present in the response of Zeinab from Azerbaijan: when asked about whether she experienced ethnic intolerance in Northtown, she responded that she did not and added that people in Northtown did not like
migrants with a dark skin (in her own words), the ‘Blacks’ in particular. In contrast, for ‘White’ Europeans it is easier to blend in a local population and become immune to local manifestations of ethnic intolerance.

Not all interviewees saw a connection between ethnic intolerance and the particularity of Norhtown as a migration destination. Some would simply say that Norhtown was an ethnically homogeneous place and implicitly acknowledge that it was new to migration, but did not see it as a problem or as a source of intolerant attitudes directed against them. Here is what one of interviewees, Witold from Poland, a worker in a distribution centre, said:

*What contrasts this town from other similar towns is the absence of ‘ciapakow’. By this word I mean Pakistanis, this is the way they are called in the Polish slang. This absence makes Norhtown so different from the places like Bury, Leeds and Sheffield, where there are many of them. These places have ethnic neighbourhoods, many different ethnicities, cultures...There are Asians, and there are also Roma. Here there are some Pakistanis, but there are not too many of them, they do not occupy whole parts of town, entire streets. This is something which contrasts Norhtown to other places*

For Witold, Norhtown was a very particular place because of the noticeable absence of significant non-White/non-Christian communities. It was something he shared with the interviewees’ opinions cited earlier. However, there is also a noticeable difference in the way Witold approached discussing this subject. While others linked it with greater ethnic intolerance, he did not make any connection. Moreover, he used Polish slang carrying explicit derogatory connotation when referring to the people from the Indian subcontinent.

Moreover, when Witold’s narrative is examined more closely, it appears that he identifies himself as a ‘White’ European and that for him the absence of ethnic and racial diversity is not a problem. It makes Norhtown to stand out as a distinctive place, but this feature is seen in a neutral light. Throughout the interview Witold did not make any explicitly racist statements or used stereotypes, but the fact that he employed an explicitly racial noun to articulate his views on Norhtown is
notable since it represents a different kind of ethnic stereotyping, the stereotyping coming not from the ‘locals’ but from a migrants newcomer.

The narratives of interviewees’ quoted above can be contrasted to a non ‘White’ European interviewee who saw ethnic intolerance as an extension of ethnic homogeneity. While EU labour migrants and other ‘White’ European migrants could be indistinguishable during their appearences in Norhttown’s streets and other parts of public space – at least when they did not speak their mother tongue langauges or speak English with a foreign accent, non-White/non-European migrants could feel to be a target of ethnic intolerance on the streets and other public areas of Norhttown. Aziza from Kyrgyzstan said the following:

*There were very few immigrants in Norhttown when I first came here five years ago. The people would stare at me on the streets – I would have been even afraid to go out. I would feel like an alien from a different planet here. Now they are still staring but I do not pay attention, I just smile... In general some people on the street look at you as if they want to kill you. I hated to travel on bus, so when there was a first opportunity, I have bought a car so I would not see anyone. Some people are horrible. But most of them here are pleasant, they smile so one can get used to live here. But when you see the hate in some people’s eyes, you think: what have I done? I am not a criminal. And then I want back home, to Kyrgyzstan...*

Aziza’s narrative tells a story of ethnic prejudice directed against the migrant woman who is visible because of her non-European appearance, but it also carries a different, less pernicious element. For Aziza, it is some people who are abusive and racist. In contrast, the majority are tolerant. In contrast to some other interviewees (notably coming from Polish, i.e. ‘White’ European background), Aziza shows reluctance in labelling everyone in Norhttown as racist, in other words from generalising ethnic intolerance of some local residents. She also did not point to socio-economic explanations. Instead she believed that while with the changing demographics – the increase in ethnic diversity, the manifestations of ethnic intolerance had not completely disappeared (there are those for whom even mere visibility of people like Aziza inflames ‘silent’ hate), at least it became easier to live in Norhttown for someone who is a migrant newcomer. The issue of changing
attitudes and the move towards greater tolerance are going to be discussed later in this chapter. What is important to stress here is that being non ‘White’ European is much more difficult in Northtown: visible racial differences attract greater ethnic intolerance. At the same time, even such victims of intolerance as Aziza would resist in describing all ‘White’ British residents of Northtown as racist and Northtown as an impossible place to escape racially motivated hate. It contrasts to the statements of the interviewees quoted earlier, who saw Northtown as inherently ethnically intolerant area.

6.2 Individual responses to ethnic intolerance

The acts of ethnic intolerance have been taking place in various public settings. Sometimes it would take a form of verbal harassment which consisted of questioning migrants’ right to be residents of Northtown or the right to engage in a particular form of economic activity. For instance, Shima from Iran (a participant of a focus group interview) with her husband ran a fast food outlet. Independent, family run fast food outlets are known to be located on the bottom of the service sector, particularly in terms of profit they make (Ahmad, 2008). However by becoming small business owners in Northtown, this migrant couple had distinguished themselves and became a target for verbal harassment. According to Shima:

*When we are working there and the people come and say: why you got your own business but we haven’t got? I say I don’t know... because of our hard work.*

Such form of questioning was experienced as a form of ethnic intolerance directed against the interviewee and her family. Moreover, Shima also noted that many of their local customers came from disadvantaged social background. Hence this form of intolerance could be also seen in the light of socio-economic disadvantages experienced by some members of local ‘White’ British communities: they would express their frustrations over their own socio-economic exclusion by verbally challenging migrants’ right to engage in this form of economic activity. Shima and her family would counter those accusations by highlighting their own efforts and labour. However it was not sufficient to compensate for emotional injuries caused
by such comments: those comments created a feeling of being unwanted by some of Northtown’s ‘White’ British residents. Such encounters would also suggest the existence of intersection between the newness of migration to this certain area and socio-economic challenges faced by the members of established groups. The existing literature explained partially the manifestations of racism and xenophobia in new destinations by labour market competition. However, as the example with Shima seems to demonstrate, even when locally disadvantaged social groups do not compete with migrant newcomers directly, but see them as relatively successful, it can cause tensions and manifest itself in social interactions.

Similarly to Shima, other participants would directly associate ethnic intolerance, which they experienced, with socio-economic disadvantages faced by perpetrators. Occasionally this recognition would drift towards demonizing some sections of local population: in this version, the perpetrators of violence were lazy and resentful locals who did not want to work, but hated migrants who had to put up with long working hours and low status jobs. Some interviewees would refer to the ‘pathological families’ (a Polish interviewee) and the ‘people on the dole’ (an Iranian focus group participant). One of Polish interviewees, Jan, said that some local people consumed drugs and alcohol and had numerous children in order to get benefits – in his words, ‘drink beer and smoke marihuana, while making children’. He claimed that such people were the most likely to be hostile to migrants like himself. However he also added that not all local British people or UK nationals more generally were ethnically intolerant. Moreover, he would make a connection between post-industrial character of Northtown – the closure of mines, and the intolerant sentiments felt and expressed by some local ‘White’ British residents. According to him, this form of anger rooted in socio-economic problems would spill over into the acts of ethnic intolerance directed against migrants.

In contrast to Jan, some participants would speak about the relation between ethnic intolerance and socio-economic tensions using more neutral expressions. The search for the answers to the question over the origins of ethnic intolerance could even start at the time of verbal attack. A Polish interviewee Alina confronted the perpetrators of abuse in a direct and rational manner:
Once we had a situation here. Young people in front of our house started to yell – go back to Poland. They used very offensive language, they said that we did not have the right to live here. Even small children were screaming that we were stealing jobs from their parents. I told them: wait a second. Are your parents going to work in the factory for twelve hours like we do? Are your parents going to clean toilets? People who are employed in those workplaces come from very educated background. The difficult life back home forced them to come here...

In this episode Alina tried to establish some kind of dialogue with those young people. In response to the stereotypical claims over stealing jobs, she tried to explain that the jobs which migrants supposedly stole were both difficult and unpleasant. The jobs she had in mind were the ones of the most unattractive character both in terms of pay and occupation – the recycling plant, cleaning jobs, etc. Alina used the local examples of employment – the recycling plant as well as more general examples of low status work. She also said that migrants came to Northtown not because they wanted to steal jobs from the parents of those young people, but because they were driven by economic hardships in their home countries.

The analysed narrative also points to the justifications put forward by people responsible for this kind of abuse – the young people. What is central is the abusive slogan and its main message – the alleged jobs’ theft. It shows that ethnic intolerance cannot be exclusively explained by some kind of innate xenophobia or culturally rationalised racism of perpetrators. Although this group of people engaged in clearly ethnically motivated abuse, they themselves tried to justify it by the reference to the competition in the local labour market. The insecurities felt over the labour market acted as one of the main motivators in creating ethnic intolerance. One of the conclusions to be made from this encounter is to point to the role played by the reality and fear over unemployment among local people from ‘White’ British background in creating tensions which in turn contributed to ethnic intolerance. Alina realised this and used those arguments in countering intolerant behaviour of some local young people.
While some elements of ethnic intolerance have been explained by the feeling of being disadvantaged in the economic sphere, some acts were seen as a form of pure and irrational racism. It particularly affected migrants from non ‘White’ European backgrounds whose appearance could trigger acts of ethnic intolerance. Aziza from Kyrgyzstan, once undertook a regular trip, when she took her daughter to the school. This regular journey turned into an unexpectedly unpleasant experience. She recollected the following:

Once with a daughter we wanted to catch a bus to her Grammar school - it was raining, it was very cold. The driver asked us to leave the bus telling that he was not going to that direction. But I told him – it is written on your schedule that you stop there. But he said: No, you will have to leave. Myself and my child would have to walk quite a lot and the weather was horrible. But then we were disembarking the bus, an Englishwoman came in. Then this driver said hello, here the lady is here so you can stay, we will go there. Can you imagine this? I did not realise first what was going on...Firstly, I thought: thank you Lord, we won’t need to go on foot. But then I thought: are we seen as not human beings? If an English girl, a woman comes, only then we can travel on a bus. I even cried. Later my partner said: we have to call and complain – it is a racist abuse...

What is striking in this highly unpleasant encounter on the public transport is a gradual realization of ethnic intolerance. For the victim, it was hard to believe and comprehend that just because of looking differently she could expect to find herself on the receiving end of such prejudiced and discriminatory behaviour. This kind of behaviour was labelled as a racial abusive, notably by her English partner. The place of abuse is noteworthy: historically the public transport had been one of the most symbolic sites of racial segregation in the past (e.g. the US, South Africa, but also in the UK where bus companies had discriminatory hiring practices). In this case, the driver of ‘White’ British background behaved in the way which suggested that Aziza could only undertake the journey if there was a White ‘British’ traveller on board - otherwise she did not deserve his labour. It was not the only time when Aziza encountered this form of ethnic intolerance, but it traumatised her so deeply that she spent a considerable amount of time talking about it during the interview. Apart from being an unpleasant episode, this recollection also poses a question
over the responses to ethnic intolerance from statutory agencies. This subject is going to be considered next.

