

Teresa Astramowicz-Leyk^{*}
Yaryna Turchyn^{**}
Olha Ivasechko^{***}

A Theoretical Modelling of International Migration on the Explanation of the Nature and Motives of Labour Migrants From Ukraine to Poland

Abstract

This article considers the concepts and theories of international migration which answer questions about the current trends of migration flows. Particular emphasis has been placed on the transformation of established perceptions of women's migration as, under the influence of globalisation in the modern system of international coordinates, there is a trend that is interpreted as the "feminisation" of international migration. Designing theories and concepts of international migration on an explanation of the motives and specifics of the adaptation of Ukrainian labour migrants in Poland offers a basis upon which to argue that each of them is appropriate for application. In addition, a theoretical modelling of migration policy has been presented. In practice, national governments use such models of migration policy as: the complete exclusion of immigration into a country or profess a "closed-door policy", differentiated exclusion/segregation, integration as a gradual and weaker form of assimilation, the so-called "selective policy", and the assimilation, multicultural or "open-door policy". Future scenarios for the modelling of migration flows represented by leading international organisations

^{*} **Teresa Astramowicz-Leyk** – University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, e-mail: teresa.astramowicz@uwm.edu.pl, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5881-2325.

^{**} **Yaryna Turchyn** – Lviv Polytechnic National University, e-mail: turchynj@ukr.net, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9114-1911.

^{***} **Olha Ivasechko** – Lviv Polytechnic National University, e-mail: ivasechko.2011@ukr.net, ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2141-3309.

have been designed. The multidimensional MIPEX Index, according to which Poland's policy on migrants is assessed as "equality on paper", is lower than the EU average, and, with a score of an estimated 40 points out of a possible 100, has been used to assess the trends of modern migration policy of the Republic of Poland. The new migration model of Poland leans towards a model of a differentiated integration of migrants rather than a multicultural policy or assimilation. It has been concluded that migration policy should be based on the principle of "tripartism"/scenarios (the 'win-win-win' concept) and benefit the donor state, the recipient state, and the migrants themselves.

Keywords: Migration, Concepts of Migration, Models of Migration, MIPEX Index, Labour Migration, Poland, Ukraine

The problem of regulating migration flows in the modern system of international coordinates occupies one of the leading places in international politics, especially in the context of globalisation. Migration issues are studied from different angles, and, as the problem of migration has an interdisciplinary dimension, it contains a basic, political, economic, social, cultural, and environmental focus. The problem of migration is dynamic, because a set of exogenous and endogenous factors permanently influence the circulation of migration flows.

Today, the world is facing an unprecedented phenomenon, namely the COVID-19 pandemic, which has undoubtedly foisted significant changes upon all areas of human life, including trends in migration flows. Observing the situation with migration in Ukraine, gives us reason to assert the fact that both before and in the post-Coronavirus period, the outflow of the Ukrainian working population cannot be stopped, because the key motive for this outflow is economic in its nature. As long as there is a significant difference in wages, migration flows from Ukraine to neighbouring countries (and not only) where wages are significantly higher, will continue. Of all the countries, the largest share of labour migrants from Ukraine is concentrated in Poland. According to unofficial estimates (since migrants can be legal/illegal), this is about from 1.3 million to 1.7 million Ukrainians in the neighbouring country.

The attractiveness of Poland for labour migrants from Ukraine is explained by a number of factors, among which are: the development of migration networks; the wage gap between Ukraine and Poland; its geographical location, access to the Polish market, especially the informal sector; linguistic and cultural affinities; geographical proximity and, in part, safety in the workplace and safety in the vicinity.

The study is also actualised by the fact that the territorial representation of Ukrainian workers in Poland has changed due to the aggression of the Russian Federation in eastern Ukraine in 2014. Therefore, the projection of existing concepts and models, forecasts of international migration and their application on an explanation of the motives and problems of adaptation of Ukrainian labour migrants in its eastern neighbouring country is, in our opinion, appropriate.

The Projection of Concepts of International Migration on the Explanation of the Nature and Motives of Ukrainian Labour Migration to Poland

Referring to the etymology and interpretation of the term “migration”, it should be noted that it was introduced into scientific use for the first time by German scientist, geographer and cartographer, and pioneer of migration research – Ernst Ravenstein. In his scientific exploration “The Laws of Migration”, the researcher defines migration as a continuous process caused by factors that he represents in four groups: the migrant’s initial place of residence; the stage of their movement; the place of entry; and personal factors (Bezuhlyi, 2018, p. 2).

We subscribe to the idea that voluntary migration is the movement of people at will, and is caused by personal reasons. One of the types of such migration is actually labour migration (Sokołowicz, Lishchynskyy, 2018). The term ‘labour migration’ appeared in 1990 in the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. The Convention fixes the definition of labour migration, namely: a migrant worker is a person who is to be engaged, is engaged or has been engaged in a remunerated activity in a State of which he or she is not a national (United Nations, 1990, paragraph 1, Article 2). Thus, labour migration is the relocation of the working population from some states to others, caused by, *inter alia*, economic reasons. Labour migration is due to the uneven distribution of labour resources in regions and countries, as well as the desire of people to do easier work and receive higher salaries. Today there are two types of labour migration: low-skilled labour from developing countries to developed countries and highly qualified professionals – the so-called professionals’ migration, or “brain-drain” (Kirian, 2013, p. 56).

Theories of migration can be conditionally classified into two groups, those that study processes at the micro level, the focus of their research – the root causes of migration, and those that focus on the macro level, where the centre of attention is society as a whole, a state, a world com-

munity, and relations between the subjects of world economy and politics (Ryndzak, 2015, p. 79).

The theoretical and methodological base of concepts of migration developed in various ways today offers a foundation to the claim that the most attractive element for the assessment of migratory sentiments of society, in our opinion, is the concept of push and pull factors (Nosek, 2018, p. 23), which has been presented and finalised by researcher Everett Lee. Migration is interpreted as a function of the relative attractiveness of sending countries and countries of entry, and the presence of barriers is interpreted as a restriction of migration processes. According to Everett Lee's migration model, a push is a factor that motivates people to leave places. A push occurs under the influence of economic, cultural, and environmental factors. Within these three groups of factors, there are many conditions that can motivate a push. Among the most notable are "limited capacity", discrimination, war, and the loss of wealth, among others. The factor that motivates people to move to a new place – a pull, similar to a push factor, is divided into economic, cultural, and environmental factors. That is, among the factors prevailing are: employment opportunities, improving living conditions, social security, and an attractive climate. According to Everett Lee, all migration factors can be divided into four groups: 1, factors associated with an area of origin; 2, factors associated with an area of destination; 3, intervening obstacles; and 4, personal factors (Novosad, 2020, p. 18).

To this day, there are active discussions in the scientific community about the priority of existing strategies for adapting migrants to new conditions. There is no single correct one, and so therefore, they are classified differently.

