

University of Sussex
Sussex Centre for Migration Research

Internal and International Migration: Bridging the Theoretical Divide

Working Paper No 52

Russell King, Ronald Skeldon and Julie Vullnetari

Abstract

The interdisciplinary field of migration studies is riven with binaries, one of the most fundamental of which is its split into internal and international migration, characterised by different literatures, concepts, methods and policy agendas. Most migration scholars nowadays are researching international migration, even though, quantitatively, internal migration is more important. Yet the distinction between internal and international moves becomes increasingly blurred, not only because of geopolitical events and the changing nature and configuration of borders, but also because migrants' journeys are becoming increasingly multiple, complex and fragmented. Nevertheless, there remain both many similarities and many differences between these two 'migration traditions'.

The paper is in three main sections. First we present a schematic model which sets out 10 migration pathways which combine internal and international migration, and return migration, in various sequenced relationships. Second, we survey the limited literature which attempts to compare and integrate internal and international migration within the same theoretical framework – both general models and some case-study literature from Mexico. We consider three approaches where theoretical transfer seems to hold potential – systems analysis, studies of migrant integration, and the migration-development nexus. The final part of the paper looks in more detail at the case of Albania where since 1990 there has been contemporaneous mass emigration and internal migration. We deploy both quantitative and qualitative methods to examine the links between the two forms of migration in the Albanian context, demonstrating how closely they are entwined both in the macro-dynamics of regional

migration with its regime of passports, visas and border controls. Moreover, borders themselves can be mobile; they can appear or disappear, or move across people. The dismemberment of the Soviet Union and of Yugoslavia transformed erstwhile internal migrants into 'international' migrants or minorities (e.g. Russians in the Baltic States of the FSU, or Bosnians in Slovenia). This process is not unique to Europe (on which see King 2002) but also takes place in other parts of the world (see Adepoju 1998 on Africa; Skeldon 2006 on Asia).

The African example is particularly pertinent because of the way in which the demarcation first of colonial territories and then of new nation-state boundaries after independence in the 1960s has cut through areas across which there was once free movement based on ethnic or tribal affiliations, or on nomadic circuits.³ In some cases these mobilities have been allowed to continue; in other cases they have been blocked; in yet other cases differential development of adjacent states has stimulated new cross-border migrations which are economically driven; and in yet other cases again war, ethnic strife and genocide have triggered refugee migrations (see Adepoju 1998 for examples of all these). Indeed Zacharia and Condé (1981) maintain that, within Africa, emigration can be regarded as simply an extension of internal migration. Conceptually, according to these authors, both types of migration derive from the same set of fundamental causes: inequalities in development, employment prospects, incomes and living conditions between and within countries. Internal and international migration are thus complementary and can indeed supplement or substitute each other, according to changing political and economic circumstances. For West Africa, the volume of internal migration is estimated at twice that of international migration (Adepoju 1998: 389).

The third and final introductory point we wish to make concerns the variable stress on the differences vis-à-vis the similarities between internal and international migration. The African examples just cited emphasised similarities. The situation in other parts of the world may be very different. For Zolberg (1989: 405), international migration, especially to wealthy countries, inevitably brings in a political economy perspective which recognises the importance of international relations and the control that states exercise over their own borders; hence international migration is a 'distinctive social process' in which the container of the state has fundamentally different functions from a region or census tract within a country. Immigration controls and regulations have major implications for migrants in terms of the right to enter a country (through a visa for instance), to reside for a given length of time there, and to access citizenship rights such as education, employment, healthcare, political participation etc. Linguistic and cultural barriers often characterise international migration, although this is by

³ We acknowledge here the risk of reifying tribalism in any discussion of African migration and state borders; also the arbitrariness of nation-state boundaries is not unique to Africa.

outlined above as well as the global political economy of international migration. What we wish to do in this paper, rather, is to

1960s as a waiter, and then later moving to a provincial city to open his own restaurant, perhaps with the help of family members. Finally, pathway 5 combines 3 and 4 and sees the international move sandwiched by internal migrations both in the country of origin and destination.

We now examine in more detail the two main ways in which internal and international migration are sequenced: first, internal leading to international; second, international leading to internal. In

Veracruz etc.) to the 'hybrid' US/Mexico border cities and export-oriented zones aligned along it (see Cornelius and Martin 1993; del Rey Poveda 2007).

If we de-couple migration trajectories from the individual/family scale and look at

adjustment arising from the international move that sets international movers apart?' Literature on this migration sequence is rather limited, since it tends to be split into two separate fields of study: international migration, and internal population redistribution. The latter phase has been quite extensively studied by population geographers in the UK and USA; however their view has generally been less one of linking internal moves to the international moves that preceded them, and more one of seeing the internal mobility of international migrants and ethnic minorities within the frame of overall internal migration and regional population change (Belanger and Rogers 1992; Nogle 1994; Salt and Kitching 1992). To take one rather particular example, studies of refugees' internal migrations in the US, UK and Sweden have shown that their initial dispersal, designed to relieve pressure on capital cities, has been followed by secondary migration from peripheral locations to more favoured metropolitan locations where refugees often see better opportunities (Gordon 1987; Hammar 1993; Robinson and Hale 1990).