6.3 Ethnic intolerance and responses from statutory and voluntary groups

In the earlier example, Aziza did not approach local police or any other agency – she solely complained to family members and friends. However other participants have contacted statutory agencies or statutory agencies got involved themselves. The interpretations of narratives point to a mixed picture when it comes to the response from the local police. On one hand, there were cases of quick and swift response from the local police. For example, Alina’s family was faced with the acts of verbal abuse coming from the teenagers who gathered in front of their house. According to Alina and her husband, the youths were screaming profanities at them. When this Polish family threatened to call the police, the youth taunted them saying that they would never do such thing since they were migrants and could not speak proper English. This mocking had a reverse effect: Alina’s husband went home and telephoned the police. In turn the police car came quickly (in a matter of minutes) and dealt with the incident efficiently. However the responses of police were not always so straightforward.

Extremely problematic example of police response can be seen in the incident which happened to Jan. This episode requires a detailed description. When he caught one of teenagers throwing eggs into his house, he called the police. Jan was very nervous, firstly because a couple of days ago the windows of his car were damaged, and secondly, he initially thought that this was a case of stone throwing and he was worried for his son, who was playing in the room which was targeted by two egg throwers. The teenagers later claimed that it was a Halloween joke. For Jan this explanation was questionable since the egg throwing took place not at All Saints day. No one knocked at the door, and no one asked for sweets – the gestures which Jan would associate with Halloween. Much more disturbing was the follow up to the story. The arrival of the police attracted the attention of local residents:
Many people gathered in the front of the house...Some shouted racist slogans like ‘fucking Polish’ and other similar phrases. When I pointed it to the policeman, he said to me that it was my own fault and should stay at home rather than get into this mess. The policewoman said that some people in the crowd were drunk that’s why they screamed those things...I asked her when I am drunk if I could go on the street, do anything, even kill, that’s ok because I am drunk?

In Jan’s version of the event, the police officers did not stop racist abuse but instead ignored it. The story did not end up here for Jan: the teenager whom he chased, caught and brought to his home, complained that Jan was touching and grabbing him inappropriately, that in Jan’s words he had ‘violated his dignity by imprisoning him in his house’.

Jan stressed nothing of this kind took place, apart from the teenager spending a couple of minutes in a hallway, where his wife offered him a glass of juice, while waiting for police arrival. However, based on these accusations, Jan was arrested and held for six hours in the Northtown police station. He was not charged, but got an official warning stating that if a similar situation would take place in future, he would face criminal charges. It was a psychologically traumatic event, particularly since he felt that he was not only treated unfairly, but was himself a victim of ethnic intolerance. There was certainly a case of Jan’s over-reaction: there was a degree of ambiguity, e.g. chasing of the teenage. However it was notable that the police officers, at least in his account, did not respond to ethnically abusive chants.

This episode points to the existence of ethnic intolerance which can turn into the aggression in ambiguous situations like the one described by Jan, but also to an inadequate response from the police side when the incident of ethnic intolerance is less obvious and is accompanied by greater ambiguity. However, irrespective of such ambiguity, it shows that statutory agencies do not always confront the acts of intolerance, finding justifications for abusive acts and may punish migrants involved in the incidents rather than investigate the role of all parties. Such position may undermine the trust of police by migrants residing in such new destinations as Northtown. Moreover, it can send a signal to local population that ethnic intolerance can be justified, for example, because of the concern for
children safety. It also makes migrants such as Jan to perceive Norhtown as an ethnically intolerant place and reduces changes for more positive social interactions between migrant newcomers and local residents.

Police services were not the only statutory agency which did not deal with ethnic intolerance in the way expected by migrant participants. Another example comes from the sphere of social housing. Nargiza’s (she participated in a focus group interview) family from Iran was harassed for a prolonged time by their neighbours:

*They broke windows and we had a lot of problems with them... my daughter was a baby and when I told them and asked them to change our house they said: you have to wait for four years*

Initially Nargiza’s family was given accommodation by local social housing association after they were dispersed to Northtown. Since they could not work at the time of their arrival to Northtown, staying in this house was the only alternative to homelessness. They could not rent privately because of the lack of funds. The fact that she and her family had to wait for four years and tolerate violent behaviour suggests that the response of the local social housing association was highly inadequate.

In contrast, more extreme acts of violence would receive faster response: when a local family living in a council flat assaulted violently a Polish couple, the whole family received police warnings and was re-housed in a relatively short period of time. The interviewed Polish couple was horrified and described the whole experience with that family as ‘racist’ (the example of abuses included jumping on the roof of their car), but was satisfied with the response and stayed in the same house. However it starkly contrasts with the experience of Nargiza: while the perpetrators of extreme abuse were re-housed very quickly, Nargiza had to wait for a considerably longer time to get new accommodation. The comparison of these cases points to potential inconsistencies from the side of social housing association when it comes to dealing with the acts of ethnic intolerance.

The analysis so far was focused on the direct victims of ethnic intolerance – individual migrant interviewees. The interviewees representing statutory and voluntary bodies also expressed concerns over ethnic intolerance in Northtown.
One of such interviewees – a UNISON representative Jane referred to the violent assault on a Chinese take away in the town’s centre, which had highly racist undertones, and was accompanied by physical injuries and property damage. In her description,

*There was a very nasty racist incident a couple of years ago when the people in Chinese take way were seriously assaulted. It was purely because they were Chinese...The people were badly injured...And that can give an image that this is how Northtown like, cannot it? But it isn’t...It happens once but it skews how the people see Northtown...But by large it is an accepting place...*

Two elements are important in this event and its retelling for the analysis here: firstly, it points to the existence of local intolerance and even extreme violence directed against migrants and ethnic minorities. It is not only recognised by the interviewed migrants but by the interviewees coming from ‘White’ British background. Secondly, Jane seems to suggest that ethnically motivated acts of criminal violence can distort the overall picture of Norhtown: migrants and non migrants who abhor violence and hatred, could start viewing Northtown as a place defined by extreme level of ethnic intolerance. The same interviewee suggested that for some young people, whose parents were unemployed, the use of casually abusive phrases like ‘Cheenky takeaway’ or ‘Paki shop’ became a way of filtering their frustration over their own socio-economic exclusion. In other words, when migrants demonstrate a degree of economic independence, it provokes resentment for members of ‘White’ British community which may spill into the acts of ethnic intolerance.

Additional explanations of ethnic intolerance pointed to the far right political activism in Northtown. The extreme far right group, the British National Party (BNP), has been targeting Northtown’s ‘White’ British communities in its electoral strategy. Northtown’s central street was a scene of the BNP’s self-promotional activities. Such presence and the content of this campaigning had far reaching implications in creating adverse ethnic relations, including spreading ethnic intolerance among some local ‘White’ British residents who were more receptive
to such propaganda. Here is how a representative of statutory agency describes the role of the BNP:

*It’s a small town centre... BNP has a stall with about four union jacks and a group of thugs I mean I walk by and I mean my wife is from Thailand and she’ll go into town sometimes with her Thai friends. Now I know that my wife when she’s in town she purposely avoids that area if she’s with some of her friends...some of the young people have said to me that when they walk by there’ll be comments like can you speak English or shouldn’t you be swinging through the trees*

From this point of view, the visibility of the party which campaigned on explicitly racist platform combined with the casual harassment directed against people from other than ‘White’ British background, acted as a way of normalizing and legitimizing local manifestations of ethnic intolerance directed against migrant newcomers. It should be noted that the interviewee went beyond making a general critical point on the negative impact of far right propaganda, but demonstrated a degree of personal engagement when he referred to his migrant wife.

It shows that ethnic intolerance directly impacts not only on migrants but people close to them, particularly on their partners. Following up on the impact of the far right group it should be added that the police did not close the BNP stand: its representative asserted that it could not persecute a legal political party. In effect, the local branch of the BNP was given a free hand in spreading its xenophobic views. At the time of research, the local website of the BNP called ‘Northtown Nationalist’ circulated propaganda over alleged criminal behaviour involving migrants: the ‘news’ ranged from Polish women shoplifting in the local supermarket, a Slovak migrant assaulting local sex workers, and the asylum seeker from Sri Lanka attempting to sexually abuse ‘White’ children by seducing them with sweets. Overall, in the opinion of local interviewees opposed to ethnic intolerance, the BNP tried to exploit socio-economic particularities of the area: the decline of traditional industries (the coal mining in particular) which stripped the local men from traditional form of employment. It was felt that those factors in
itself did not create ethnic intolerance, but provided environment in which such sentiments could develop.

A similar role was attributed to the lack of local experience of ethnic diversity: participants expressed a belief that Norhtown was relatively new to migration as well as ethnically homogenous which made its ‘White’ British population more susceptible to the propaganda of views associated with such groups as the BNP. This overlaps with the arguments developed by the studies on new destinations (see the literature review). Moreover, for some ‘White’ British residents meeting migrant newcomers could be a first experience of ethnic diversity. This kind of attitude was present in the narrative of one of migrant interviewee Gazmend from Kosovo:

Some Norhtown people don’t know any difference so whatever the far right says that could be the truth because obviously they haven’t had the chance really themselves to actually meet these people to talk to them or have friends with ethnic minority backgrounds

According to Gazmend, the relative infrequency of daily contacts between migrants and locals worked to the advantage of groups keen on spreading ethnic intolerance. Furthermore, those local ‘White’ British residents of Norhtown, who did not have any contacts with migrants, were more likely to be affected by the spread of intolerant views. The same interviewee – the head of migrant umbrella organization also argued the underrepresentation of people from migrant and ethnic minority backgrounds in the local public services, particularly, the police, acted as another factor in decreasing the effectiveness in persecuting criminal violations associated with ethnic intolerance. Gazmend’s views are particularly significant since he spoke both as a Norhtown’s migrant resident but also as a representative of state funded local voluntary organization. He pointed to the activity of extremist far right groups as one of key contributor of fostering ethnically intolerant sentiments among the local ‘White’ British population.

However, unlike most migrant and local interviewees, he also advocated a specific practice aimed to reduce the distance between migrants and non migrants, which in his opinion could contribute to the weakening of ethnic intolerance in itself. It
included the increase of social interactions between migrants and locals from ‘White’ British background, and the employment of migrants in statutory agencies responsible for tackling criminal behaviour associated with ethnic intolerance. In relation to increasing social contacts between newcomers from different migrant background and local ‘White’ British residents, Gazmend pointed to a number of social events such as the annual Mayor parade which were used to attract participants from EU, non EU and ‘White’ British backgrounds and helped them to get to know each other. A similar (though with a certain degree of variation) approach was taken by a head of another migrant community organisation. Instead of favouring official events, she advocated what she labelled as a grass root approach: she organised meeting both for migrant and local women with children and encouraged to interact socially and make friendships. According to Gisele, local participants became more positively disposed towards migrants, while participants got greater confidence and started to see the interactions in public space not only as something related with the threat of ethnic intolerance, but as the opportunity to make friends. Such experiences point to the potential of change and the dynamics of increasing tolerance – the topics which will conclude the discussion of this chapter.