Given that the focus of our study is the problem of the adaptation of Ukrainian labour migrants, then the strategy of adaptation (*acculturation*) presented by John Berry (Nosek, 2018, p. 39) seems appropriate here. Among the strategies of acculturation, the researcher distinguishes integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalisation. At the core of migrant adaptation strategies, John Berry sees two dimensions/aspirations – to maintain their former culture and accept a new one (Hirnyk, 2014).

Acculturation is interpreted as the process of direct and long-term contact between people from different cultures. Thus, according to accepted approaches, assimilation is defined as a variant of acculturation in which the immigrant has fully identified with a new culture. Quite often this is accompanied by a denial of the culture to which the migrant belongs. Separation is understood as a complete denial of a "new culture" or

a culture of the majority and maintaining a commitment to their culture. Provided that the migrant does not identify himself or herself neither with the culture of the majority, nor with the culture of the minority, then ethnocultural marginalisation is coming (Blynova, 2016).

A harmonious process is multiculturalism, which involves the integration of the migrant, their identification with both their own and a new culture. Thus, preserving ethnic identity helps to overcome the consequences of “culture shock” and maintain positive self-identification. Integration can achieve a positive effect only under the condition of mutual adaptation, which provides for the acceptance of the right for each group to live as culturally unique peoples. In this way, the end point of acculturation is adaptation, including that of the social and cultural, psychological, and economic (Blynova, op.cit.).

The process of adaptation in another environment with different cultural characteristics depends on the following factors: firstly, there is the degree of similarity or difference between cultures. In order to assess/determine the degree itself, various indices of cultural distance (cultural dimensions), which include language, religion, family structure, climate, and food and clothes are used. Secondly, there are the features of the culture from where the migrant comes – a knowledge of cultural code; and thirdly, the specifics of the recipient country, mainly the way in which the “host party” exerts an acculturational influence on the “visitors” (Novosad, op.cit., pp. 21–22).

In the process of adaptation, labour migrants in a destination country accept certain things immediately and easily, and they also have to put up with other things, but, to a greater extent, they feel the “transition shock” (Kalervo Oberg) (Novosad, op.cit.). “Culture shock” is interpreted as meaning that entering a new culture is permanently accompanied by the loss of friends and status, along with neglect, surprise, and discomfort during the realisation of differences between cultures, and confusion in value orientation and personal identity.

Modernity is characterised by many transnational ties under the influence of globalisation, and therefore quite often leads to transformation in various spheres of public life, and hence to significant transformations of currently known theoretical concepts. One such transformation was the departure from the classical understanding of migration as the phenomenon of a unilateral flow of people from a sending country to a recipient country.

Instead of categories, researchers of emigration and immigration more often began to use the concept of “transmigration or transnational migration” (Jaskułowski, Pawlak, 2016, p. 138), which implies the procedural,

relational nature and dynamics of the phenomenon of migration. The transnational perspective assumes that migrants connect the spaces of two nation-states, which can no longer exist as separate political units, but as a common field of activity, such as that of the social, cultural, economic, and political. Thus, Luis Guarnizo, referring to the thoughts of Pierre Bourdieu, offers a *transnational* concept that defines a “set of dualistic dispositions” of migrants (Jaskułowski, Pawlak, op.cit.).

The transnational concept provides a migrant’s “reaction” or “response” to their migration situation in which “traditional families become transnational and multilocal families” (Jaskułowski, Pawlak, op.cit.).

A notable entity in the study of migration is also The Hypothesis of the Mobility Transition, the creator of which is considered to be Wilbur Zelinsky (Synkovets, 2016). The innovative approach of Mr Zelinsky (Skeldon, 2012) is determined by the fact that he took the role of globalisation in changes in international migration into account, and considered migration processes from a structural-dynamics perspective and in connection with other dynamic processes, both demographic and socio-economic, including: economic growth, transport development, the formation of new channels of information transmission, increasing (or decreasing) economic opportunities, and increasing the welfare of the population as a condition for the formation of migration intentions.

In 1987, József Böröcz, an economist in the theory of relative difference known as the “Relative Inequality Theory of Migration”, grouped migrants by dividing them to “positive” and “negative” (Synkovets, op.cit., p. 14). Depending on the relative difference between countries that send and receive labour, some migrants are more skilled and motivated than the indigenous population, and it also applies to the US population (a “positive” migrant group), while others are less skilled or motivated (a “negative” group).

In view of this, mobility is evaluated as a positive when it comes to tourist businessmen, “highly skilled” migrants, and migrant knowledge, while others are seen as a negative (Jaskułowski, Pawlak, op.cit.) – for example, “illegal” migrants, refugees, and “low-skilled migrants”.

The theory of “social networks” (Piché, 2013) is also attractive in the context of related migration research. This concept has been actualised simultaneously with the growing importance of globalisation processes in the lives of migrants, and is used along with the concept of “chain migration”/the concept of “migration network”. The main message of the theory of migration networks was to answer the question of the duration of migration. Migration networks are a set of interconnections connecting migrants (arrived, experienced), returned migrants, and non-migrants, the

scope of which covers both the recipient country and the donor country. Kinship, friendship, and joint ownership play a key role here. According to many researchers, these are the bonds that make up the migration networks, explaining the transfer of funds and resources to migrants' countries of origin. In contrast to neoclassical theories – those focused mainly on the individualism and specificity of migrants – research has focused on the context of “affiliation” and “community”, which is the result of a relationship such as family or friendship. The theory of social networks, or “Network Theory” (Synkovets, 2016, p. 13) at the micro level explains the links between participants and their influence on the decision to migrate to another country, often combining individual migrants with their families and jobs before and after a change of residence. Sharing information and building strong relationships is the foundation on which the migration network is built. It is often the case that communities of former migrants help their compatriots find work and adapt to new living conditions.

Since the main motive for migration is the economic factor, economic theories on the study of migration flows should not be overlooked. Among economic theories, the “dual labour market theory” (Jaskułowski, Pawlak, op.cit.), developed by British economist Arthur William Lewis in 1954, in an article entitled “Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour”, stands out. An important consequence of neoclassical theory is the thesis that in the long run, as a result of changes in the supply and demand of labour in sending and receiving countries, the main reason for migration was primarily the difference in wages.

Experts consider that the most popular theory for studying the issues of international migration today is the “theory of the neoclassical economic approach”, which focuses on the study of “human capital mode” (Verbovyi, 2011, p. 3), and treats the phenomenon of labour migration as a result of economic development. The main factor in migration is the receiving of high wages, which is a key push factor in the recipient countries where the migrant worker comes from and, accordingly, a pull factor in the donor countries. The point is that a labour migrant has the opportunity to calculate all the necessary costs, including transport, accommodation, the issue of adapting to a new place, and the inherent psychological burden. This theory has two dimensions, namely those of the micro and macro. At the micro level, the theory summarises that a migrant goes abroad to improve his or her standard of living, in the hope that their income will outweigh their costs. Then there is the macro level – wherein the demand for labour of certain qualifications exceeds supply. Thus, migration flows, in theory, are mainly directed from less developed countries

with a surplus of (low-paid) labour to more developed countries with limited labour and high wages. As long as there is a significant difference in wages, migration flows will continue.