As with pathway 3, it is very difficult to get good empirical data on this dual migration process. Comparison of decennial census records can reveal both aggregate and pattern changes (e.g. between region Ya and Yb), but the precise nature of spatial change is obscured – in other words, an increase in migrants from country X resident in Yb and a (proportionate) decrease in Ya could be due either to internal migration of X's migrants from Ya to Yb, or to direct entry of international migrants to Yb. Two solutions respond to this problem: the availability of population registers which separately record the internal mobility of 'foreigners' or international migrants (e.g. Andersson 1996 for Sweden); or the analysis of linked census records such as the 1 per cent Longitudinal Study (LS) within Britain, used by Fielding (1995) and Robinson (1992).

Both Fielding and Robinson used the 1971-81 LS, which matches a sample of the

census returns for 1981 with the same individuals in 1971. The LS therefore allows the researcher to trace part of the life course of individuals (such as immigrants) from one census to another, and to compare certain recorded characteristics (such as socio-occupational status and location) with those of the population as a whole, or with other groups. Robinson (1992) found that immigrants from the Caribbean had low social and low geographical mobility over the period in question, whereas Indians and Pakistanis were highly mobile inter-regionally, especially the Indians who exhibited, over time, high rates of upward mobility into the middle class. Fielding (1995) carried out a more detailed and disaggregated analysis of Black and Asian social mobility – showing for instance that Asians moved strongly from 'blue collar' to 'petty bourgeois' occupational classes, whilst Afro-Caribbeans remained (relatively speaking and especially males) trapped in blue collar jobs with increasing unemployment – but he did not match these different immigrant social trajectories with geographical mobility, which can therefore only be inferred from the general finding validated in several other studies that 'upward mobility ... increases the likelihood of inter-regional migration' (Fielding 2007: 109).

The key question, then, is: how does the social mobility of immigrants map onto their geographical mobility within migrant-13 TD.00 and eae high ly mcontext-dependernt. Data 1Albnisns rn sltlysof d (1Kdg 2nd eMai20072;20074isns rae w the rmo mw4.3(ji-53(dly sis)per4.78(ed tf illy i4.7(wn the ntivelpopulation . Mre ver uhe yehave

anyway but to an adjacent or alternative region where the opportunities are better than they are at home, but not as good as in their first-preference destination area.

An entirely separate form of international leading to internal migration takes place within the sending country. Large-scale emigration from one particular set of regions creates a vacuum into which internal migrants from other parts of the country can move in another form of replacement migration.⁹ Here, one phase of (international) migration changes the geography and structure of opportunity within a country, thereby influencing subsequent migration phases. Cases of this phenomenon are noted for South Asian areas of high overseas emigration such as Mirpur (Pakistan), Kerala (India) and Sylhet (Bangladesh): in these areas shortage of labour due to emigration and to new wealth created by remittances has stimulated migration of poor workers from adjacent regions (Gardner 1995: 67-8, 279; Nair 1989: 353-6; Skeldon 2006: 25). De Haas (2007: 25-6) notes similar patterns of migration in Morocco, where internal migrant labourers from poorer villages and regions are attracted not only to the rural areas of origin of international migrants, but also to regional 'migrant boomtowns'. Here, internal migrants work primarily in the booming construction industry fuelled by investment in housing from international returnees.

Other links: adding return migration

Internal-then-international and international-then-internal are the two most obvious pathways linking the two forms of migration under examination, but other patterns are also evident, especially as multiple and mixed forms of migration and mobility become more common. Trajectory

5 – internal, then international, then internal again – is probably much more common than the limited research evidence to support it. Another important linkage occurs when internal and international migration take place simultaneously – from the same country, region or household. We shall discuss Albanian evidence on this presently, as well as comment on some of the possible factors which discriminate between internal and international migrants from the same place of origin.

A more complete refinement of the scheme portrayed in Figure 1 occurs when we add return migration, which produces another five trajectories to extend those outlined earlier.¹⁰ Pathway 6 is the simplest – a 'U-turn' back to the place of origin and departure. Pathway 7 is different: here the migrant left from Xa (e.g. rural southern Italy) but returns to Xb (e.g. industrial

4ove trajtowards

⁹ Of course, this can also occur internationally. Taking two examples from Southern Europe, mass emigration from Portugal created vacancies in the construction industry for immigrants from Cape Verde after the 1960s; and mass emigration from Sicily in the early post war decades opened up opportunities for immigration from nearby Tunisia into labour market niches in fishing and tourism (see Carling 2002; King and Andall 1999).

Finally, pathway 10 sees the returnee, an internal migrant before emigrating, return to a place which is neither the place of

Table 1
Returned emigrants to three Greek Cities by pre-migration residential history (data are percentages)

<i>Prior residential history</i>	<i>Athens n=220</i>	<i>Thessaloniki n=216</i>	<i>Serres n=131</i>
First 15 years of life:			
Athens	15.7	-	-
Thessaloniki	0.5	21.3	0.8
Serres	5.1	1.9	60.3
Other urban	13.4	16.7	3.1
Semi-urban			
Rural places	16.1	19.9	16.8
Prior to emigration:	49.3	40.3	19.1
Athens			
Thessaloniki			
Serres	48.6	0.9	5.3
Other urban	1.4	42.6	2.3
Semi-urban	2.3	0.9	71.8
Rural places	7.7	13.0	0.8
	10.9	14.8	11.5
	29.1	27.8	8.4

Notes: urban places have more than 10,000 inhabitants, semi-urban have 2,000-9,999, and rural places less than 2,000.