6.4 Change and the reasons of change

The narratives of ethnic intolerance which were analysed earlier revealed that Northtown was perceived as an area characterised by a high degree of hostility directed against migrants. Participants narrated their own experiences, told about the responses from statutory agencies and tried to offer rational explanations of the acts of ethnic intolerance taking place locally. Many interviewed participants tended to see the relation between the particularity of Northtown as a destination and ethnic intolerance.

At the same time, participants in their narratives would not describe the manifestations of ethnic intolerance as something permanent and static. On the contrary, the interviewees, whether coming from ‘White’ British background or migrants from different ethnic groups, would acknowledge that the attitudes
towards migrant newcomers in Northtown became more tolerant. The interviewees would suggest that people from ‘White’ British background became more willing to accept migration and the increase in ethnic diversity coming with it. Moreover, they started to see migrants as a part of Northtown’s population. While participants still pointed to the experiences of ethnic intolerance, such positive shifts encouraged participants to believe that in future they would be able to live in Northtown without experiencing ethnic intolerance. A similar sentiment was expressed by ‘White’ British interviewees associated with voluntary and statutory support groups.

The following extract, which comes from the interview with the local health professional Diana, points to the belief that over time migration started to be perceived more positively by the locals:

_Historically Northtown had been very much a mono-cultural society. Apart from the GPs...A lot of it was the fear of the known...But now they are much more receptive now..._

Such view was mirrored by another interviewee – a ‘White’ British woman Jane who worked as UNISON equalities’ representative for health and social workers. She said that in earlier years when dispersed non EU migrants and EU labour migrants started to arrive, they were seen through the prism of suspicion and distrust. But when social interactions became more common and the numbers of migrants increased, people became more used to new diversity and the presence of migrants became normalised in the eyes of local residents. As Diana indicates, while post-1945 Northtown did not have significant non ‘White’, non English speaking groups living in Northtown, contemporary migration has transformed the established pattern and led to less hostile attitudes to migration and ethnic diversity. Overtime, the relations did not become more antagonistic, instead they have softened.

Migrant interviewees would also recognise the softening of attitudes but would still to the hostile and unwelcomed attitudes towards migration which met them upon the arrival. As many migrant interviewees said, the first years of their lives in Northtown were characterised by the hostility encountered on the streets, in the
shops and other public areas. The anecdote retold by Gasmend, an Albanian migrant from Kosovo who settled in Northtown as a dispersed refugee, illustrates such hostile attitudes in an almost comic manner. While talking about casual xenophobia taking place on Northtown’s streets, Gazmend re-told a story of dispersed African migrant who was once subjected to the following screams: ‘Go back to Kosovo’. Since Kosovar Albanians were initially the most significant migrant group in Northtown after 1999, all other migrant groups became associated with Kosovo. Those locals from ‘White’ British background, who were intolerant towards migrant newcomers, did not separate between various migrant groups. The xenophobic sentiment was not directed against particular ethnic groups, but covered all migrants: when it came to ethnic intolerance, all migrant newcomers were not welcomed whether they came from Europe and Africa, EU member states or from outside the EU. However, the same interviewee stressed that this story happened a couple of years before the interview and was much less likely to take place at the time when the interview was conducted. It show that the exposure to greater ethnic diversity led to some kind of softening of attitudes towards migrants among local residents.

The recognition of the hostile start and slow progress did not prevent some migrant interviewees from recognising the importance of the latter. Adam, a refugee from Congo (he participated in a focus group interview), while sharing the sense of Northtown’s particularity – an ethnically homogeneous composition of local population when compared to such cities in Yorkshire as Sheffield which had an ethnically diverse population, also said that the attitudes towards migrants have been improving. In the narrative cited below, he captured the move to greater acceptance of migration and migrants by the members of local ‘White’ British population:

*In general there is some positive movement in Northtown between English people and foreigners but before it was not like that in 2005 2006... It was so difficult to come here, to live in Northtown and even friends say: ‘you live in Northtown’ and people say: ‘they are racist’... it’s everywhere you go. I’ve got friends in Sheffield and Doncaster who say: ‘you are still in Northtown? They say: why you like*
Northtown and I say: ‘Northtown is good and they say ‘no Northtown is racist’ but I never feel it... I’ve got friends among White people they are cool, you know

For Adam the local perceptions of migrants and migration were not static, but dynamic. He also emphasised the development of personal relations between migrants from different backgrounds and locals. It contrasted to the generalising perceptions of Northtown as an implacably racist town among his friends. Moreover, by challenging stereotypes of his friends living outside of Northtown, he actively participated in changing the perceptions of Northtown as migratory destination. In other words, Adam developed a nuanced view of Northtown based on his personal experiences, a view which contradicted the essentialist images of Northtown’s ethnic intolerance. Significantly, he used the notion of time in articulating his feelings: according to him, it took time for locals to get used to the increase in ethnic diversity (in the cited quote, he explicitly provided dates and indicated that even the passing of a couple of years can have an impact) and accept it rather than to fear it. As he added, if earlier on, migrants would be viewed in shops with a mixture of curiosity and suspicion, at the time of the interview they were seen just as ordinary customers. Adam expressed this opinion during one of focus groups interviews. During the same focus group interview, one of participants (a woman originally from Iran) claimed that ‘White’ British Northtown residents were inherently racist and that she was afraid to visit public places such as pubs. She was confronted by other participants who countered such extreme opinion by stressing that not all ‘White’ British residents of Northtown were intolerant and that the attitudes towards migrants had become more tolerant over time.

Even Gazmend, a Kosovar Albanian, who believed that Northtown was a particularly difficult place to live as a migrant, recognised that since his arrival in 1999 the atmosphere in Northtown has changed for the better. He would also associate greater ethnic tolerance with the increase in social interactions between established residents and newcomers. In his description, those interactions would include different generations:
I think things have improved... People are more accepting because obviously they’ve got now their children at school and their children now have grown up and they have become Norhtown’s boys and girls and they have integrated with their children can go to say to their dad: ‘I’m in school and my best friend is a Kosovan

The continuous presence of migrants signalled the local public that migration is not a passing phenomenon and that migrants are going to stay in Northtown. In other words, the presence of migrant newcomers has ceased to be seen as temporary and passing phenomenon and it became more normalised in the eyes of locals. Gradually personal relations were formed between members of established communities relatively unaccustomed to ethnic diversity and migrant newcomers. The social interactions between young people at schools helped adults to see migrant newcomers as potential friends and neighbours rather than suspicious foreigners.

Some schools themselves were actively involved in challenging intolerance. During the visit to a local secondary school, I have noticed posters with anti-racist inscriptions (e.g. the inscriptions like 'zero tolerance to racism'). Schools like the one visited can be seen as the sites of social interactions of young people from different backgrounds. The interviewed young people stressed that in this particular school which had taken a proactive stance against any form of ethnic intolerance, they felt more secure and were less afraid of ethnically motivated bullying.

On the other hand, it does not only take the locals to change their attitudes to migrants, but for migrants themselves time is needed to feel to be a part of local society and participate in its civil institutions. For example, Gisele, an activist with the local migrant support association, stressed that a degree a determination and courage was necessary for CEE migrant women to start to participate in the activities of her organization. It involved spending time with children and their parents from various backgrounds and taking English classes. According to Gisele, the fear of experiencing xenophobia locally kept many migrant women isolated at home, but gradually they found a way to join and participate in the activities involving both migrants and locals, and thus contributed to changing dynamics of
local ethnic relationships not only, as Gazmend had described, by default, but by their own actions.

Conclusions

The analysis has covered diverse processes broadly associated with the manifestations of ethnic intolerance in Northtown. It was shown that all migrant groups – participants coming whether from EU or non EU countries were affected by it. The problem of ethnic intolerance has been also recognised by the representatives of statutory and voluntary groups. While the participants from a visibly non ‘White’ European background were more vulnerable, ‘White’ CEE migrants were also affected by it. EU citizenship did not shield them from hostility expressed on a local level. Participants have described various acts of ethnic intolerance: from violent attacks to verbal abuse to the malicious questioning of migrants’ rights to live in Northtown.

The acts of ethnic intolerance were felt as something unique and happening specifically in Northtown. Sometimes participants would simply state that it happened because Northtown was a new destination for migrants. At the same time, participants reflected on those acts and sought to explain to themselves and to others the causes of ethnic intolerance experienced in this locality. Participants have linked the acts of intolerance to the sphere of the labour market: the fears and insecurities of disadvantaged groups spilled into the hostility directed against migrant newcomers. Some of the hostility was explained by the absence of daily interactions with migrants, while other forms were attributed to the activities of the far right political grouping. In other words, participants would explain intolerance not solely as the reflection of entrenched prejudice, but by such socio-economic factors as low wages, labour market competition and the fact that prior to the wave of migration which took place over the last decade, the area’s population was pre-dominantly ‘White’ British.

There were two references to the historical background: the first one on the relative newness of migration to Northtown, which according to some interviewees explained the manifestations of intolerance. Northtown was seen as
new migratory destination, the factor which appeared to be linked with the high level of ethnic intolerance. Secondly, participants pointed to the closure of the coal mining industry. The latter was responsible for economic problems which in the opinion of some interviewees contributed to hostile attitudes to migrants. Notably, participants’ views on Northtown were contradictory: while sometimes Northtown was described as an ethnically intolerant area, where all migrants were unwelcomed, on other occasions participants argued that ‘White’ British population of Northtown became gradually more tolerant and accepting to migrants and ethnic diversity.

Finally, when it came to the activities of local statutory agencies in response to the acts of ethnic intolerance, participants reported that they experienced in some occasions prompt assistance, while in others they had to wait for help for prolonged periods. In one case, the abuse directed against one family was tolerated by the police. To conclude, while ethnic intolerance was construed by participants as something experienced by individuals in the local space, they also pointed to the impact of structural factors such as ethnic homogeneity, labour market competition and the legacies of restructuring as factors contributing to the hostile attitudes to them as migrant newcomers.

After completing the analysis of ethnic intolerance in local space, it would be logical to move to another issue which has an explicit spatial dimension – the experience of housing.
Chapter 7

Settling down in Northtown: the places of residence

Introduction

In one of the earlier sections I’ve in detail discussed how migrant participants arrived to Northtown and enter the local labour market. The subsequent chapters covered a variety of topics and dedicated a close attention to paid employment. However, any form of settlement in any locality would require from migrants not only to look for paid employment or other forms of work, but to find a place to live. In this respect, the discussion of housing experiences would make an important contribution in the understanding of social lives of interviewed Northtown’s migrants. It would strengthen the focus on the local dimension: after all, the study’s participants have been living not anywhere in the UK, but specifically in Northtown, place in which they have to establish durable (most of interviewees spent at least two years in this locality) housing arrangements. Finally, it should be remembered that when it comes to the discussion of the ways individuals experience ‘place’ in the sense of geographical space, e.g. everyday realities of living in a particular urban environment, it is important to bring into the discussion the notion ‘home’ or, in other words, the living arrangements (Cresswell, 2004).