A prominent place among the theories of international migration is occupied by Verbovyi's "Institutional Approach" theory (Verbovyi, 2011, p. 4), which is aimed at studying the migratory behaviour of a population which is formed with the full support of various governmental and non-governmental organisations, law firms, social services, humanitarian organisations, mafia structures etc. The level of support from these structures will have a direct, proportional effect on the share of migration. Such firms and organisations have providing assistance to workers as their main goal, but, of course, not without benefit to themselves. Among the range of services offered, there are also those of an illegal nature, such as the facilitating of illegal border crossing, fake marriages, the forgery of documents and visas, etc. International statistics show that these types of firms and organisations are key supply channels for migrants.

Gender aspects have not been the focus of research in migration theories for a long time. However, today, this area is considered to be key among researchers. The origins of research on gender aspects in migration are associated primarily with the intensification of the feminist movement in the 1960s.

The traditional portrait of labour migrants is usually of men, due to the assumption that women are their dependants. However, according to Ernst Ravenstein's "migration laws", women are actually more prone to migrate. This is confirmed by statistics which have recorded the share of women in the structure of international migration at the level of 50% (Oishi, 2002).

Modern foreign researchers, such as M. Abraham, K. Aspurgand, and T. Hinz (Abraham, Aspurgand, Hinz, 2010) argue that the state plays a decisive role in shaping international models of female migration. The migration policies of the countries are different; there are those that do not restrict the migration of men, but restrict or even prohibit the migration of women. The emigration policy of the countries explains the basic laws of female migration, and the key factor at the level of the agent is the autonomy of migrant women. Researchers hypothesise that for the large-scale migration of women, they must have greater autonomy and decision-making power in the household.

Based on their research, scientists deduce the patterns of international migration of women through three levels of analysis by the "sender": (1) the state; (2) individuals; and (3) society (Abraham, Aspurgand, Ginz, op.cit.). At the state level, emigration policy treats men and women dif-

ferently. Because women are not a valuable workforce, but rather a neutral one, and are symbols of national dignity and pride, governments usually pursue a protective and restrictive policy on female emigration.

Such current trends as globalisation and technological progress have changed social perceptions of women's employment and their independent departure from their own communities. The growing demand for female labour is gradually changing the traditional established norms that previously limited women's mobility. The mechanism of international migration of women is extremely complex, and therefore requires an "integrated approach" with different levels of analysis (Abraham, Aspurgand, Ginz, op.cit.).

One of the newest theories developed by the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP) is the "Synthetic Theory of International Migration" (Synkovets, op.cit., pp. 15–16). The analysis covers six theories, namely: neoclassical theory, the new economic theory of labour migration, the dual labour market theory, the world systems theory, the social capital theory, and the theory of aggregate causality.

The International Union for the Scientific Study of Population defines international migration as the result of social, economic, and political transformations, accompanied by the spread of capitalist market relations to pre-market and non-market societies (as follows from the „hypothesis of world systems" theory). The study shows that migrants do not come from poor, isolated places that are cut off from world markets, but from those regions and countries that are experiencing a phase of rapid change due to their inclusion in the global trade, information, and production network. So, we can summarise that international migration is not the result of insufficient market development, but to the contrary; it is the result of the development of the markets themselves.

A similar view is held by Douglas Massey (Castles, Miller, 2011), who laid the foundation for building an accurate and comprehensive international migration theory for the 21st century. The researcher concluded that international migration is not the result of insufficient market development, but the development of the markets themselves. In addition, he argues that the study of international migration is often carried out within the framework of two separate branches of the social science. The first one is aimed at the causes, course, types, and consequences of migration, and the second one focuses on methods of adaptation in host societies.

Modern Ukrainian researcher Kristina Novosad notes that Douglas Massey, in his scientific exploration on international migration, focuses more on international migrants, who belong to the category of migrants "searching for opportunities", but omits two other categories of migrants, such as: "migrants of survival" and "migrants of persecution"

(Novosad, op.cit., p. 4). The researcher states the fact that labour migrants from Ukraine and other developing countries belong to all three categories of migrants. Labour migration, that which is undertaken in order to increase earnings and improve living standards, must be distinguished from migration as an escape from poverty and unemployment. Recently, the number of migrants trying to avoid outright violence, persecution, and/or military conflict has increased.

Theoretical Modelling of Migration Policy: Demonstrative Practices of Their Application

In the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) adopted in 2015, UN Member States have committed themselves to promoting, by 2030, an “orderly, safe and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies” (UN, 2015) (Migration data portal, 2020b).

It is clear that there is no universal definition of migration policy in scientific literature. However, we rely on the approach presented by the International Organization for Migration (IOM), whose glossary in 2019 states that “migration policy is a set of legal norms, laws and regulations, as well as organizational structures (subnational, national, regional and international) and processes that shape and regulate states’ approaches to migration in all its forms, guarantee rights and responsibilities and are designed to promote international cooperation” (Migration data portal, 2020b).

In the practice of migration policy, national governments are guided by three key strategies. Among these strategies are the following: firstly, there is the “closed-door” policy, aimed at curbing the influx of migrants; secondly, there is the “open-door” policy, which is the complete opposite of the previous policy and aims to stimulate immigration and countries to develop approaches to their resettlement and adaptation; and thirdly, a “selective strategy” aimed at state regulation of migration flows, taking into account the situation on the labour market and demographic situation. It is worth noting that states are increasingly using a selective migration policy strategy (Rovenchak, 2010).

Accordingly, countries, taking into account the historical, cultural, social, and mental characteristics of their societies and the situation on the labour market, including the demographic situation, choose for themselves the most favourable model of migration policy. The most studied and well-known models are five in number, the first one being – *the complete exclusion of immigration into a country*; the second – *differentiated exclusion or segregation*; the third – *integration as a gradual and weaker form*

of assimilation; the fourth – *assimilation*; and, finally, the fifth one – the *multicultural migration policy*.

We consider it expedient to dwell on the characteristics of each of these migration models which are inherent in the states.

Thus, the first model assumes that the state refuses to accept immigrants, and thereby solves the problems of ethnocultural separation and conflict. Practically, in the context of globalisation, this type of model is no longer implemented by countries. In addition, the prohibition of legal immigration leads to an increase in the number of illegal migrants, which is a reason for the growing number of criminal problems, such as: a lack of opportunity of legal employment which transfers their activity into the criminal sphere, and a lack of civil rights which automatically transforms migrants into objects of criminal encroachments (Korolevska, 2019).

The key feature of the second model – “differential exclusion or segregation” – is mainly aimed only at the temporary entry of migrants into a country, if their permanent stay in the recipient country is treated as a threat.

This model provides for the temporary inclusion of immigrants in certain subsystems of society (the labour market), but exclusion from other spheres of social life (political life, social security, and citizenship). Ultimately, the implementation of the migration model of “segregation” in destination countries inevitably leads to discrimination.