Source: Unger (1986: 142); survey data refer to 1980.

Finally, de Haas's (2006: 576) work on Morocco reveals similar patterns of linked internal and international migration via return, corresponding to pathway 7 of our diagram; i.e. international migrants originated from rural areas but settled in the regional capital and other regional towns upon their return.

Factors differentiating internal migrants from emigrants

Now we refocus our attention on the sending-country context and ask the question: what distinguishes international migrants (emigrants) from those who migrate internally? Research on Mexican migration provides one set of responses, although the picture is complicated by evidence, noted earlier, that many emigrants to the US are former internal migrants and that many families contain both internal and external migrants (cf. Lozano-Ascencio *et al.* 1999; Zabin and Hughes 1995). But this spatial division of household labour also reveals age/sex differences: with reference to Oaxacan migrant families in Baja California (northern

Mexico) and California (USA), Zabin and Hughes (1995: 410-13) found that migrants in California were more likely to be males and older. Aggregate data revealed that, whilst only 2 per cent of Mexican-US immigrant farm workers were under 18, the percentage amongst Oaxacan migrant farm workers in Baja was 32; the respective percentages of females in the two migrant populations were 19 and 50. Oaxacan migrant households allocate family members between Baja California and California in response to different work and wage structures, different child labour laws on either side of the border, and the dual social role of women as wage workers and primary providers of childcare. Finally, border crossing was regarded as physically and psychologically much more dangerous for women.

However, the special circumstances of this migration context must also be borne in mind. The expansion of labour-intensive export agriculture in Baja since the 1980s has turned the area into 'a school for *e/ Norte*' (Zabin and Hughes 1995: 413). Workers are attracted to Baja from southern Mexico by higher wages and regular work, but then after a few years many, especially men, cross the border where they can do the same work (but

confirm the relevance of all three theoretical standpoints. Good employment opportunities locally were significantly associated with lower out-migration both to the US and to other parts of Mexico, consistent with the neoclassical view. On the other hand, and supporting the 'new economics' paradigm, US migration was significantly higher from municipalities with abundant opportunities for small-scale investment. Thirdly, social networks were found both to facilitate migration and to deter competing types of migration (internal versus external). As for distinguishing between internal and international migration, the implications of this study are that emigration to and return from the US is a form of investment-oriented migration, whereas internal migration is a lower-risk strategy geared more towards household survival. Social networks are equally important for internal and international migration; and each acts to screen out the probability of the other kind of migration.

Somewhat similar results are gleaned from del Rey Poveda's (2007) three-way study of migration from rural Veracruz: to regional market towns, to the industrial estates along Mexico's northern border, and to the US. He finds (2007: 305) that migrations to local markets and to the border are generated by precarious economic conditions in the places of origin, whereas the determinants of international migration relate to the capability to put this more expensive and demanding migration into practice. These differences are reflected in the individual risk factors derived for each type of migration by multinomial logistic regression. US migrants are overwhelmingly male, with more years of education; they have more agricultural property (as an indicator of family resources) and are more likely to have a family history of migration. Consistent with these factors, they are much less likely to be part of the ethnic indigenous population or to come from communal *ejido* villages. Some of these features are also characteristic of migration to the border towns, but to a less marked extent. For local migration, distinguishing factors are high population density in

the township of origin and prior family connections to the destination place.

A final perspective from Mexico is provided by Stark and Taylor's (1991) analysis of 61 randomly selected households in the Pátzcuaro district of Michoacán state. Their focus is on the role of *relative* deprivation within the rural community as a possible predictor of non-migration, internal migration, and migration to the US. At an *absolute* level, US migrants were more likely to be male, have greater household wealth (land, animals, machinery etc.), come from larger families (but not be household heads), and have kin already in the US, when compared to either internal movers or non-migrants. Internal migrants were often 'intermediate' in socio-economic and demographic characteristics between the other two groups, except for stronger kin links to internal destinations and prior experience of internal migration. So far, this is consistent with findings reported above.

Interestingly, in this study, however, internal migrants had on average more years of schooling (6.5) compared to US migrants (4.1); non-migrants had 3.9 years. This last characteristic is relevant in explaining the somewhat surprising outcome of Stark and Taylor's analysis, namely that the households sorted themselves in terms of high returns to human capital yet high risk of increased relative deprivation (through low incomes) for internal migrants, and low returns to human capital (because of low-skilled jobs offered to immigrants in the US) yet low risk of increased relative deprivation (through high remittances) for international migrants. In other words, 'better-educated villagers are much more likely to migrate to (urban) destinations in Mexico, where returns to schooling are likely to be high, than to low-skill undocumented immigrant labour markets in the United States' (1991: 1176). Stark and Taylor's key empirical finding is that both absolute and relative deprivation are significant in explaining international migration, but they have no (direct) effects on internal migration behaviour. The authors conclude by pointing to an important policy outcome of

what they term the 'relative deprivation paradox of migration': economic development that does *not* address intra-village income inequalities may lead to more not less international migration, even if overall incomes rise in a distribution-neutral way (1991: 1177).