In this sense, any attempt to understand the experience of being a migrant resident of Northtown requires the inclusion of the dimension associated with the experiences of housing. Significantly, the gathered data brings light onto issues related to housing arrangements. Throughout the fieldwork, I had not only visited migrants’ homes, but inquired about the mechanisms used by them in finding accommodation. Moreover, I was keen to learn whether migrants tended to prefer certain areas of the town to others. Such questions were asked not only when the interviews took place in participants’ homes, but when interviews were conducted in public areas such as cafes and in a local college where focus group interviews
took place. One of the initial aims of such questioning was to determine the patterns of spatial distribution of migrant participants in local space – to establish in which parts of the town they were living.

However, based on gathered data, it was impossible to determine a definitive spatial distribution of migrants in local geographical space; the interviews themselves took place across different locations in Northtown. Participants would say that their fellow migrants were living everywhere in the town and that they could not point to any areas with particularly high concentration of migrant residents. Others would point to the town’s centre as the main residential area for migrants. In my own experience of interviewing in migrants’ homes, participants were living in multiple locations: it included people living in close proximity to the train station in the town centre to former mining villages located 10min. drive from the town’s centre. Such answers and observations did not allow building a definitive picture of migrants’ spatial distribution within this area. However participants spoke considerably about their housing experiences in a more personal way: the ways of finding accommodation, the advantages and disadvantages of certain forms of housing provision and the impact of housing on their migratory plans. Those experiences rather than the mapping of spatial distribution have eventually formed the ground for the analytical category covering the issues of housing.

Overall the interviews revealed how individuals and families responded to the challenge of finding suitable accommodation in Northtown. Participants’ testimonies pointed to two major structural mechanisms which affected the housing arrangements of interviewed migrants: the social housing renting on one side and the private housing provision on the other. The differences existing between those two forms of provision, as experienced by migrant participants, are going to form the backbone of the discussion. Firstly, the analysis will focus on how the local form of social housing provision was evaluated by migrants. It will look at the narratives of those participants who managed to get social housing as well as to those who did not. The second part will focus on the experiences of the private sector renting. Participants were highly critical when it came to private sector provision and have pointed to a number of problems associated with it. The
analysis will also include a reference to the specific area of the town associated with the private sector renting.

7.1 The preference for social housing

One of the first challenges facing migrant newcomers to Northtown was related to the finding of the place to live. Finding a suitable accommodation was a part of the migration process: in some cases, family members would migrate separately, e.g. female partners would come to Northtown and bring their children only after their male partners would secure accommodation suitable for the family. Moreover, participants would not accept any kind of accommodation, at least permanently: they would try to find something of better quality. In addition, those CEE migrants, who settled with their children, not only deeply cared about having a suitable housing for their children but also realised that having a child can facilitate their access to social housing. For example, one interviewed Polish family initially rented privately a flat located close to their employer – the repackaging plant. However, Alina and Lech managed to find a better quality accommodation via the local social housing association. The preference to finding accommodation via the local social housing association was not something limited exclusively to this particular family: other interviewees have also sought to move from the privately renting property to the state supported accommodation.

From the narratives of some participants it appeared that the access to social housing constituted an important factor in participants’ ability to achieve a certain degree of personal and family security when it came to settling in Northtown. Interviewed CEE migrants showed an explicit interest and preference for getting social housing. For example, one of interviewed Polish migrant families lived in what looked like a spacious house 5min. drive from the town’s centre. When I inquired on the ways they found it, Regina responded in the following way:

*We got this house eight months after our arrival. We have a small daughter so we had the right to get social housing quicker. But initially we were renting privately, a room. After some time the notification arrived that we got a house from the*
council. That was a first offer and we accepted the first offer. With a combined effort, we renovated it, my husband showed great abilities in this area.

Since this family planned to stay in this house for years to come, they were prepared to invest a lot of effort in renovating it. The other factor was the possibility to buy it – at least they thought that this was possible. As far as they understood, they could buy this house: hence the efforts in redecorating it could be explained by the intention to turn it into long term residence and even buy it in future. At meantime, Regina saw personal advantages in living in the house provided by the local social housing association:

*It is less expensive than to rent privately and it feels like our own – we do not have any landlord who can come and check on us and bring other people...*

Renting via the local social housing association was advantageous not only in a purely financial way, but in a more subtle psychological one. The obvious advantages – better value for money when compared to private renting, was augmented by a greater sense of family autonomy. Although they did not own it formally, there was a strong sense of security – the sense that they could live in this house for a long time. Hence, although the property was owned and provided by the local housing association, the nature of relationship between the tenants and the statutory provider allowed this migrant family to feel secure and independent – the benefits which could be stereotypically associated with the form of private ownership. Interestingly, it is their own privately owned flat in Poland’s capital city of Warsaw which made them worried: firstly, they were continuing to pay mortgage for it, which constituted a drain on their limited financial resources. This arrangement constantly reminded them that the flat was owned not by them but by the bank. Secondly, since they acted as landlords, they were also concerned about their tenants, who, as they feared, could cause damage to their property.

A greater sense of security associated with social housing could be also manifested in a different way. For another interviewed Polish family a house rented from the local social housing association also represented a safety net when it came to their son’s future: they had plans for returning to Poland and wanted use their savings
earned in the UK to start a small business there. At the same time they hoped that their son, a secondary school student, who planned to remain in the UK, would stay and live in the house which they were currently renting from the social housing association. Thus, the access to social housing gave a degree of extra-generational security, which could be maintained even if the family would be separated by return migration of some of its members.

Another positive observation over social housing was made by a Georgian interviewee Moses. When asked about his and his family experiences with social housing, he said that the quality of accommodation was very good. Moreover, he saw the issue of social housing in a broader context of public services: he said that it was similar to the NHS when it came to high standards (by the way, not all interviewees would share such high opinion over the NHS) and he could describe it only in a positive way.

While the stories of two families analysed above reveal a degree of positivity – those participants not only managed to get access to social housing, but considered it to be important to their long term family security, others did not get social housing and were disappointed about the way this form of statutory provision was handled.

The access to social housing was also determined by other factors, particularly by the preferential treatment of families with children. As it was shown earlier in the examples with the interviewed Polish couples, having a child provided an advantage then it came to getting access to social housing. Single people or couples without children were in a different position: some claimed that it was more difficult for them to get social housing. This created a feeling that the distribution of social housing was unfair. For instance, a Polish interviewee Wanda (she participated in a focus group interview) said this:

If you have no family, just mother and father, you have to wait for years... It’s not a just system is my impression because some people wait years and some people get house after few months even straight away... it’s not fair

It was the family size and more importantly the needs of children, which created a form of social differentiation when it came to getting access to social housing.
Childless and single migrants could find themselves excluded from social housing due to the policy which prioritised the needs of families. Interestingly, the following narrative of difficulties of accessing social housing for childless migrants was articulated during a focus group interview. This statement provoked a response. In the opinion of an Estonian female migrant Helle (a focus group participant) a lot depended on migrants’ stamina and patience when dealing with the staff of the local social housing association. Making constant reminders, following up and being assertive was seen as instrumental of getting a publically subsidized accommodation:

*I can give some advice for these people who want to get this council house. You need to call ...you need to go there always explaining everything. If you want they take you humanly. You need to go there more you need to explain more...There are various houses...*

Helle seems to be arguing the following: if one makes an effort and persists in dealing with the local social housing association, the result will be positive. Such seemingly neutral argument contains several hidden assumptions: for example, it requires certain psychological assertiveness and even more importantly, the English language fluency, which some of new arrivals lacked. Another limiting factor could be related to the availability of time to do such follow ups. Most of migrants, who were employed in low paid jobs and worked long hours, would struggle to get permissions from employers to adjust working time in order to deal with non work related issues. It meant that individual opportunities in accessing social housing interacted with structural factors over which migrants have a limited degree of control.

Non EU migrants – the study’s participants who came to Northtown as dispersed migrants, also had a right for social housing. However from the start this right came with a certain restriction – it was applicable only to Northtown (the area chosen for dispersal not by migrants but by UK authorities), not elsewhere in the UK. Moreover, there were additional difficulties, which came out in the testimony of one of the focus group participant. In contrast to CEE interviewees who were generally very positive over the local experiences of social housing, one of
participants expressed a degree of reservation when it came to the local provision. When asked about the quality of accommodation and his personal experiences, Adam from Congo (a participant of focus group interview) responded:

*Since I've been here I always be accommodated by the Home Office ... I share house with other people from different backgrounds from Asia from Africa. I'm always sharing the house with people. You get your room but you share the kitchen...Sometimes friends they can say our place is not clean something like... But most of the time things are good compared to where we come from the situation...when we've got here we can say that this is a better way to live... this is quite comfortable*

For Adam, the quality of social housing provided to the dispersed migrants was acceptable, when put into the context of hardships related to the pre-migratory context. Yet he was critical over the policy which led to the crowding of people from multiple ethnic backgrounds in the same accommodation without taking into account their preferences and choices. Moreover, Adam suggested that migrants like himself had to share basic facilities such as kitchens (whether they wished it or not) which reduced the sense of autonomy and created various confusions, for example over the responsibility for cleaning. Unlike interviewed migrants from the EU, who could move as a family unit with children and at least have a possibility to live in a separate home provided by the local social housing association, for dispersed migrants from outside the EU, it was much difficult to achieve of this degree of security. Adam had to share it with other migrants, who were often separated from their family and kin: hence a degree of discomfort and other issues such as the alleged untidiness of the flat.

In spite of this specific and broader problems Adam tried to see positive aspects in social housing arrangement for him and other migrants. None the less, there was a clear separating line between migrant families from the EU and individual non EU migrants such as Adam. In contrast to Adam, who was surrounded by other dispersed non EU migrants and lived in the accommodation specifically designated for dispersed migrants by authorities, interviewed EU migrants tended to live in the predominantly 'White' British areas. When asked whether they had neighbours
belonging to their own ethnic or other migrant groups, CEE participants typically gave a negative answer. The exceptions would be the references to the descendants of past-WWII Polish migrants, but participants saw them as British citizens rather than fellow migrants.

In contrast, while describing a certain part of Northtown - the neighbourhood around the school attended by her children, Alina said that in this area there was a whole street, where, according to her, all dispersed Africans migrants lived. Such observations illustrate how the difference in citizenship rights and ethnic divisions constructed on international and national levels are recreated in the form of residential separation and in the way migrant participants describe their experiences. While both EU and non EU migrants lived in the same town and could receive housing assistance from the same statutory agency – the local social housing association, there was a considerable difference in their experiences. The narratives of participants reveal unequal dynamics. On one hand, EU citizenship has allowed some interviewed CEE migrants to achieve certain degree of comfort associated with family living, make plans for the future and do not feel in any way that they have been housed in certain areas designated only for migrants. The reality for such dispersed non EU migrants as Adam has been different: he had to live in the house with other migrants and could not afford to make plans and arrangements which CEE interviewees had been making.