The third model of migration policy is integration as a gradual and weaker form of assimilation. At the same time, the goal remains to completely eliminate ethnocultural differences, and to absorb the culture of immigrants by the dominant culture in the recipient society.

The main motive for the implementation of the fourth model of assimilation by countries involves the inclusion of migrants in the recipient country’s society on the basis of a unilateral process of changing linguistic, cultural, and social characteristics. Segregation is one of the mechanisms that motivate migrants to assimilate. An alternative is clearly emerging for the migrant; the choice of ethnocultural identity and segregation, or, the loss of ethnocultural identity and full inclusion in the host society (Korolevska, op.cit.).

And, accordingly, the fifth one, the “multicultural” model, is based on the recognition of the presence in society of different ethnic groups and the need to manage their relationships, the focus of which is to ensure not only migrant, but indigenous population equality in all areas while preserving the migrants’ native culture. Such model of migration policy is based on anti-discrimination, legal norms, an equal opportunities policy, and is distinguished by the rapid granting of full political and civil rights to migrants.

It is worthwhile, in our opinion, to represent the levels of assimilation, which have been distinguished by the Western researcher Hartmut Esser. The scientist identifies cultural assimilation (knowledge, skills, language); structural assimilation (approval in education and in the labour market); social assimilation (network of relationships, marital behaviour); and emotional assimilation (identification dictated by feelings) (Hokkhan, 2016).

Obviously, integration is impossible without some degree of assimilation. Under the influence of globalisation, societies/civilisations choose their own vector of regulation of “immigration expansion” (“assimilation, differential exclusion, multiculturalism”), which is important to take into account when fathoming the relationship between a country’s “own” and its “foreign” people as a social consequence of migration.

Migrants have violated the “security climate” and contributed to destructive actions in many spheres of life. Examples can be found in the realms of the shadow economy, criminal structures, and extremist organisations, which have created serious threats to the national security of European states (Hokkhan, op.cit.).

The resettlement of migrants by enclaves is a kind of barrier to the formation of open and positive relationships with local residents and, of course, is a catalyst for conflict situations, as it divides the parties into two groups in one area. In the scientific community, such settlement of migrants by enclaves is referred to as “ghetto”. Migrant communities can easily acquire the nature of a ghetto, wherein the population dealing with high unemployment lives mainly through social transfers (Hokkhan, op.cit.). Instead of assimilating, migrants form micro-societies with their own culture. A modern Ukrainian researcher, Demir Gökhan, cites the Turkish district of Kreuzberg (Berlin) and Green Lanes (London) as examples (Hokkhan, op.cit., p. 38).

Referring to the scientific achievements of the English sociologist Anthony Giddens, the modern scholar Olha Ryndzak identifies three models of integration policy (Ryndzak, 2014, p. 73).

1. The ‘assimilation’ model, the meaning of which is that immigrants shall abandon their customs and traditions, and accept the norms and values of the host society. Most importantly, newly arrived migrants need to learn the language and adapt to the style of clothing and lifestyle of the majority. The assimilation model assumes that immigrants will concede their excellent linguistic, cultural, and social characteristics and will not differ from the majority of the population. The role of the state in assimilation is to create favourable conditions for individual adaptation and transformation of culture and most values through the

persistent use of dominant language and education in migrant children's schools.

2. The 'alloy' model (crucible, melting pot) means that immigrants shall not "dissolve" in the values of the dominant majority, but be absorbed in order to facilitate the formation of new cultural patterns. The theory of the "melting pot", or "outbreeding", is a concept that emerged in the Anglo-Saxon emigrant states. This concept is also known by its less popular names, such as: "salad", or "mosaic" (relative to Canada). The essence of the alloy model is that all nations and races in a new place of residence (in an emigrant state) must mix freely, forming a "supernation". In general, this model has features that are also inherent in multiculturalism, as it does not indicate the dominant (main) culture, but contributes to the mixing of ethnic groups into one political nation. This concept is especially relevant and practically implemented in the United States (Diedush, 2015, p. 73).

3. Cultural pluralism implies that immigrants maintain their own culture in a destination country alongside the culture of the majority. Meanwhile, migrants take an active part in the economic and political life of the recipient country. According to the migration model of cultural pluralism, immigrants have the right to develop their own language and maintain their own customs. This model is often interpreted as a cultural mosaic to emphasise that different cultures do not mix with each other, but coexist side by side.

In order to clearly distinguish between assimilation policy and countries officially listed as being multicultural, migration specialists and experts identify assimilation as a "melting pot", while multiculturalism is portrayed as a "colourful cultural mosaic", or a "dish with chopped salad" (Rovenchak, op.cit.). If the result of the assimilation policy is a figurative "melting pot", countries with the official status of being multicultural are portrayed as a "colourful cultural mosaic" or a "bowl of coarsely chopped salad" – a multinational society consisting of ethnic groups that preserve their culture, language, religion, way of life. Government institutions, meanwhile, do not aim to equalise them in terms of ethnic and/or national origin, language, religion, skin colour, etc., but to establish equality in all social, political, and public spheres, other rights of different nations, ethnic groups, races, and religions while preserving all ethnocultural features (Rovenchak, op.cit.).

Modern Ukrainian researcher Olha Rovenchak (Rovenchak, op.cit., p. 153), in her study entitled "Integration Component of Migration Policy", presenting a comparative analysis of immigration policies and integration adaptation components of the policies of 17 immigration countries,

attributed the migration assimilation model to various analysed countries such as France and Israel; while countries using the differential exclusion model include: Switzerland, Austria, Ukraine, the Russian Federation, Great Britain, Germany, the USA and others; whereas multiculturalism is embodied in Australia and Canada. Focusing on the model of migration policy of the Republic of Poland, it should be noted that, so far, the country is not classified as one which employs the multicultural model, nor which operates under the differential exclusion model.

It is worth noting that Poland's immigration policy has focused on pendulum and short-term migration, as this type is the most profitable given the current needs of the labour market. Also, there is the interesting fact that Poland develops its own migration policy, taking into account the concept of the dominant culture. The Polish government does not envisage the transformation of its state from monocultural to multicultural, which is confirmed by the fact that there is a clear limit of stay for foreigners.

In our view, the migration policy model of the Republic of Poland tends to be more towards the selective integration of migrants/differentiated exclusion than towards assimilation or multicultural integration. This is confirmed by the fact that due to the changing demographic situation, Poland is considering the possibility of launching active migration measures to resettle "from selected countries" (Ewropejska Prawda, 2021).

Such recruitment mechanisms will take into account both the qualifications of foreigners and the factors that help in their integration and subsequent assimilation. Poland's migration policy should be conducted in accordance with the concept of the dominant culture, which sets certain limits for immigrants to function in the country, and not in accordance with the model of multiculturalism.