How does this Mexican evidence stack up against findings from elsewhere in the world? This is difficult to say because comparative studies on the two forms of migration are so few. An early study from the Philippines (de Jong *et al.* 1983) compared intentions to migrate from Ilocos Norte province to Manila and to Hawaii; note, this concerned intentions, not actual migration. The authors used a value-expectation framework alongside more conventional conditioning variables such as household demographic and economic characteristics, family and friendship networks, and personality traits such as risk-taking orientation. Results indicated that, compared to a control sample of stayers, intending migrants had more financial, human and demographic capital (i.e. more money, more years of schooling, larger families), more kinship contacts in destination places, more frequent travel to Manila (also valid for those intending to move to Hawaii), and a more sophisticated 'cognitive calculus' of the costs, benefits and risks of moving. Moreover, 'individually held expectations of attaining important values and goals ... differentiate intended movers to Hawaii from intended movers to Manila ... (Thus) the findings confirm the application of the general expectancy theory to not only the decision to move but also the decision where to move' (1983: 479).

Drawing from a range of mainly Latin American studies, including his own work on Bolivian migration to Argentina, Balán (1988) makes the following generalisations about the differences between internal and international migration. Those who are better off tend to migrate further (i.e. abroad) while those with fewer resources tend to be limited to internal migration. The higher costs (and risks) of international

migration largely explain the types of selectivity involved – for instance with regard to education and family contacts. Males are more predisposed to international migration than females, especially when the migration is temporary. Internal migration to cities shows a large presence of females. Interestingly, some of these generalising statements echo Ravenstein's laws of a century earlier.

Elsewhere in the literature, not all the bold statements about differentiating internal from international migration stand up to empirical scrutiny. For instance Kleiner *et al.*, in their promisingly-titled but ultimately disappointing paper, state that 'migration to another country is more irreversible than internal migration' (1986: 313), but the weight of evidence in the Mexican studies cited above, and from other research, for example in southern Italy (King 1988), tends to suggest the opposite.

Integrating internal and international migration theory

Two early attempts to link internal and international migration within a single theoretical-analytical framework are worthy of note. The first is Brinley Thomas's pioneering analysis of transatlantic migration from Britain in the nineteenth century, which correlated overseas migration with internal migration in Britain (positing an inverse correlation) and with alternating economic cycles in Britain and North America (Thomas 1954). Briefly, when Britain boomed and America was economically stagnant, domestic rural-to-urban migration in Britain was dominant; and when the cycles were the other way round, international moves from Britain to America were dominant. Thomas thus saw internal and international migrations as alternative strategies depending on the intermeshing of long-wave economic cycles in the two parts of the North Atlantic regional system. However, a major flaw in Thomas's analysis arose from the fact that much British migration to North America originated not from rural areas, as Thomas hypothesised, but from cities. We look to

Baines (1986; 1994) for a more accurate analysis of the historical relations between internal and international migrations in Britain, Europe and North America.

major emigration flows to available and attractive foreign destinations
small, but significant,

The second notable attempt to link internal and international migration within the same framework is found in Zelinsky's famous paper on 'the hypothesis of the mobility transition' (1971). Zelinsky drew on 1950s and 1960s modernisation theory and the notion of stages of migration to provide a logical framework for hypothesising connections between internal and international migration (Pryor 1975). In Zelinsky's own words (1971: 221-2), *'There are definite patterned regularities in the growth of personal mobility through space-time during recent history, and these regularities comprise an essential component of the modernization process'* (emphasis in original). Zelinsky decomposed mobility into international migration and various internal moves – rural-rural, rural-urban, inter-urban and circulation – that varied systematically and sequentially through the five stages of the mobility cycle: see Table 2. Underpinning this descriptive model was the parallel analogy with the demographic transition; hence the supply of potential migrants, as generated by shifting patterns of fertility and mortality, was combined with a discourse of 'modernisation' and 'development' to produce a staged evolutionary model. This model essentially represented a *post hoc* interpretation of how migration and development trends have been historically sequenced and linked over the past couple of hundred years or so in Western Europe.

Table 2
Zelinsky's model of mobility transition

PHASE I – Premodern traditional society

Little genuine migration and limited circulation, linked to 'traditional' practices such as land use, commerce, religious observation etc.

PHASE II – Early transitional society

massive movement from countryside to cities
significant movement of rural population to colonisation frontiers within the country, if such areas exist

Roughly contemporary with Zelinsky's
(1983) reappraisal of his earlier theoretical

that future studies of international migration may increasingly be able to illuminate the causes and consequences of internal migration' (1992: 162).

Pryor's paper can perhaps best be regarded as a road map for theoretical integration, for he nowhere concretely or empirically demonstrated how the two migration systems might be theoretically linked. Moreover, the course of migration scholarship over the last 20 years or so has if anything deepened the cleft between the two migration traditions. The 'age of (international) migration' (Castles and Miller 1993), the rise of the transnational approach since the early 1990s and the revival of studies of diasporic communities (Vertovec and Cohen 1999) clearly leave no room for internal migration except as a separate field of study. On the other hand, Pryor's plea for interdisciplinarity has not gone unheeded: recent years have witnessed a growth in the mutual recognition of the value of conceptual and methodological commonality and pluralism across the social sciences, perhaps nowhere more so than in the study of migration. As Robin Cohen (1995: 8) memorably writes, 'Those of us who have the migration bug recognize each other across disciplines and across nations, languages and cultures. We are part of the webbing that binds an emerging global society... We have found that our research is inadequate without moving to history and to other social science disciplines with which we had previously been unfamiliar ... We recognize that the study of world migration connects biography with history and with lived social experience'. Fine words indeed; but much of this interdisciplinary collaboration and cross-feeding has been in the field of international migration, facilitated by the global growth of interest in the theme and accompanying national and international research funding opportunities. Internal migration has faded into the backcloth and surely needs to be rehabilitated, for both its quantitative and theoretical importance.