The analysis of social housing experiences would suggest that although it reflected social processes taking place in a new migratory destination – Northtown, it was shaped by broader structural mechanisms. CEE interviewees living in Northtown had to navigate the same regulatory framework (in terms of accessing social housing) as elsewhere in the UK. The analysis also indicated that there were problems linked to dispersal policies which brought many non EU migrants to Northtown. Non EU migrants living in such areas as Northtown could access social housing not as EU/UK citizens but as individuals dispersed by UK government. Although single migrants could get accommodations, it came with a number of negative elements such as poor quality of housing stock and the concentration in certain areas. Again this illustrates how national policies contributed to local specificities.
7.2 The private sector provision

The discussion so far has been focused on social housing. However, many interviewees – even those who eventually managed to get access to social housing, have had experiences of the local private sector provision. As it was demonstrated earlier CEE migrants who eventually found social housing, at least initially lived in privately rented accommodation. Some of Northtown’s migrants have also relied on labour market intermediaries (who employed them) when it came to finding housing. It was particularly common during the initial stages of migration: upon arriving to the UK some migrants did not know anyone so relying on intermediaries who brought them to the UK in the first place could have been seen a reasonable option. However the private renting intermediated by employment agencies was seen as problematic. One Polish interviewee indicated that this form of accommodation was characterised by overcrowding and added that it was unsuitable for normal family living. Another interviewee Jan spoke about Polish migrants (his co-workers in a local kitchen manufacturing firm) recruited by transnational employment agency Fire living in the same house. Furthermore, the instability associated with this form of renting pushed migrants to look for new accommodations themselves. For example, Witold had to change accommodation eight times in six years. Upon arrival to the UK he was placed in the accommodation provided by the same employment agency which brought him to the North of England in the first place:

*Initially the agency placed us in the house far away from work, but in two weeks time they moved us to different place which closer to work. The landlord of this new house was a Pakistani man and the house looked like it was refurbished just before our arrival. It had everything, even fresh bread – it felt like a family left for a day and did not come back. Not after long this family came back and we had to leave. This landlord owned loads of properties so he placed us elsewhere*

As this testimony shows, for Witold the private sector renting administered via employment agency was associated with personal insecurity. Those conditions affected not only him but also migrants with whom he shared the accommodation.
The owners of those properties could ask migrants to leave at any time. Migrants would not have any legal rights (e.g. lease agreements) for the property and had to vacate properties upon the demand of landlord or/and employer. Witold also felt insecure personally, while staying in this accommodation, because he did not know well the people with whom he was sharing the house. The estrangement and confusion among people, who lived under one roof in shared accommodations, but did not know each other well, led to interpersonal conflicts. Witold simply left one of such accommodations because he was afraid of people renting the room next door: landlord brought them without any prior warning or notification. Witold reacted by leaving and moving to his friends.

While he was never robbed himself, he told he knew friends who stayed in similar conditions and were robbed by fellow migrants. Those stories further increased his sense of insecurity and anxiety. Subsequently, Witold started to look for accommodation himself and managed to find it by using informal contacts. A local (in his words, ‘English’) man, whom he met, was prepared to rent his flat because he had to leave Northtown for a year and needed a tenant. However, it only happened after he spent in the UK a couple of years and acquired informal connections. Notably, he preferred to rent from someone whom he personally trusted rather than a letting agency. It can be explained by his belief that this form of arrangement was preferable because of the quality of accommodation and trustful relationship with the owner. However it was one year rent which meant that Witold had to look for a new accommodation soon. Once again such feature highlights the pattern of short-termism associated with private sector renting.

The issue of personal insecurity has received further development in participants’ narratives. The area of the town, which was described by the representatives of statutory agencies as the main area of migrant residence and private renting, was the least attractive. It was also the area where renting was controlled by private landlords (in the anecdotal opinion of the representative of health services, it was owned by ‘the Arabs from London’). Interviewed migrants saw this kind of private renting as very problematic. Significantly, it was not the cost of living in private housing but the fear of crime. Here is how one of Polish focus group interviewees Wanda described it:
Sheffield Road is full of druggies, alcoholics... druggies plenty of places over there... I think just don’t take house on Sheffield Road because it’s very bad there everybody is saying this... People are racist

Although the area was, according to the perceptions of statutory agencies’ representatives, a mini-centre of Northtown’s migrant life, migrants themselves wanted to avoid it when it came to renting. There was a fear of petty crime associated with the alcohol and drug use, but also of ethnic intolerance coming from local residents. In contrast, the problems identified by the representatives of Northtown’ statutory agencies were related to multi-occupier residence and overcrowding. Moreover, there was a perception among statutory agencies’ interviewees that the presence of fast food outlets located in this street made this area attractive to migrants. In contrast, migrant interviewees expressed little enthusiasm about this area whether it came to leisure or consumption: there was a brief mentioning by interviewed young people of Polish background when it came to fast food. Another Polish interviewee Ludmila mentioned it in relation to Xmas shopping: apparently, a carp – the fish traditionally prepared for the family celebration was sold there in late December.

This part of the town, or one particular street to be exact, was visited by me twice during data collection. In the early hours of mid afternoon, there were no signs of socio-economic activities which could be associated with migrants and migration. The only exception was a migrant-run store. It was mentioned earlier in one of interviewees with representatives of statutory agencies. It was quite difficult to identify it from outside. The only sign indicating that it could be a commercial site was a sign ‘Delicatessen’, a name hinting on something foreign and continental. But it was impossible to see what was inside: the windows were painted in white – it looked like the shop’s owners were not particularly interested in publicity. The variety of items which the shop was selling was very limited: some newspapers in Russian, boxes of chocolate and crisps, and a variety of soft drinks from CEE countries. There were many colourful boxes with chocolate, which (in my experience) are usually used as presents rather than for daily consumption. It was surprising to see so many of them particularly since the shop lacked staple items associated with daily grocery shopping. The man at the check-out desk was first
reluctant to speak, but later introduced himself by a common Russian/Slavonic name. However it seemed that he had an accent common to Northern Caucasus, where such name would be unusual; people from Caucasus involved in trade across the European parts of former Soviet Union were often subjected to xenophobia and discrimination (Law, 2012) – it contributed to reserved reception which I got in this Northtown’s store. According to him, the shop apparently was owned by someone from Leeds, but they were planning to close it. He did not want to go into further details. The other issue worth mentioning was an improvised notice board at the shop’s entrance: it contained hand written notes in Polish, Lithuanian and Russian – an indication of ethnic and cultural diversity of Northtown’s migrant communities. The notes were typically about people looking for informal services and contained e-mails and phone numbers. The typically sought services were baby-sitting and house renovation. Hence even a store, which apparently struggled financially and was only mentioned once by interviewed migrants, still managed to act as an informal hub for migrants from different nationalities. The second time I visited the street, at least two takeaways were open: a Middle Eastern or South Asian kebab kiosk and a Chinese takeaway. But again I did not notice any passerby’s speaking languages other than English on the street. From those observations, it could be asserted that this area, firstly, was not particularly attractive to migrants as an area of residence (for obvious reasons related to crime), and secondly, there was a clear divergence of perceptions between local and migrant interviewees when it came to the geography of migrant living in Northtown. Significantly, migrants would prefer social housing located in other parts of the town, in contrast to private renting in the area labelled as a migrant one.

Coming back to the issue of housing experiences in a more limited sense (in terms of accommodation), an additional issue related to private sector renting should be mentioned. The insecurity associated with private sector renting has preoccupied interviewed migrants whether it came to specific houses and flats or the whole areas of the town, as the one described above. However it was not the only problem: while participants did not speak directly about the fees which they paid to the providers, there has been circumstantial evidence pointing to the existence
of overcharging. There were more complaints over private renting, particularly when it came to the involvement of labour market intermediaries. Jan mentioned that many migrants, whom he knew from work, were housed by the same employment agency which was employing them. He argued that this agency charged more (and deducted it from the worker’s wages) compared to what it was possible to find with greater personal knowledge of the area. In other words, some employment agencies not only benefited from migrants’ labour, but as housing providers. Such configuration would suggest that those migrants who were new to the area, did not have good English language skills and lacked informal contacts were particularly vulnerable to lose out when it came to the quality and price of the private sector accommodation.

Finally, it should be said that participants spoke about private sector provision in very general terms, they would not relate it specifically to Northtown as a migratory destination. Only one interviewee linked the particularity of Northtown as an area, the housing issue and the rationale for residing in Northtown. A female focus group interviewee from Pakistan mentioned the comparatively lower house prices in Northtown act as an attraction to her. She thought about owning a property locally. However, when it came to housing, other interviewees were concerned not with the particularity of Northtown as an area, but the specific problems present in the private sector provision. It shows that when it came to private housing renting, it was also general considerations over finding a suitable place to live rather than only Northtown specific preferences which acted as contributing factors in shaping migrants’ decision over the place of residence.

Conclusions

To sum up the review of housing experiences of interviewed Northtown’s migrants, it would be possible to argue that the private sector renting was not seen as an attractive option among migrant interviewees. It could be explained by the insecurity and short-termism associated with this form of provision, at least in the way it as experienced by migrants. There was also even greater uncertainty and insecurity when housing was intermediated by employment agencies. The
private landlords contracted by employment agencies to accommodate migrants, could ask migrants to leave without giving enough time to look for new accommodation. All of this created a vicious circle of changing accommodations until the point of getting social housing – at least for those migrants who were able to do it. In theory migrants could find a suitable arrangement via informal networks in the private sector or could buy properties by taking mortgages. This option would be only possible when participants had secured employment contracts – only two participants, one from Poland and another from Slovakia actually had bought houses by taking mortgages. They could do it because they had stable and better paid jobs. Moreover, the residential areas which were perceived to house migrant newcomers were seen by migrants themselves as the places to be avoided. In their narratives migrant participants did not display any preferences for ethnic clustering instead stressing the need for generally secure and safe accommodations.

The discussion overall highlights the preference for social housing as opposed to private sector renting. Such conclusions would contradict the observations made by other scholars: Pemberton (2009, p. 1382) argued that when it came to the preferences in housing, the effort of CEE migrants ‘has been focused towards accessing better private rented accommodation or owner occupation...rather than securing property in the social rented sector, even as eligibility for the latter has become available’.

The picture presented in this section differs from this interpretation of Pemberton (2009). In contrast to the instability of private sector provision, migrant interviewees who managed to get social housing spoke about it positively, particularly highlighting the possibility of long term planning and family related security. However, the social housing provision also had its own problems: the quality of accommodation being one of them. Notably the interviewees who were generally content with the local social housing provision had to spend considerable amount of time on renovating those houses. The other issue related to the difficulties in accessing social housing. The analysis demonstrated that living arrangements of migrants depended not only on individual preferences and
capabilities as well as local dynamics but on the structural dimensions such as the rules of getting social housing determined on a national level.
Conclusions

This study sought to examine working and social lives of migrants residing in a Northern English town. To use a theoretical concept articulated by such authors as Massey and Hirschman (2008), this locality can be described as a new destination for international migrants. Since the late 1990s, the migrant population of this medium sized town has increased largely due to the structural changes introduced on national and international levels: firstly, UK dispersal policy brought non EU migrants to this town and, secondly, EU enlargement in 2004 led towards the arrival of the new EU citizens from CEE. In the light of such context, this study attempted to explore the experiences of migrants who had left their countries of origin and arrived to this particular locality and examine their labour market and broader social experiences in Northtown itself.