Therefore, considering the various approaches to the implementation of migration policy by national governments, we can single out key conceptual approaches to the study of migration policy of individual states:

The pluralistic model. Migration policy is defined as a component of the international political system and as a process in which a set of entities – from entrepreneurs to churches, from trade unions to ethnic associations – seek to get concrete benefits without focusing on the systemic quality of society as a whole. Pluralism presupposes that equal rights in all spheres of public life should be granted to immigrants without expecting them to give up their diversity. However, as a rule, ethnic groups must adapt to the core values of their host country (Chaikovskiy, 2019). Again, migration policy is defined as a component of the international political system and, in this way, immigration control is seen

as an urgent need due to the mismatch of global market forces and sovereign state entities that have territorial boundaries. According to this approach, the limits of the effectiveness of state control depend on the existence of an international regime of “enshrined liberalism”, which covers a number of human rights instruments and agreements, both international and national (Malynovska, 2018). However, even with the application of a pluralistic model of state migration policy, which applies the same restrictive measures, the nature, scale, and intensity of efforts to curb immigration differ significantly.

The Class Model. The application of the class model in practice is still popular when explaining the flows of illegal migration. This is the so-called “back-door” policy; an active strategy of states that provides a flexible workforce. As a conclusion, countries that put the class model into practice and allow the flow of illegal migrants are not considered weak in protecting national borders, but rather “objective focused” in importing migrants into the weakest positions from a legal point of view. Migration policy is aimed at bringing the need for a reserve army of industrial workers in line with the real need to avoid social unrest and high levels of conflict in relations between domestic and foreign workers.

The Realistic Model. Researchers who take a realistic view argue that public interests are key to understanding how states manage immigration flows. The Geneva Convention of 1950 stipulates clearly that states own the undisputed sovereignty concerning who enters and exits their territory. In *Politics Among Nations: The struggle for Power and Peace*, Hans Morgenthau (1993) presents several key assumptions of realism in international political theory. All of them are relevant to an explanation of the status of the international migration regime: 1) Paradigm 1: The state is the central actor on the world stage. 2) Paradigm 2: The natural state of international politics is that of anarchy. 3) Paradigm 3: Interest is the essence of politics and states seek to have the greatest amount of power. 4) Paradigm 4: It is the intrinsic nature of the human actors who control the states that shape the states. So, from a classical realist standpoint, the global governance of migration is ruled by a state’s balance of power (Faure, 2018).

The Neo-corporatist Model. In the area of immigration policy, the neo-corporatist model focuses on how the destination country of migrants aligns transnational and international constraints with the structure of its domestic interests. For example, the Australian neo-corporatist model is based on state selection using a points system with extensive business and labour participation. Australian practices are shifting towards the US

demand-driven model as employers - rather than government officials - are selecting increasing percentages of permanent immigrants from pools of temporary foreign workers and foreign students already in Canada and Australia rather than from abroad (Koslowski, 2022, p. 108). The Australian government does not select immigrants on its own but rather turns to industry cooperation with labour to determine which immigrant skill sets are needed by the Australian economy. In this way, government, industry, and labour collectively shape immigration policy much like neo-corporatist economic development strategies adopted by the governments of smaller European states with exports constituting large shares of GDP (Koslowski, 2013, p. 4).

The Communicative Model. Representatives of this model explain that migration policy is a system of communicative actions that act as a chain of mediations. In the framework of this approach, research focuses on the social component; the context of making immigration policy, rather than on whose interests this model serves. A number of features of immigration policy relate to the context of policy making rather than the specifics of immigration. New technology, especially new media, help migrants a lot and immigrants communicate with each other via new media and networks. Migrants use all available communication opportunities, yet they still have communication problems. National and local authorities bear great responsibility in this regard (Cereci, 2019, p. 21).

The Gravitational Model. This is a theoretical model similar to Newton's law of gravity and used in urban planning to predict the migration rates between two regions/countries. It is based on the idea that with the increasing importance of the regions, the number of interactions between them increases, and with increasing distance under equal conditions, the number of interactions decreases (Shvets, 2016). This model has long been popular for the analysis of economic phenomena related mainly to the movement of goods and services, capital, and labour. Researchers can use this model, for example, to assess the impact of visa restrictions on migration flows. The gravitational model assumes that flows between two countries are directly proportional to their size (population or GDP) and inversely proportional to the physical distance between them (similar to Newton's law of gravity) (Ramos, 2016).

Thus, we can conclude that among the representatives of the scientific community there is no unity nor a clear position in the theoretical modelling of migration policy. Each of the models has its advantages and disadvantages, and even the multicultural model does not always work in practice.

Migration Policy Trends: Global Dimension and Forecasts (Migration Data Portal, 2020a)

The future of global migration differs in the forecasts of leading organisations and institutions on trends in migration flows and tendencies. Let us focus on the coverage of some of them.

For example, researchers at the Vienna Institute of Demography, taking into account the views of experts, project global flows of international migrants for five-year periods from 2015 to 2060 in three different scenarios. According to their estimates, the number of international migrants in these decades will remain at the same level as now, will reach its peak in 2040–2045, and then decrease slightly. The lower scenario assumes 29 million international migrants worldwide, with the average being 33 million, with the upper being 50 million. Such indicative global levels depend mainly on the region. According to the average scenario, researchers predict that there will be 8 million international migrants in Europe and North America by 2055–2060; 5 million in West Asia; 4 million in Africa; 3 million from the post-Soviet countries; and about 1 million in Oceania, Latin America, East Asia, South East Asia, and South Asia, respectively.

According to estimates of the UN Population Division for 2019, a constant level of net migration is expected between 2019 and 2100. Net migration is “the difference between the number of immigrants arriving and the number of emigrants leaving a country over a certain period of time“. At the global level, the sum of such migration levels is zero, which means that the number of immigrants arriving in all countries is the same as the number of people leaving the same countries. According to the report, it is quite obvious that the level of migration will be constant until 2100, as migration flows “have historically not been significant and have no crucial impact on the size and composition of the national population”.

Previous UN estimates, to the contrary, have predicted that net international migration by 2095–2100 will reach half the level projected for 2045–2050 (Migration Data Portal, 2020a). Taking this assumption into account and interpreting net migration as gross immigration, researchers had predicted that in 2010–2015, registered total net immigration in the world would amount to 25 million, and was expected to decrease to 16.6 million. During 2020–2025, there will be a further reduction to 13.7 million for the five-year periods between 2030–2050. In comparing the estimates of the UN and the Vienna Institute of Demography, the researchers concluded that, although the UN estimates were lower than expected be-

cause they had taken into account only gross immigration and not gross migration – the trends are quite similar.

The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2017) has developed descriptions of global migration scenarios for 2030. In a scenario characterised by the successful implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals, the change in average annual global migration flows during 2015–2030 compared to 2000–2015 will increase by 3.3 percent, but remain below 4 percent. In contrast, under the scenario of conflict and unilateral and uncoordinated international cooperation, future flows will fall below 3% during 2015–2030 compared to 2000–2015.

In a research study, the Global Migration Data Analysis Centre (GMDAC) of the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Dutch Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute combined two separate methodological approaches (Migration data portal, 2020a): migration scenarios and the Delphi survey. According to the results, the total immigration flow to the European Union (EU) in 2030 may increase between 21% and 44% compared to the average annual immigration flows recorded between 2008 and 2017.