We close this section of the paper by considering three instances in which some kind of theoretical transfer or fusion seems appropriate. These are just some examples; no doubt there are many others.

Systems

The first is systems analysis. 'System' is one of the most widely, and loosely, used words in the migration lexicon; indeed we have used it ourselves several times thus far in our paper. Its genealogy in -vthke migratī, 5 T

Despite the seminal status of Mabogunje's paper, his systems model has had very limited practical application in subsequent empirical research (see Poot 1986 for an exception). Several reasons can be suggested for this (Boyle *et al.* 1998: 78): data shortages, rigidity of the formulation of boundaries around the system in comparison to the greater fluidity of migration in real life, and limited recognition of the social element of migration networks (cf. Boyd 1989) in favour of a more mechanistic approach based on 'energy' in the system. In abstract terms, the systems approach is appealing, for it emphasises the dynamics of links and flows, causes and effects, adjustments and feedback. As a 'sophisticated descriptive method', it allows for any number of interrelationships to be built in, but in the absence of really good data the model cannot be fully operationalised and therefore cannot generate real results, explanations or theory (Zelinsky 1983: 33). This problem is even more evident when we note how widely the term's meaning has come to be stretched. In fact there is little consensus as to what constitutes a 'migration systems approach' (Fawcett 1989: 672). Frequent reference is made to the 'global migration system' (e.g. Kritz *et al.* 1992; Skeldon 1997: 42-59), to regional migration systems based on world areas such as Europe, North America, the Gulf, Southern Africa etc. (e.g. Castles and Miller 2003; Salt 1989), and to more local-scale (but maybe globe-spanning) family and chain migration systems (e.g. Lever-Tracey and Holton 2001).

Nevertheless we find the systems approach attractive and can see obvious possibilities for its application to the study of international migration, as well as to the challenge of integrating internal and international migration through different system layers and linkages. Some progress in applying the systems model to international moves has already been made. White and Woods (1980: 49-55) apply what they call an 'integrated systems approach' to the case of postwar labour migration into North-West Europe, based on a rather simple model of a structural context

(economic and political integration, demand for labour etc.), areas of origin and destination, and flows of migrants. Kritz and Zlotnik (1992) also draw on Mabogunje's ideas in their advocacy of a systems framework for studying international migration. Their migration systems comprise groups of countries linked by migration flows and exchanges whose importance is determined by their coherence and functionality. Such systems may be stable over time or, more likely, wax and wane, often rapidly, in response to political and economic changes. Kritz and Zlotnik also argue for the renewed importance of systems modelling in an era of enhanced mobility and global interdependence.

Pryor (1981: 122-3) describes some interesting work on Yugoslavian migration to, and return from, West Germany using a

1981: n g) f a m i l y

regulatoryi sy-ivex949gw [l0ngth study

As a final example, Nijkamp and Voskuilen (1996) use a systems approach to develop an explanatory framework for recent migration flows in Europe. Like the other studies mentioned above, they pay homage to Mabogunje, but acknowledge a greater role for historical and social factors in patterning and maintaining migration flows. In their own words:

It is widely recognized that most international migration flows do not occur randomly but usually take place between countries that have close historical cultural or economic ties. It is noteworthy also that most recent immigration flows are strongly linked to earlier flows of immigrants. Family reunification is one of the main reasons for migration, while also refugees look for countries where adoption and local absorption is best possible. Therefore social networks explain nowadays an important part of the direction of international migration (1996: 7).

Their systems model adapts Mabogunje's framework to the international context and, like its predecessor, has five components. Macro-structural conditions frame the system and lie outside the box of the model: politico-economic situation, population, transport and communications, and environment/quality of life are the four axes. Secondly are motives to move – economic motives (survival, wealth accumulation), social motives (status, social mobility),

America, there is a massive literature on immigrant integration (or, to use alternative terms, assimilation, acculturation or incorporation). The vastness and complexity of this literature defy effective summary. We react to this 'impossible task' by making one simple point: that much of this research on the integration of 'foreign' immigrants in their destination settings – usually cities – has a largely unexplored relevance to research on internal migration, especially rural-urban migration where such moves bring population groups together which have social, cultural, linguistic, ethnic and racial differences (or just some of these). It is a mistake to assume that internal migrants are necessarily more homogenous in terms of these characteristics than are international migrants: it is enough to think of the great migration of rural southern blacks to the burgeoning northern industrial cities of the US in the early decades of the last century to grasp this point. Even the rural-to-urban migrations which have characterised most European countries over the past 100-150 years brought rural folk face-to-face with an urban-industrial milieu that they found very strange and challenging, and often reacted to by living in regional-origin-based concentrations, and maintaining their own cultural traits, regional languages and dialects and links to their home regions. Much the same holds for internal migration situations in many developing countries in more recent decades.