The final organisation of the thesis is a result of a prolonged reflective process. In line with the main principle of grounded theory articulated by Charmaz (2006), the main ideas of the thesis originated from empirical findings. In contrast, such theoretical constructs as new destinations were used to contextualise and frame the study’s findings rather than vice versa. In conjunction with the analytical framework developed in the literature specific to the analysis of migrants’ social and working lives in the UK as well as theoretical debates on agency and structure covered in the section on methodology (Plummer, 2001), those theoretical constructs were instrumental when it came to the interpretation of empirical material. The literature related to migrants’ experiences in the context of EU and UK migratory regulations (e.g. MacKenzie and Forde, 2009 and McDowell, 2009) was particularly helpful when it came to the interpretations concerning the relation between individual subjectivities of participants and the role played by structural mechanisms.

Those structural mechanisms – migratory regulation regimes, the rules related to migrants’ socio-legal rights and various forms of socio-economic divisions (e.g. labour market segmentation) are covered in this literature and they are in turn used in interpreting thick empirical data. When it came to the analysis of
experiences of non EU migrants, the studies covering the policy of dispersal proved to be useful in explaining the trajectories of non EU migrants’ arrival to Northtown. The outlining of the literature (e.g. Robinson et al., 2003) concerning this topic allowed to interpret social experiences of dispersed non EU migrants in the way which involves both the recognition of agency and the fundamental impact of structure. Although social and labour market rights of non EU migrants were severely constrained by this policy, their decisions to stay or not to stay in Northtown were not totally determined by it. The other factors included individual intentions to contribute to the development of a more multi-ethnic and more tolerant local community. Finally, the literature on new destinations (Godziak and Martin, 2005 and Williams et al., 2009) helped to understand how socio-economic particularities of the area of settlement are important in exploring various aspects of the migration process: from the structure of migrant employment to the experiences of ethnic intolerance. Moreover, the concept of ‘new destination’ proved to be useful in analysing the experiences of EU and non EU migrants in Northtown.

However there have been significant differences between this study and the approach adapted by previous studies on new destinations. While the local dimension was important in understanding migrants’ experiences, the interpretations of this study revealed that the influences of structural mechanisms exceeding geographical boundaries of Northtown were equally salient. The framing of the study’s findings in the following way differentiated it from the approach taken by the literature on new destinations (Godziak and Martin, 2005), which tended to prioritise the dimension highlighting the significance of local dynamics (and to a lesser degree the dimension related to national policies), while paying considerably less attention to broader structural processes developed on national and international levels. The discussion also shows that the experiences of migrants in Northtown (the locality based in the North of England) is different to the experiences of migrants residing in new destinations in the US. The key differences are associated with the impact of EU freedom of movement and EU citizenship rights which gives CEE migrants greater social rights in the UK than, for example, the rights which irregular Latin American migrants have in the US.
The analysis of social interactions constituting the experiences of migrants residing in a chosen locality is explored through the interpretation of data gathered through individual, family and focus group interviews. The study was interpretive in its epistemological position: the knowledge is viewed as something which emerged from social interactions between me as a researcher and migrant participants. The role of participants’ national and cultural backgrounds was also important: the inclusion of both EU and non EU migrants into the analysis helped to understand how structural mechanisms influence individual and family migratory trajectories, but also demonstrated that migrant participants irrespective of their migratory status and ethnicity had to confront similar challenges in this locality. It was particularly a case when it came to what was described as the manifestations of ethnic intolerance in local space.

While the study does not exclusively examine the experiences of a particular group, the interpretation is primarily based on the testimonies of Polish and Russian speaking participants. The interpretations rested on the translations of migrant narratives which were articulated in those two languages. Significantly, some of the translations gave names to certain analytical categories – e.g. humane and inhumane relations in the workplace. In effect, it would be right to say that the study provides an interpretation of migrants’ experiences in a Northern English town, and does it in English – the language foreign to most participants. However through linking the act of interpreting (in the sense of translating) with actual interpretations, the analysis managed to preserve Russian and Polish ‘accents’ when it came to the rendering of empirical findings. The relevance of certain type of translation (foreignizing) was highlighted in the literature covering the sociology of translation (Venuti, 2008). The instruments and tools developed in this literature were applied in the analysis of empirical data. The discussion has shown the intrinsic relation between the acts of translation and interpretation: the latter is not separated from the former by some kind of objective and neutral line, but reflects linguistic choices made by the researcher. This observation is particularly pertinent for migration studies more generally since data collection is often conducted in a language different from the one in which findings are interpreted and presented.
On the other hand, the use of the English language also played an important role in focus group interviews and in semi-structured interviews with the representatives of local statutory and voluntary bodies. It was also used with migrants who were comfortable in speaking English and agreed to be interviewed in this language. English language had also become the language of the interpretation: the ways, in which social worlds of participants are represented, were constructed in English.

The language was one among many other issues which influenced the organisation of the thesis. As a researcher, I made choices over the ways findings were analysed and presented. Such authors as Mauthner and Doucet (2003) argue that qualitative sociological research is not shaped only by the personal views of scholars but also by their institutional embeddedness. In my case, the institutional factor was related to my affiliation with the work and employment relations division of a UK based business school. It was expected from me to produce a doctoral thesis primarily focused on the study of work. As a result of it, the theme of work played a key role in the study’s findings and their theoretical analysis. It also impacted on the ways findings were analysed theoretically: the stress was placed on regulatory mechanisms such as state’s migratory policies – one example of the space of regulation affecting individual actors (MacKenzie and Martinez Lucio, 2005), when it came to interpreting individual and family experiences of participants. At the same time, the biographical nature of interviewing allowed the exploration of social processes which were not strictly linked to the sphere of paid employment. Such analysis did not undermine the focus on work, but instead allowed the examination of migratory experiences in a more integrative manner: e.g. it explored the dimension related to informal work.

While the theme of working lives was at the centre of the analysis, the discussion had explored other topics such as ethnic intolerance and the experiences of housing. Significantly, the discussion of those angles enhanced the local dimension within the context of national divisions: the themes of ethnic intolerance and housing allowed the examination of participants’ views of Northtown as a new migratory destination and at the same time helped to analyse broader structural mechanisms influencing social lives of Northtown’s migrants. Moreover, while ethnic intolerance and the experiences of housing are distinctive topics, some of
the issues covered by these respective analytical categories are still related to the 
issues of work (e.g. the perceptions of migrants’ neighbours that the members of 
the former group are undercutting them in the local labour market).

The interpretations suggested that labour market competition could lead to the 
tensions between the established residents of Northtown coming from ‘White’ 
British communities and newly arrived migrants from different national groups. It 
also should be noted that ethnic tensions could emerge not only from everyday 
encounters, in which migrants and individuals coming from settled communities 
would compete for jobs and social services, but from social perceptions. Migrant 
participants felt that they were perceived as competitors and the existence of such 
perceptions was sufficient in turning them into the target of ethnic intolerance. 
Even though many migrants were working in the jobs, which locals found to be 
unattractive (at least, migrant interviewees and one local employer made such 
claims), the presence of migrants in itself was met by anxieties. It also shows that 
employer strategy to hire workers coming from a particular ethnic group can have 
social consequences, including the perception that migrants are preferred to 
locals. Moreover, those perceptions can be transferred from isolated cases (e.g. 
the employment in the recycling plant) to the local labour market more broadly. 
Those are important issues and to answer them in a comprehensive way would 
require further research on recruitment strategies of local employers and on social 
attitudes of local ‘White’ British residents.

While the analysis of such diverse themes as work, housing and ethnic intolerance 
may appear to be chaotic, there is a degree of consistency, at least when it comes 
to the main aim of the thesis: to explore social and labour market experiences of 
migrants residing in a particular locality. It should be noted that the study does not 
cover all social experiences – e.g. such subjects as health, education or religious 
practices have not been incorporated into the final version. However, it focuses on 
the subjects deemed important by the study’s participants on one side and my 
theoretical interests on the other. Importantly, the analysis focuses on research 
material which through the framework of theoretical sampling was organised into 
coherent and sustainable analytical categories capable of constructing a theory 
exploring and explaining the lives of migrants working and living in the area not
considered to be a traditional destination. Such handling of data allowed to build a theoretical understanding of how does it feel to be a migrant in the locality which has a particular set of social characteristics.

The diversity and multiplicity of themes show that the realities of migratory experiences cannot be compartmentalised only around one-dimensional issues, even such central ones as the sphere of the labour market. Among other things the analysis has shown that the lives of migrants residing in a Northern English town should be understood through the prism of pre-migratory experiences and the process of migration itself. It was demonstrated that the arrival to the receiving country and the entrance to the labour market could predate the settlement in a locality categorised as a new destination. This observation constitutes a valid theoretical and empirical contribution when contrasted with the literature on new destinations. The latter typically limits its scope with the experiences taking place after the settlement in the localities labelled as new destinations (Krahn et al., 2005 and Massey, 2008). On the other hand, while the studies of CEE migration mention pre-migratory experiences and highlight their significance to intra-European mobility (Krings et al., 2013), the EU-centred focus of such studies tend to exclude non EU migrants.

The focus on the experiences pre-dating the arrival to the area of final (at least at the time of fieldwork) settlement allowed an answer to the question related to the causes of migration and arrival mechanisms. Theoretical interpretations revealed that when it came to the social worlds of migrants residing in a particular locality, pre-arrival experiences formed an integral part of their broader experiences of becoming and (actually) being migrants of Northtown. The migratory experience of individuals and families did not begin and end in the area of settlement (Northtown) or even in the country of settlement (the UK). The period predating the arrival to the UK and settlement in Northtown was seen by participants as an integral part of their migratory biographies. Making the decision to migrate and leave the country of origin was a complex process in itself and it was affected by the nature of interpersonal relations on one side and broader patterns of socio-economic opportunities and political events on the other.
Such recognition further highlights the significance of agency exercised by individuals and families involved in migration: when faced with such negative phenomena as low wages in the countries of origin and given the existence of socio-legal opportunities (e.g. EU mobility rights), individuals and families from CEE could decide to migrate to a town in Northern England about which they had limited knowledge, but which they also saw as a place where they could not only find work but also re-unite with their family members. Importantly, most interviewed CEE migrants acted not only as economic migrants interested in getting higher pay or as family migrants seeking the reunification with their spouses and children, but as a combination of both. Those processes were rooted in the contexts of the countries of origin and continued to play an important role in migration to the UK and Northtown. The segments of the thesis covering pre-Northtown’s experiences proved to be instrumental for the study’s interpretations overall. Thus the adapted approach also points to the importance of analysing social processes (e.g. family relations) in conjunction with those related to work and labour market when it comes to the study of labour migration.