It is worth noting three probable developments in the labour migration of Ukrainians to Poland: that of optimistic, pessimistic, and realistic scenarios. The optimistic scenario mainly envisages a stabilisation of the Ukrainian economy and an improvement of the labour situation in Poland. The pessimistic scenario – the main parameters of economic development in Ukraine will decrease significantly by 2030 compared to the level of 2019–2020. Under such conditions, seasonal migration will become more long-term. The third scenario is the realistic scenario, in which the economic indicators of 2019–2020 levels will not improve significantly, but will not decrease.

To these three scenarios there should be added an additional one, a model of Ukrainian labour migration to Poland after the COVID-19 pandemic (Astramovich-Leik, Turchyn and Ivasechko, 2021, p. 22).

In our opinion, whichever of these scenarios develops, labour migration of Ukrainians to Poland or to other EU Member States will continue and gain momentum as long as there is a significant difference in wages.

So, we can summarise that after analysing the represented trends regarding the future of migration flows, there is confidence that they will only intensify.

Poland's Position in the Index of Integration Policy MIPEX 2020

In recent years, Poland has become an increasingly attractive country for immigrants, among whom Ukrainians make up the largest percentage. In 2016, the largest number of work permits related to employment (almost half a million) was recorded for third-country nationals among EU Member States. Thus, we can summarise that Poland, whose citizens over the past three decades have significantly influenced European migration processes and formed a new diaspora, numbering more than 2 million people, is being transformed from a land of emigration to a country of immigration.

Despite the fact that Poland has not been as strongly affected by the migration and refugee crisis as other EU Member States, the forced migration rate began to play a crucial role in the country's key political development after the 2015 parliamentary elections. In 2016, a key document on migration policy, "Poland's Migration Policy – Its Current Status and Postulated Actions" (2012), developed by the previous government in collaboration with partners from scientific circles and civil society, was suspended. Although this should have been quickly replaced by a new policy strategy, to date, this has not happened.

In June 2019, during a conference, a document entitled "Polish Migration Policy", prepared by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Administration (dated June 10, 2019), was presented in the Parliament. This document contains 70 pages of text, describing the key reasons for the new migration policy, including the abolition of the previous key policy document, the demographic crisis, one of the lowest overall birth rates in the world, dynamic ageing, migration processes, and depopulation in the country. The ambitious goal is to promote the construction of a "Polish model of active migration policy" that would improve the management of emigration and immigration processes and the integration of foreigners, as well as create an incentive for foreigners to settle in Poland. However, such a migration policy should not jeopardise the security of the state (Pędziwiatr, 2019).

The term "security" occurs more than 70 times throughout the document. According to experts and analysts, this contradicts the realities of Polish migration, as it is usually its citizens or members of the Polish diaspora living outside the country, rather than immigrants living in Poland, who are involved in violations of the law. However, this feature of the document is closely related to the significant securitisation of certain types of migration by the mentioned government in the form of speech

acts, as well as bureaucratic and technical practices. It is contradictory, as Polish researcher Konrad Pędziwiatr notes, that on the one hand, the presented document recognises that immigrants are needed to alleviate some of the country's future problems, and on the other hand, portrays them as threats to national security and Polish culture.

Focusing in the document on persons seeking international protection, this draft of the new migration policy of Poland mostly mentions them in the context of them being a security threat. The term “refugee” is mentioned 24 times in the document and is usually associated with illegal migration, threats to national security, and forced evictions. Persons fleeing persecution and war are represented as fake refugees who abuse migration laws. The analysed document provides for further restrictions on their admission and restrictions on the types of persons who can apply for asylum. As a result, the researcher notes, the proposed recommendations, if implemented, could further jeopardise the rights of asylum seekers in Poland (Pędziwiatr, *op.cit.*).

In our opinion, it is worth noting the phases of migration policy in Poland. Thus, the modern Polish researcher Agnieszka Weiner identifies 4 key phases, namely: Phase I – its chronological framework 1990–1997; Phase II – 1998–2001; Phase III – 2001–2003; Phase IV – since 2004. In our opinion, this list should be extended and a Phase V should be added – from 2014–2019, in which the military actions of the Russian Federation in eastern Ukraine became the drivers of migration flows to Poland, forming a large proportion of internally displaced persons who were forced to seek asylum within Ukraine and abroad. In addition, 2014–2015 was the peak of the migration crisis in the EU. And, obviously, such a factor as the introduction of a visa-free regime between Ukraine and the EU in 2017 also significantly affected Poland's migration policy. We propose adding to the realities of today a Phase VI, which began its countdown in 2020 and is associated with the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic (Weinar, 2005).

To assess the current integration policy of Poland, we consider it appropriate to use the Integration Policy Index (MIPEX), which is composed by a consortium of European organisations led by the Migration Police Group and covers 52 countries. The MIPEX index is multidimensional, as it analyses integration policy in seven areas: access to the labour market; family reunification; education; long-term stay; participation in the political life of the country; obtaining citizenship; and protection against discrimination.

Non-EU citizens have faced a number of obstacles in Poland. Thus, according to MIPEX for 2020, the country's integration policy is estimated at 40 out of 100 points. MIPEX classifies Poland's approach to the integration of migrants as “Equality on paper” (Migrant integration policy index,

2019). As in most Central and Eastern European countries, immigrants in Poland enjoy some basic rights but do not have equal opportunities. Poland still needs to invest in equal rights and equal opportunities for immigrants, which are below average compared to most MIPEX countries. Poland's current policy encourages the public to perceive immigrants not as equals but as strangers. Immigrants in Poland face many obstacles in several areas, mainly the labour market, education, health care, and political participation. Under such a restrictive policy, the public experiences a higher level of xenophobia and a lower level of social trust, which leads to less contact and fewer positive experiences with immigrants. Poland's integration policy is estimated to be below the EU average (Migrant integration policy index, op.cit.).

There is an interesting opinion of Ludwika Wlodek (Babakova, 2021), a Doctor of Science, as well as a Polish writer, reporter, sociologist, and lecturer at the University of Warsaw, who gives an interview about her book "Worse Children of the Republic", wherein she analyses and compares the situation with migrants in France and Poland. Her conclusion is that, unfortunately, the majority always distrusts the minority. The migrants who are in France and Poland, are all treated equally stereotypically. Migrants are, *a priori*, perceived as builders or cleaners. Migrant doctors, engineers, and businessmen etc do not like this approach, as their potential is not fully appreciated and, eventually, this annoys them.

Ludwika Wlodek also emphasises that there is no such thing that some people treat migrants especially badly, but there is a difference in the approaches of the elites. The French situation is better than the Polish situation, because in France these topics are actively discussed, and, as the expert notes, there is recognition of the problem. In her opinion, there is no serious debate on migration in Poland today. There are either naive stories about how wonderful it is to receive people from all over the world, or tales of paranoid inculcation in front of strangers. There is no talk about demography, nor about the problem of an ageing society, and that without migrants the Polish economy simply would not cope.