What we do now is to pin-point some aspects and concepts of the integration/assimilation literature which appear to have relevance to the situation of internal migrants. We have in mind particularly those cases where the internal migration involves groups of people who are somehow 'different' from the setting in which they settle. In order not to proliferate references, we draw our ideas from recent overviews (Asselin *et al.* 2006; Bastos *et al.* 2006; Bauböck *et al.* 2006; Bommers and Kolb 2006; Castles *et al.* 2002; Heckmann 2005) rather than citing a lot of primary literature.

The integration process is commonly divided into a number of spheres – economic, social, cultural, political and spatial (Engbersen 2003). Heckmann (2005: 13-15) reorganises these into:

structural integration – the acquisition of rights and status within the core institutions of the host society, particularly access to employment, housing, education, health services, and political and citizenship rights;
 cultural integration (or acculturation) – refers to the cognitive, behavioural and attitudinal change of immigrants and their descendants in conformity to the norms of the host society;
 interactive integration – social intercourse, friendship, marriage and membership of various organisations;
 identificational integration – shows itself in feelings of belonging, expressed in terms of allegiance to ethnic, regional, local and national identity.

Heckmann (2005: 15) then defines integration in the following terms:

... a long-lasting process of inclusion and acceptance of migrants in the core institutions, relations and statuses of the receiving society. For the migrants integration refers to a process of learning a new culture, an acquisition of rights, access to positions and statuses, a building of personal relations to members of the receiving society and a formation of feelings of belonging and identification towards the immigration society. Integration is an interactive process between migrants and the receiving society, in which, however, the receiving society has much more power and prestige.

This definition is very much a mainstream or conventional view. It connotes both a normative condition which is somehow to be expected or desired, and a pathway towards that norm. Castles *et al.* (2002:

112-15) take a more deconstructionist stance. They point out that integration is a very contested term, and open to a variety of definitions and interpretations. Moreover it is a two-way process, requiring adaptation on the part of both the immigrant and the host society. They also pose the question: 'Integration into what? Are we referring to an existing ethnic minority, a local community, a social group, or [the national] society?' Of course the host society is not homogenous; it is structured and stratified in various ways, and it also has marginalised elements such as subcultures of poverty and welfare dependency, into which some immigrants may fall, thereby creating a situation of non-belonging or social exclusion from the wider society. This reminds us of Portes and Zhou's (1993) concept of segmented assimilation, mentioned earlier.

Heckmann acknowledges in his definition, but does not question, the hegemonic role of the host society. Castles *et al.* point out that in an open democratic society people have quite different lifestyles and values and hence different ideas about what constitutes the norm for that society or their participation in it. 'In a multicultural society marked by differences in culture, religion, class and social behaviour, there cannot be just one mode of integration', they write (2002: 114). These authors then go on to suggest that inclusion might be a more neutral and appropriate term.

All these debates – and here we are doing no more than picking at the surface – are commonly played out in the context of immigration, typically of poor immigrants into the urban, industrialised or post-industrial societies of 'the West'. But, if we read back over these definitions and frameworks, and change our mind-set from one of (foreign) immigration and national host society (in Europe, North America, Japan etc.) to one of internal migrants arriving in the cities of, say, Asia or Latin

The meaning of *social integration* is often widened to be coterminous with integration as a whole, i.e. comprising economic, political and cultural aspects. Here, partly following Asselin *et al.* (2006), we narrow the definition to include key structural integration dimensions such as housing, health and education as well as interaction variables such as friendship patterns, intermarriage and memberships of voluntary organisations. Given that much of the research on social integration thus defined is set within an urban context, tracing its lineage from the Chicago School and debates on assimilation, the ‘melting pot’ and its variants (see Glazer and Moynihan 1963; Gordon 1964; Park 1928 for some key studies), the parallels with internal, rural-urban migration are potentially close, although rarely drawn out in comparative studies. In practice, the socio-spatial integration pathways beaten in earlier times by internal migrants in major European cities are often followed at a later stage by international migrants – as studies of Athens have shown (Iosifides and King 1998; Leontidou 1990).

The *spatial dimension* of integration comes out more strongly in the now-long tradition of research by geographers and urban sociologists into residential segregation, much of which is quite technical and measurement-orientated. There is also a strong racist imprint within this research, linked partly to the legacy of ‘the ghetto’ but also focusing on the ‘visibility’ of populations which are, to a greater or lesser extent, segregated. The trope of race comes out quite strongly, for instance, in the comparative segregation studies collected by Huttman *et al.* (1991) on Western Europe and United States, where the differential migration histories of blacks in American cities and immigrants in European cities fades into the background.

About *political integration* there is perhaps less to be said, given that the political participation and citizenship rights of

international migrants are likely to be different from those of internal migrants. On the other hand, long-distance, rural-to-urban migrants moving, let us imagine, from interior China to coastal industrial cities, or from the Latin American countryside to capital cities, or from eastern Turkey to the *gecekondus* of Istanbul or Ankara, are all likely to be (or to feel) excluded from participation in the political life of the city or of the district or municipality, at least for a time.¹⁷ And studies of political transnationalism which focus on migrants’ political activities both ‘here’ (in the host society) and ‘there’ (in the origin country) have their parallel in the differential political activities exercised by internal migrants in their places of origin and destination – typically villages and small towns, and big cities respectively.