The interpretations contend that inward migration of migrant participants to Northtown were initiated by complex processes of social transformation which took place in CEE and Eurasia after the collapse of the Soviet era communist system. While the post-communist period could be characterised by the improvements in civil, political and other rights (e.g. international mobility), it has also changed the social structure of those societies, e.g. created new forms of socio-economic polarisation, which in turn created a structural context of outward migration destined for the UK. In some countries the transition was followed by violent ethnic conflicts and the sharp weakening of the welfare states, which left many citizens without basic social support. For many interviewees, particularly CEE labour migrants, emigration meant the possibility to earn incomes deemed to be acceptable to sustain a dignified personal and family level of living – something which, according to interviewed participants, was unobtainable for a variety of reasons in the countries of origin.

On the other hand, there was a noticeable difference between the interviewees coming from the countries which became part of the EU and the states which for
the variety of reasons were not part of EU enlargement. While for the former the arrival to Northtown was facilitated by the combination of labour market intermediaries and interpersonal networks, the inward movement of the later was primarily controlled by the state’s policy (the UK) of dispersal. Moreover, often it was initiated by extreme political instability rather than by the intent to improve socio-economic wellbeing and re-unite with family members. This can be described as a new form of division created by the difference in citizenship status in post-Cold War era: CEE migrants as EU citizens have more rights than non EU migrants (including those with the shared Soviet/communist past) in Britain. This division has a local impact: while migrant participants were part of wider migrant community of Northtown, e.g. they attended English language classes or the women support group, their arrival trajectories and citizenship rights were different. The distinctions in citizenship rights had a direct impact for the pattern of their settlement in Northtown: while the lives of CEE migrants were dominated by the sphere of paid employment, including such areas as housing, e.g. employers acting as landlords, dispersed non EU migrants were much more depended on various forms of statutory provision and their access to paid employment was initially restricted.

The central part of the thesis is dedicated to the analysis of paid employment experienced by migrants in Northtown. It shows how individual experiences were shaped by structural contexts unfavourable to migrants. Local employers in the private sector organised their business strategy around relying on low paid and numerically flexible labour. It was one of the major factors behind in-ward migration: some of Northtown’s migrants were directly recruited by labour market intermediaries and brought to the UK and Northtown. Migrants found themselves in lower end of the local labour market; they were also often further disenfranchised by ethnic segregation at the workplace level. Migrants also saw better jobs as either unattainable locally because of the structure of the local economy or because they recognised the existence of other problems such as the recognition of foreign professional qualifications or English language proficiency. Those very few (among interviewed migrants) who had escaped the confinement to secondary labour market jobs, had managed to find employment in the
organisations and occupations involved in providing social support to new migrant communities. Those jobs were largely designed to assist the statutory and voluntary social support groups in outreaching to new migrant communities. However the possibility to find paid employment in this sphere was also limited: the study described the case of one interviewee who faced a choice either to leave the voluntary sector and find paid employment elsewhere or to continue his work on an unpaid basis.

On a subjective personal level, migrant participants viewed their employment experiences in local terms: they spoke about Northtown’s employers and their fellow Northtown’s co-workers. Their working lives were part of their local living in Northtown, not in the UK more generally. Yet, the same narratives, while highlighting the significance of the local, revealed patterns which went beyond the subjective focus on Northtown’s particularity. Arguably, this pointed to broader structural mechanisms. This not only could be seen on a descriptive level, when participants talked about the realities of downward occupational mobility and low status employment – the negative phenomena affecting not only Northtown’s migrants but international migrants more generally in contemporary history (Piore, 1979), but when they made moral judgements over social interactions which they had experienced in Northtown’s workplaces.

The responses toward the realities of low status work tended to have universal rather than Northtown specific nature: the themes identified in the narratives of work were centred on the subjects of individual and collective dignity. Participants spoke about humane and inhumane relations in the workplace. In other words, they were both specific to the type of work opportunities available to migrants in local geographical space as well as reflected broader problems associated with low status and low wage employment in Britain (Pollert, 2010). Furthermore, the articulation of the narratives of humanity and inhumanity pointed to the way migrant participants exercised their agency: when confronted with structural barriers, participants would not simply accept them as a given and reconcile with the status quo, but reflected on their daily experiences of work and insisted in articulating a personal view of the sphere of the labour market. This view was not limited by an economic prerogative, but included a notable normative dimension.
It also overlapped with the dimension related to the involvement with trade unions – the subject on which migrants had contradictory views.

The discussion around the normative dimension of migrants’ experiences of paid employment was encapsulated by the concept of moral economy. The notion of moral economy was applied in other studies of labour migration, particularly in relation to domestic work (Nare, 2011). Nare (2011, p.405) argued that the informality associated with migrants’ employment in the sphere of domestic care ‘is based on a moral rather than economic contract, and at its core are notions of gratitude, shared responsibilities and altruism rather than profit maximizing’.

While Nare (2011) explains the significance of moral economy by referring to close interpersonal relations existing between employers and migrants, the analysis in this thesis highlights that the normative dimension is not limited to the private sphere or a particular type of employment. Although migrant participants interviewed for this study worked in a very different environment than the one described by Nare (2011), they still viewed workplace interactions in a similar way. When it came to their narratives, the emphasis was not only on earning more than in the countries of origin or accepting jobs below their qualification, but also on the insistence to be viewed as individuals expecting trust and respect from their employers. It highlights the applicability of the notion of moral economy to labour migrants more broadly, not only to irregular ones or those employed by private households.

Moreover, by bringing the notion of the moral economy into the analysis of migrants’ labour market participation, the discussion managed to be innovative, at least in terms of the study of labour migration from the perspective of sociology of work and employment relations. McGovern (2007) stressed the need to go beyond the economic focus on migrants – the focus which views labour migrants as rational individuals looking for the maximisation of their income. Instead McGovern (2007) pointed to the role played by structural mechanisms, e.g. by the regulations of international mobility and employer strategies in recruiting migrants. McGovern (2007) particularly pointed to the issues around labour market segmentation. This piece of doctoral research not only had followed the advice of McGovern (2007) to pay attention to various forms of segmentation, but
also made an additional step by bringing the moral dimension into the account: it allowed it to explore migrants not only as economic actors facing divisions in the local labour market, but also as moral actors showing concerns for interpersonal relations at work.

The processes of informal and home based work taking place in Northtown also revealed a broader problem common not only to migrants or to migrants residing in Northtown but also to other social groups, e.g. the challenge faced by women before and after the childbirth. The insufficient levels of pay and the unsatisfactory nature of jobs available locally were among factors which influenced migrant women’s decisions to withdraw from the local labour market and create informal work-related arrangements within the households. It pointed to wider problems associated with the welfare provision for working mothers and the consequences of low pay for women. At the same time, the analysis had shown that migrants were keen to engage in voluntary work which they saw as a way to interact both with migrant and local residents outside the workplace. It further shows that even when migration is driven partially by such structural mechanisms as the demand for labour by employers and state’s policies, in the area of settlement migrants could choose to engage in all kinds of activities, including in those related to broader social sphere. More specifically, the study has also shown that labour migrants from CEE, e.g. the Polish people, could engage in autonomous leisure-related activities, e.g. by organising events involving music and dancing. Such practices were described in the studies focused on dispersed non EU migrants (Lewis, 2014). However, as this study reveals, leisure activities are equally important to labour migrants from CEE.

Other social processes explored in this study also affected by EU/CEE and non EU dispersed migrants. For example, when it came to the manifestations of ethnic intolerance, this phenomenon affected migrants from all backgrounds – CEE migrants and non EU dispersed migrants. While the former consisted exclusively of people coming from ‘White’ European background and the latter included migrants of Asian, African and Latin American backgrounds, participants irrespective of their background reported the incidents of ethnic intolerance. It also appeared that being ‘White’ European did not insulate migrant participants
from the xenophobia attitudes present in the local space. Most interviewed migrants faced considerable difficulties when it came to being accepted as equals by some members of local ‘White’ British community. While some studies on new destinations highlight the dimension of ‘Whiteness’ when it comes to various forms of anti-immigrant sentiment (Burdsey, 2011), the analysis here shows that the fact of being a migrant in itself (the ‘Other’ in a broader sense) rather than racial identity per se could act as the central factor in the manifestations of ethnic intolerance. While being ‘non White’ made migrants more vulnerable to ethnic abuse (at least, the narratives of such interviewees as a female participant from Kyrgyzstan would suggest so), being ‘White’ European and EU citizen did not legitimise the presence of CEE migrants in the eyes of local residents prepared to commit various acts of ethnic intolerance.

In the final part of the thesis, the analysis of housing experiences revealed problems associated with the involvement of labour market intermediaries in the private sector provision. Moreover, the interpretation suggested that housing experiences of migrants residing in a particular locality were complex: they were not limited to the form of provision (private or public), but were related to such diverse aspects of living as various forms of informal work and the manifestations of ethnic intolerance. Social housing was preferable to private renting not only because it offered more affordable rates, but also in relation to personal security, the quality of accommodation and the feeling of control. The regulation of the access to social housing was seen as unfair and arbitrary by some migrants: while they would prefer to have an accommodation provided by local social housing association, their family status made it difficult to get one.

While migrant participants were residing in a medium-sized town and their direct experiences of housing were embedded in a local context, they were also affected by broader structural context determined on a national level. While the literature on housing tends to highlight the issue of cost – greater attractiveness of local housing prices when compared to traditional destinations (Painter and Yu, 2010), housing experiences of migrants were also affected by national regulations, in particularly the rules in accessing social housing.
Although the study presents an original empirical data, it can be located within the reviewed literature on international migration to the UK and in the research on new destinations. Those two strands of literature could be seen as the opposite poles of the continuum, while the study’s core findings and conclusions could be positioned somewhere in the middle. The literature on new destinations tended to essentialise the local dimension—the particularities of urban areas which were largely absent from the map of migration studies (Massey, 2008), while the literature on migration to the UK more generally tends to highlight broader structural contexts—the policies of British state (dispersal), the strategies of UK employers (particularly in low wage sectors) and the dynamics of EU enlargement (Currie, 2008). In contrast, this PhD thesis shows that both elements—the particularity of Northtown as a migrant receiving area and the impact of broader structural mechanisms, shape the lives of Northtown’s migrants.

The interpretation of empirical data suggests that interviewed migrants could be seen as both residents of a medium-sized Northern English town and migrants to Britain. The study’s participants should not be seen as migrants living ‘somewhere’ in the UK, in which this ‘somewhere’ did not mean anything significant in understanding their migratory experiences. By the same token, their social and labour market experiences were not exclusively explained by the fact that they resided in the locality which had certain social, economic and historical features. In the interpretations of the study, migrants’ lives are located somewhere in the middle, which acknowledges the significance of both local and broader contexts in structuring migratory experiences and influencing the ways in which migrants exercise their agency. The unpicking and reconciling of the manifestations of particular (in the sense of local) and general (in the sense of national and international) in individual experiences forms the cornerstone of the study’s theoretical analysis.