The very issue of migration in France has existed for a long time – the post-war welfare of the French was built by migrants. In Poland, this topic is relatively new, but it does not justify the government labelling labour migrants from Ukraine as refugees. Change takes time, along with some critical mass (Babakova, 2021).

We can summarise that migration still has a positive effect on the development of countries of migrants' origins. Today, it is popular to create a three-party winning scenario («win-win-win»), in which migration processes have a positive effect on countries of origin, the countries of desti-

nation and the migrants themselves. The positive impact of migration is that migrants use their rights in the host country to find work, develop their skills, earn money, some of which is transferred to their countries of origin, while for destination countries the benefit is the employment of migrants in unpopular areas. First of all, the increase in remittances is assessed as a new and additional source of funding for economic development. Through remittances, migration has a direct impact on poverty reduction in countries of origin. In addition, the positive effect is also in social exchanges in the form of information flow, ideas, values, etc. Migration is also seen as a positive factor that leads to a more balanced dynamic of supply and demand in the labour market, and therefore international migration is expected to have contributed to reducing inequality and to have led to a better distribution of the benefits of globalisation.

Conclusions

Migration policy should be based on ensuring the principle of tripartism/(«win-win-win») (Fogel, 2018) a three-party winning scenario, which, in this context, means a predominance of positive effects for both the recipient state, the donor state, and labour migrants. Thus, when weighing the positive and negative consequences of labour migration, those that promote a tripartite partnership will prevail. The point is that for well-thought-out and balanced migration policy, the interaction of three parties should be coordinated: the donor state, the destination state and the labour migrants (Castles, Miller, 2011), all of whose opinions should be taken into account while constructing migration policy.

Based on our analysis of a large number of literature sources, we have found that there are four categories of key problems for labour migrants abroad related to adaptation: firstly, there are domestic problems, such as: finding a job, housing, adaptation to life in the city, the cost of living, and the organisation of time; secondly – the social and psychological, including the following: longing for loved ones and the homeland, and the need to be independent and to find new friends; thirdly, the educational, among which are things distinguished such as: differences in the values of education, requirements for educational work, and teacher-student relations; fourthly, cultural and communication, which are characterised mainly as a lack of proficiency/low level of proficiency in the local language, cultural differences, diversity of ethnic composition, features of the local mentality, etc.

Today's political practice shows that one of the priority issues on the agenda of Ukrainian-Polish relations is the problem of regulating labour

migration from Ukraine to the Republic of Poland. Today, Poland is considered by Ukrainian workers both as a “destination” country and as a transit territory for further migration to the leading countries of Western Europe. According to the latest opinion polls of Ukrainian labour migrants, migration to Poland specifically is perceived by them not as an opportunity to improve their financial situation in the first place, but as the achievement of higher social living standards. Among this share, we can distinguish: firstly, short-term migrants who come only for seasonal work, and secondly, migrants who do not rule out the possibility of staying in a host country, in this case the Republic of Poland, permanently or immediately purposefully migrate without any thoughts about returning to Ukraine.

This is an ambiguous situation, due to a number of objective reasons and factors, most of which have negative consequences. The presence of unresolved issues related to migrant workers makes adjustments in the development of relations between Ukraine and Poland.

The represented concepts, theories, and approaches, in our opinion, can be applied in order to study and explain the situation around Ukrainian workers in Poland. That is why there is a need to study the specifics of migration from Ukraine to Poland which will analyse the factors, the motives, the structure of migrants, the consequences for the economic and political situation of Ukraine and Poland, the features of legal regulation, along with the threats and obstacles to cooperation. Therefore, an intensification of cooperation is appropriate today.

References

- Abraham, M., Auspurg, K. and Hinz, T. (2010) “Migration Decisions Within Dual Earner Partnerships: A Test of Bargaining”, *Theory Journal of Marriage and Family*. Vol. 72(4), pp. 876–892. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00736.x>.
- Astramowicz-Leyk, T., Turchyn, Ya. and Ivasechko, O. (2021) “Labor Migration From Ukraine To The Republic Of Poland: Regulatory Framework, Key Issues And Challenges”, *Humanitarian Vision*. Vol. 7(1), pp. 14–23. Available at: <https://science.lpnu.ua/sites/default/files/journal-paper/2021/may/23722/turchinivasechko120213.pdf> (Access 13.02.2021).
- Babakova, O. (2021) “Liudvika Vlodek: ‘Koly peremahaie natsionalna zbirna z futbolu – my vsi frantsuzy, koly treba vyrishuvaty problem peredmist – mihranty staiut zaivymy’”, *Nash vybir*. 10.03. Available at:

- <https://naszwybir.pl/lyudvika-vlodek-koly-peremagaye-natsionalna-zbirna-z-futbolu-my-vsi-frantsuzy-koly-treba-vyrishuvaty-problemy-peredmist-migranty-stayut-zajvymy/> (Access 12.03.2021).
- Bezuhlyi, P. (2018) “Teoretychni zasady doslidzhennia mihratsiinykh protsesiv”, *Political life*. Vol. 1, pp. 1–15.
- Blynova, O. (2016) *Stratehii adaptatsii mihrantiv: novi vyklyky suchasnosti*. Available at: <http://kspodn.onu.edu.ua/index.php/kunena/sektsiya-9-multikulturalizm-ta-globalizatsiya-v-politichnomu-protsesi-ukrajini-evropi-ta-svitu/10-blinova-o-e-m-kherson-strategiji-adaptatsiji-mihrantiv-novi-viklyki-suchasnosti> (Access 19.02.2021).
- Castles, S. and Miller, M. (2011) *Migracje we współczesnym świecie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, pp. 43–46.
- Cereci, S. (2019) “Communication Need of Immigrants: Instruments, Ways, Messages”, *The Journal of Migration Studies*. Vol. 5 (1), pp. 10–26. Available at: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/814553> (Access 15.03.2022).
- Chaikovskiy, Yu. (2019) “Mizhnarodna mihratsiia i vnutrishnia bezpeka derzhavy (International migration and internal security of the state)”, *Constitutional State*. Vol. 33, pp. 173–178. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18524/2411-2054.2019.33.162070>.
- Diedush, O. (2015) “Do pytannia pro reliatyvistski teorii natsii”, *Folk Art and Ethnology*. Vol. 1, pp. 72–75.
- Evropiejska Prawda (2021) *U Polshchi rozkryly osnovni polozhennia novoi mihratsiinoi polityky*, 30.06. Available at: <https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/news/2019/06/30/7097915/> (Access 12.03.2021).
- Faure, A. (2018) “Global Compact for Migrations: A classical realist interpretation of the fragmented global migration governance”, *Développement, Gouvernance mondiale*, 13.12. Available at: <https://www.open-diplomacy.eu/blog/global-compact-for-migrations-a-classical-realist-interpretation-of-the> (Access 16.03.2022).
- Fogel, H. (2018) *Analiz mihratsii vysokokvalifikovanykh kadrov i mihratsiinoi polityky Ukrainy*. NGO Agency for European Innovation, pp. 7–10. Available at: <https://www.civic-synergy.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Analiz-migratsiyi-i-migratsijnoyi-polityky-Ukrainy.pdf> (Access 12.03.2021).
- Hirnyk, A. and Hirnyk, H. (2014) “Osoblyvosti adaptatsii ukrainskykh osvitnikh mihrantiv do umov zhyttia za kordonom”, *Proceedings. Pedagogical, psychological sciences and social work*. Vol. 162, pp. 52–55. Available at: http://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/3932/Hirnyk_Osoblyvosti_adaptatsii_ukrainskykh_osvitnikh_mihrantiv.pdf;jsessionid=210DC13CFF3182B088750578F3094EB2?sequence=1 (Access 19.02.2021).