The sense in which migrants (internal or international) feel, or are made to feel, excluded from the life of the city links to the final sphere of integration, the *cultural* one, which relates most closely to Heckmann’s *identificational* integration. Common dimensions of cultural integration in studies of international migration are language and religion (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2006). These are less likely to be relevant in the case of internal migration but are by no means rare – think of migrants with different languages and religions moving within former Yugoslavia, or Andalusians in Barcelona. The point we would make here is that studies of interethnic relations and multiculturalism should not be restricted to immigrant groups of different national origins.¹⁸

¹⁷ In China the *hukou* or household registration system, whereby rights are tied to ‘official’ residence, has created, through internal migration, a vast ‘floating population’ that cannot access the normal housing, education and healthcare rights associated with urban citizenship (Li 2004: 681). Alexander and Chan (2004) liken the *hukou* system to South African *apartheid*. Meanwhile, in communist-era Albania, internal movements were highly regulated by the regime in an effort to fix the rural population *in situ* (Sjöberg 1994).

¹⁸ Indeed, if we follow Fielding (1992b) in his ‘culturalist’ reading of migration’s deeper meanings (migration as freedom, as joining in or opting out, as rupture, as success or failure etc.), the distinctions between internal and

Abruzzo region, yet the origin and mechanics of this regional business specialisation have never been explored.

Migration and development

The relationship between migration and development, especially from the perspective of less-developed sending countries, has recently become the focus of a fast-growing literature (for a few key overview studies see Ammassari and Black 2001; Lucas 2005; Skeldon 1997; Van Hear and Nyberg Sørensen 2003). As a result of this literature on what is often called the 'migration-development nexus', international migration is now widely viewed as having the potential to contribute to development and poverty alleviation. Many governments and development agencies are seeking ways to maximise the benefits of migration, e.g. through remittances and return migration, and minimise its costs (e.g. brain drain). Yet the focus of both scholars and policy-makers has tended to be almost exclusively on the relationship between (under)development and *international* migration, overlooking the fact that, in most developing countries, *internal* migration is

The second agenda question has already been mentioned above in our discussion of migration selectivity factors. The literature supports the generalisation that international migration normally has a much higher cost than internal migration (Massey *et al.* 1993: 461). Distances are greater, as are barriers to entry, especially if the migrant has no legal right to cross the border and to work. These costs are not just financial but also human and psychological – the costs of leaving and adapting to a new culture, of long-term separation from family and friends, of evading arrest etc. This affects networks, which in some cases are much stronger – precisely because they need to be – for international than for internal migration (Stark and Taylor 1991). This higher cost is however balanced by the expectation that earnings abroad will be higher, not only to justify and cover these costs, but also to attain higher goals. For instance, remittances from abroad are usually higher than internal remittances and their impact might also be more important. In his study of migration in Morocco de Haas (2006: 569-72) found that the impact of international remittances was by far more important at the family and the community level than that from remittances sent by internal migrants. Castaldo and Reilly (2006) likewise found that internal remittances in Albania were greatly outweighed by international remittances. However, this pattern is not always the case. Although internal remittances are not measured as often and as systematically as international transfers, at times they can have a greater impact on communities of origin, as noted in some parts of Asia (Deshingkar 2005; 2006). But fully rigorous and focused comparative studies of internal and international remittances have yet to be made. Widening the comparison to social remittances (Levitt 1998) – norms and behaviours communicated back to migrant origin areas, which might include views on gender and family size, or on consumption patterns – creates further research challenges in monitoring these ‘invisible’ flows from different social and cultural fields within the country and abroad.

The third generalisation concerns the way in which the internal vs. international distinction maps on to propensity to return. The cost logic expressed above leads to the conclusion that a move abroad is more likely to be long-term or irreversible because of the greater length of time needed to recuperate the higher expenses of migrating internationally (Kleiner *et al.* 1986: 313). Distances and costs of return may also be greater. Our feeling is that this need not always be the case; in fact, quite the reverse. Actually, much depends on the national contexts. Circular migration, common in Africa, self-evidently involves short-term absences in cities, mines or plantations and repeated returns to villages or tribal homelands (Gould and Prothero

the 1989-2001 intercensal period in order to explore differential spatial patterns of internal and external migration. Thirdly we move down to the individual famil

immigrants in Italy (in 1995 and 1998) and in Greece (1998), the 2001 round of censuses in these two countries, and the 1989-2001 intercensal migration residual calculated from the two Albanian censuses, all helped to give a more accurate picture of the size and distribution of the emigration. These different sources were not entirely consistent, but the broad scale of the migratory loss became clear.

The 1989-2001 intercensal calculation revealed a net migration of 600,000, mostly young adults aged 18-35, two-thirds of them males (INSTAT 2002: 19, 30). However, this excluded migrants who had been abroad for less than one year, as well as births to migrants which would have accrued to the census total had those individuals not migrated. Other estimates were somewhat higher: 800,000 from Barjaba (2000) and more than 1 million from the Government of Albania (2005) based on cross-checking with destination-country records. This latter compilation

indivmi991-92s wel mia nebrnm,mi997200che.2(JTJO -1.13 TD-.0.1692[(the sizcollapsf)Tja ses, a accle mecaankrupia nettergomeharf the

savings from working in Greece, Blendi has been able to buy a house in Tirana; the purchase has just been completed, and his sisters have moved in. He plans to return to live in Tirana, where the entire family, including his parents, who are both in their late 50s, will regroup; but he has no clear idea when this will be.