In the chapter on the process of arrival, the manifestation of particular and general could be visible in the ways migrant participants arrived to Northtown: participants arrived to a particular place (new destination), but their arrival trajectory had been shaped by structural contexts, e.g. state’s migratory policies and greater employment opportunities in the UK. The chapter on the labour market sphere has
shown that while the experiences of paid employment reflected the structure of the local labour market, Northtown’s migrants viewed their working lives through a prism of universal normative values. The chapter on social experiences demonstrated that migrant participants responded to local demand in certain services, e.g. childcare and English language teaching, but, at the same time, it re-confirmed the gendered divisions common not only to Northtown’s migrants, but to women and families elsewhere in the UK and beyond (McKie and Callan, 2011). Similarly, the chapter of ethnic intolerance illustrated that while migrants saw a firm link between abusive acts and local particularities (e.g. ethnic homogeneity and the lack of traditions of migration of diversity), Northtown’s migrants pointed to such general structural patterns as labour market competition between different groups as a source of ethnic tensions. Finally, such seemingly local issue as finding a place to live was also linked to general structural factors: from the access to social housing to the problems related to private renting. While in daily lives of Northtown’s migrants, those processes were associated with local agencies and local landlords, the analysis also suggested that the same processes were also affected by structural forces existing on a national level.

In overview, the picture presented by the study depicts personal and family experiences of migrants residing in a medium-sized Northern English town. As it was stressed previously, such structural mechanism as the New Labour government’s decisions to open the labour market to CEE workers and the dispersal policy of non EU migrants have created inward migration to the locality which was previously largely unaffected by international migration. The study’s contribution lies in showing that migratory experiences of Northtown’s newcomers are formed by the set of complex interactions between the actions taken by individual migrants and their families on one side and structural mechanisms which are determined on the local, national and international levels.

To conclude, it could be argued that this piece of doctoral research managed to expand the understanding of contemporary migration to Britain. The study has made a number of contributions to the study of migration to a UK-located new destination: firstly, it has introduced a more contextualised perspective on new destination through bringing such structural contexts as EU freedom of movement
and dispersal policy into the analysis, secondly, it has stressed the subjectivity of migrants by its emphasis on language and individual narratives, and, thirdly, it amassed original qualitative data related to such diverse themes as work, ethnic intolerance and housing.

In the light of findings and interpretations of this study, future scholarship of work and migration may follow certain directions. The study has shown that when it comes to migratory experiences in the localities labelled as new destinations, it is inherently problematic to separate migrants by ethnicity, nationality or citizenship status. For example, in relation to the experiences of ethnic intolerance, both EU and non EU migrants could face a similar degree of hostility. Moreover, migrants share similar problems in the sphere of paid employment: the difficulties in moving away from low status and low paid jobs. Such observations do not mean that such factors as citizenship status or/and ethnic identity (e.g. ‘White’ European versus Asian or ‘Black’ African) do not matter. When it came to the analysis of narratives, they did play a significant role (see the discussion of arrival trajectories), but their influence should not obscure the similarities characteristic to the experiences of migrants coming from different backgrounds. In this light, it would be advisable for the scholars of work and migration to incorporate into the analysis participants coming from different ethnic and national backgrounds when exploring social and labour market experiences of migrants residing in a particular locality.

When it comes to EU migrants from CEE more specifically, the study has pointed to the importance of studying such processes as EU enlargement and EU freedom of movement in a local context. Although those processes are both transnational and national in nature, they have profound local impacts. This study has explored some of those local impacts, e.g. paid employment and ethnic intolerance, but there is much more to be studied further across social science disciplines. Such diverse issues as youth employment, religious practices and the problems related to health require new and separate investigations.

From a broader sociological perspective, there is a tendency in postmodernist sociological theorising to claim that ‘place is no longer valued as fixed, stable and constant’ (Lehmann, 2014, p.31). Similarly to Lehmann’s (2014) study of the
experiences of Western professional migrants in a second tier Chinese city, the participants of this study had an acute sense of place: they emphasised it whether it came to arrival trajectories, the experiences of work, ethnic intolerance and housing. They saw their migratory lives as a complex set of interpersonal interactions taking place specifically in Norhtown. Moreover, many participants (both migrant and local) believed that the place of their settlement had migratory dynamics distinguishing it from other localities in the North of England. All of this pointed to the significance of place (the area of settlement) to migration studies more generally.

Looking at the findings from a different angle, it also should be argued that the study of new migratory destinations should not only include migrants themselves, but individuals and families coming from settled (in the case of such places as Norhtown, it would refer to the individuals from ‘White’ British background) communities. Members of those local communities are intrinsically involved in the migration process. They interact with migrants at work and in public spaces, compete for jobs in the local labour market and access the same social services. In other words, established residents of new destinations are not only affected by migration, but they also shape it by their responses and through their daily interactions with migrants. Thus, it would be salient for critical scholars of work and migration to explore such relations from the perspective of established residents. It could be done through a variety of research techniques: among other things, this study has shown that the employment of diverse qualitative research techniques (biographical interviews, focus group interviews and ethnographic observations) is beneficial for the analysis of the ways individuals and families experience the migration process in the local context. The study has further highlighted the role of reflexivity in sociological qualitative research: reflective practices were not only important in questioning personal bias, but also in articulating key analytical categories and in re-formulating the aims of the analysis.

Finally, it would be possible to assert that future studies on new destinations would be important not only in terms of advancing social science scholarship, but in contributing to the public debate on migration. For example, Collier (2013) controversially argued ‘that ethnic diversity in a community inhibits cooperation...’
(Collier, 2013, p.75) and suggested the public debate on migration should acknowledge that there are ‘potential risks from further large increases in diversity’ (Collier, 2013, p.76). When discussing social consequences of migration, Collier (2013) also pointed out that there was a direct link between the decrease in the level of interpersonal trust and the increase of ethnic diversity. Among other things, such pattern was attributed to inward migration, which, according to Collier (2013) affected not only the relations between migrants and individuals coming from established communities, but also within those groups.

In contrast, the findings of this study seem to suggest that while the increase in ethnic diversity can be associated with certain problems on a local level, e.g. labour market competition and ethnic intolerance, gradually the relation between migrants coming from different backgrounds and people from ‘White’ British background tend to improve. The members of the latter group gradually have become more accepting of ethnic diversity, while migrants themselves sought actively to interact with local residents in public spaces and tried to improve their English language skills. The mutually exclusive nature of the conclusions advocated by such author as Collier (2013) and the findings of this study would suggest that the analysis of local impacts of inward migration and the debate over the impact of ethnic diversity are highly contestable and unresolved issues, and that those subjects require further investigations to be conducted by social scientists.
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Appendix: the profiles of participants

Table 1: biographical interviews (families)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous names of participants</th>
<th>The countries of origin</th>
<th>Approximate date of the interview</th>
<th>Labour market status (at the time of the interview)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alina (wife), Lech (husband) and the elder son (secondary school student Robert)</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>February 2010</td>
<td>Lech in full-time employment; Alina only working informally at home (childminder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadeusz (husband) and Regina (wife)</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>Tadeusz in full-time employment; Regina in part-time employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malgosia (female partner) and Olgierd (male partner)</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>Olgierd in full-time employment; Malgosia working informally at home as language tutor and part-time modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irina (wife) and Jan (husband)</td>
<td>Latvia and Poland</td>
<td>February 2010</td>
<td>Irina staying at home caring for her son and not in paid work; Jan in full time employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Biographical interviews (individuals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous names of participants</th>
<th>The countries of origin</th>
<th>Approximate data of the interview</th>
<th>Labour market status (at the time of the interview)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>In full-time voluntary work; surviving on job seeker allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aziza</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>February 2010</td>
<td>Doing only some voluntary work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaclav</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>February 2010</td>
<td>Vaclav in full-time employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeinab</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>Doing voluntary work for Azeri community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludmila</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>Ludmila was in full-time employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witold</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>Full-time employment (night shifts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: focus group interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The composition of focus group interview</th>
<th>The countries of origin</th>
<th>Approximate data of the interview</th>
<th>Labour market status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The interview with ESOL learners (twelve in total: 11 women and 1 men)</td>
<td>Brazil, Poland and Estonia</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>Varied: some in full-time, others in part-time employment, while others doing some kind of voluntary work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interview with ESOL learners (twelve in total: 9 women and 3 men)</td>
<td>Poland, Iran, Pakistan, India, Congo and Liberia</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>The same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interview with ten secondary school students: four boys and six girls</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>All in full-time education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: semi-structured interviews with the participants born outside the UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous names of participants</th>
<th>Approximate date of the interview</th>
<th>The position and the profile of the participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pawel</td>
<td>August 2009</td>
<td>Yorkshire head GMB trade union branch for migrant workers (which also covers Northtown), a Polish man. The interview was conducted prior to the beginning of main fieldwork in Northtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taras</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>The head of Russian speaking group, a Ukrainian man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazmend</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>The head of migrant umbrella organization, a Kosovar Albanian man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisele</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>The head of voluntary organization for migrants, asylum seekers and refugees, a woman of ‘Black’ South African background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>A social worker specialising in young people, a woman with Afro-Caribbean background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant owned grocery store</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary primary Catholic school</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Catholic Church in the town centre</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport (buses and taxis)</td>
<td>December 2009 – April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public spaces: streets in the town’s centre</td>
<td>December 2009 – April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant homes</td>
<td>February 2010 – April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centres and offices of two main</td>
<td>January 2010 and March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>migrant voluntary groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The town’s library</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional observations and interviews outside of Norhtownt were conducted with the members of GMB trade union migrant worker branch for Yorkshire and Humber regions. The observations of union meeting in Wakefield – three meetings between 2012-2014. Additional interviews with the members of the same branch included the conversations with Jerzy (October 2009) and Alfred (August 2009) in Leeds and one in with Karol in Wakefield (June 2009). Those interviews took place prior to the fieldwork in Norhtontown.
Table 6: semi-structured interviews with (British-born) representatives of voluntary and statutory groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous names of participants</th>
<th>Approximate date</th>
<th>The positions and profiles of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>UNISON trade union equality and diversity representative, a ‘White’ British woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate and Jessica</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>Manager and teacher of local ESOL language centre, both females from ‘White’ British background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>The manager of ESOL classes in the local college, a man from ‘White’ British background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>The manager of bakery, one of the main local employers of migrant labour, a ‘White’ British man; the only interview which was conducted over the phone rather than face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>The manager of youth services, a man from ‘White’ British background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>The health manager, a woman from ‘White’ British background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations

CEE Central Eastern Europe
CEEs Central Eastern Europeans
ESOL English for speakers of other languages
EU European Union
NMW National Minimum Wage