- Hokkhan, D. (2016) “Suchasni mihratsiini protsesy: problema adaptatsii ta intehratsii mihrantiv v obiednannii Yevropi”, *Philosophical sciences. Bulletin of Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University*. Vol. 1 (82), pp. 35–44. Available at: <http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/21692/1/8.pdf> (Access 27.02.2021).
- Jaskułowski, K. and Pawlak, M. (2016) “Główne teorie migracji międzynarodowych: przegląd, krytyka, perspektywy”, *Sprawy Narodowościowe. Seria Nowa*. Vol. 48, pp. 128–146. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11649/sn.2016.008>.
- Kirian, T. (2013) “Notatky shchodo stanu ta tendentsii trudovykh mihratsiinykh protsesiv v Ukraini”, *Socio-economic problems of the modern period of Ukraine*. Vol. 3(101), pp. 55–64.
- Korolevska, A. (2019) “Modeli mihratsiinoi polityky ta intehratsiini indykatory YeS”. *CPMASF*. Vol. 19. Available at: <http://elar.khnu.-km.ua/jspui/bitstream/123456789/8127/1/%D0%9A%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%BB%D0%B5%D02019.pdf> (Access 10.03.2021).
- Kosłowski, R. (2013) “Selective Migration Policy Models and Changing Realities of Implementation”, *International Migration*. Vol. 52(3), pp. 1–27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12136>.
- Kosłowski, R. (2022) *Shifts in Selective Migration Policy Models A Comparison of Australia, Canada, and the US* in Czaika M. (ed.) *High-Skilled Migration: Drivers and Politics*, p. 108. DOI:10.1093/oso/9780198815273.003.0006.
- Malynovska, O. (2018) *Mihratsiina polityka: hlobalnyi kontekst ta ukrainiski realii*. Kyiv: Nacionalnyj Institut Strategicznich Doslidzeń. Available at: https://niss.gov.ua/sites/default/files/2018-07/Migration_Politic_Print_-fin-3178a.pdf (Access 05.03.2021).
- Migrant integration policy index (2019) *2020 Poland*. Available at: <https://www.mipex.eu/poland> (Access 10.03.2021).
- Migration data portal (2020a) *Future migration trends*, 20.10. Available at: <https://migrationdataportal.org/themes/future-migration-trends> (Access 07.03.2021).
- Migration data portal (2020b) *Migration policies and governance*. Available at: <https://migrationdataportal.org/themes/migration-policies-and-governance> (Access 15.03.2021).
- Nosek, K. (2018) *Migracja zarobkowa a poczucie jakości życia rodzin transnarodowych*. Olsztyn: Centrum Badań Społecznych UWM: Towarzystwo Naukowe im. Wojciecha Kętrzyńskiego, p. 23.
- Novosad, K. (2020) “Suchasni modeli doslidzhennia mizhnarodnoi mihratsii”, *GRANI*. Vol. 23(5), pp. 15–27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15421/172049>.

- Oishi, N. (2002) “Gender and Migration: An Integrative Approach”, *University of California working paper*. Vol. 49, pp. 1–18.
- Peździwiatr, K. (2019) *Migration policy and politics in Poland, Respond*. Warsaw: Centre of migration research, University of Warsaw, 20.08. Available at: <https://respondmigration.com/blog-1/migration-policy-politics-poland> (Access 08.03.2021).
- Piché, V. (2013) “Contemporary Migration Theories as Reflected in their Founding, tl. Catriona Dutreuilh”, *Population*. Vol. 68(1), pp. 141–164. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3917/pope.1301.0141>.
- Ramos, R. (2016) “Gravity models: A tool for migration analysis”, *IZA World of Labor*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15185/izawol.239>.
- Rovenchak, O. (2010) “Intehratsiina skladova mihratsiinoi polityky”. *Psychology of society. Sectoral psychology*. Vol. 3(41), pp. 150–175. Available at: <http://pis.wunu.edu.ua/index.php/uapis/article/view/483> (Access 17.02.2021).
- Ryndzak, O. (2014) “Modeli polityky intehratsii mihrantiv u pryimaiuche suspilstvo”. *Economics and state*. Vol. 11, pp. 72–75. Available at: http://www.economy.in.ua/pdf/11_2014/17.pdf (Access 27.02.2021).
- Ryndzak, O. (2015) “Teorii mihratsii naseleennia – osnova udoskonalennia mihratsiinoi polityky Ukrainy”. *Demography, Labor Economics, Social Economics and Politics*, pp. 77–81. Available at: <http://molodyvcheny.in.ua/files/conf/eko/10april2015/25.pdf> (Access 27.02.2021).
- Shvets, S. (2016) “Teoretyko-kontseptualni zasady vyvchennia modelei mihratsiinoi polityky”, *Politicus*. Vol. 1, pp. 70–73. Available at: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/polit_2016_1_16 (Access 05.03.2021).
- Skeldon, R. (2012) “Migration Transitions Revisited: Their Continued Relevance for”, *The Development of Migration Theory Population, Space and Place*. Vol. 18(2), pp. 154–166. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.667>.
- Sokołowicz, M. and Lishchynskyy, I. (2018) “Czy Polska i Ukraina to naturalne centra przepływów migracyjnych? Studium zjawiska migracji zarobkowych i jego kluczowych atrybutów”, *Comparative Economic Research. Central and Eastern Europe*. Vol. 21(1), pp. 45–65. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/cer-2018-0003>.
- Synkovets, N. (2016) “Analiz osnovnykh teorii mizhnarodnoi mihratsii v suchasnomu ekonomichnomu prostori”, *International relations, part: Economic Sciences*. Vol. 7. Available at: http://journals.iir.kiev.ua/index.php/ec_n/issue/view/163 (Access 18.02.2021).
- United Nations (1990) *International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, Article 2*. Available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/cmw.aspx> (Access 15.02.2021).

- Verbovyi, M. (2011) “Doktrynalni zasady mizhnarodnoi trudovoi mihrat-sii”, *Democratic governance*. Vol. 7, pp. 1–7. Available at: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/DeVr_2011_7_9 (Access 13.02.2021).
- Weinar, A. (2005) “Polityka migracyjna Polski w latach 1990-2003 – próba podsumowania”, *Raporty i Analizy Centrum Stosunków Międzynarodowych*. Vol. 10. Available at: www.csm.org.pl (Access 10.03.2021).