However, although this newly-acquired dwelling in Tirana will be the family home, it is expected that his sisters, when they get married, will move in with their respective husbands, according to the virilocal Albanian custom. The Tirana house will be the home of Blendi and his future wife and children, and his parents. This reflects the 'duty' in Albania of the (youngest) son to care for the parents in their old age.

Meanwhile, the parents still live and work in the village; they have not yet reached retirement age and so do not qualify for the (meagre) state pension. They live from a combination of semi-subsistence farming and remittances from their son. When the family regrouping in Tirana eventually takes place, the parents plan to alternate winters in the city with summers in the village. This is a pattern followed by many village elders whose children have migrated to Tirana; it also makes climatic sense since summers in Tirana are very hot and winters in the village very cold with frequent snow. It is interesting that the mother is keener to follow her children to Tirana than the father is.

Summing up, the family is split by migration in three locations: the village, Tirana and Athens. The game plan is to unite them all in Tirana when the brother return-migrates from Greece.

Next are *Qemal and Nevrez*, born 1933 and 1940 respectively. They live alone in the village since both their children have emigrated. Their son Skënder (born 1962) now lives in Milan with his wife and two young children, aged 8 and 4. Their daughter Leta (born 1966) lives with her husband and two children (aged 14 and 10)

in the United States. Let us follow each of these two adult children in turn.

Skënder lived in the village until he was 28, except for two years away on army service. He first tried to go to Italy by boat in March 1991, but the boat was intercepted and returned. Back in the village, he set off with a group of friends and walked over the mountains to Greece. He stayed there three years as an undocumented migrant, making occasional visits home, always clandestinely over the mountains. With the money he earned in Greece he bought a 'people-carrier' car and started a small business transporting people from the border crossing to various destinations in Albania and Kosovo. During these years (the mid-1990s) border traffic was quite intense due to the to-and-fro nature of migration from Albania to Greece.

At this point the family migration story gets more complicated! Some relatives of the family had moved to Tirana in 1992 and bought a piece of land on the edge of the city to build their own house. After Skënder returned from Greece the family decided to buy a plot of land near their relatives' plot in order to build a house there too. However the money at their disposal at that time was only enough for the land and the foundations. Skënder was working with his taxi but his earnings were not enough to progress the house beyond the ground floor. The taxi trade was falling off due to tighter border controls and the traffic police were demanding too many bribes. Meantime, in 1996 he got married to a woman from a neighbouring village, and they had a son a year later. In 2000 Skënder moved with his family to Milan; a daughter was born there soon after. The decision to move to Italy was partly influenced by his wife's two brothers who were already in Milan and told him how much better than Greece Italy was. Skënder worked in construction whilst his wife looked after the children and did occasional paid cleaning work. However, they did not have proper papers, which prevented them from returning to Albania to visit Qemal and Nevrez. Only in 2004 did they manage to get their papers in order,

and finally were able to make a return visit; Qemal and Nevrez saw their four-year-old granddaughter for the first time.

Skënder and his family are now settled in Milan and are content with their situation. With the earnings from Italy they have been able to complete the house in Tirana, adding the second floor. Their plan is to return there at some stage in the future, bringing up their parents from the village and thereby fulfilling the son's duty of care to his parents. For the time being Qemal and Nevrez continue to live in the village and the Tirana house is rented out, generating 20,000 Lek (€170) a month.

However, an eventual reunion in Tirana is only one end-game open to this family; another lies along the migration path of their daughter. Leta married a man from Korçë in 1990 and lived in that city until 2003 when, together with her family (husband and two children), she migrated to the US under the Green Card lottery system. Their economic situation in Korçë had been precarious, but has improved dramatically in America.

Qemal and Nevrez have applied for a visa to go to the US to visit Leta and her family but were unsuccessful as their daughter has to be resident there longer. Although they just want to go and visit initially, they may decide to move there long-term if they like it. In terms of Albanian family traditions, this is feasible because their son-in-law's parents, who would normally take precedence, are dead. Leta's husband's only surviving close relative is his brother, who also lives in America with his family. Once Leta has been in the US for five years, she can apply for citizenship and then for family entry for her parents. They cannot achieve family reunification with their son (the normal Albanian pattern) because Italian law does not permit elderly parents to join their migrant children in this way, and in any case the Milan flat is too small.

Our final case is *Ibrahim's family*. Ibrahim (born 1944) and his wife (1948) moved from their village to Korçë in 1993, a move

which was connected to the migration paths and marriage patterns of their children. They have three: two married daughters (born 1973, 1975), one living in Athens, the other in Florida, and an unmarried son, the youngest (born 1980).

The elder daughter married a man from Korçë and went to live with her husband's parents there in 1993; a daughter was born in 1994. Her husband had been migrating back and forth to Greece and continued this after the marriage, leaving his wife and daughter in Korçë. In 1997 the husband took his wife and daughter to live in Athens, where they have lived ever since, adding a son to their family in 2000. He works in a cosmetics factory (he used to work in construction, but he had an accident and now cannot do heavy manual labour), and she does domestic care work with elderly Athenians. They have recently bought a large apartment in Korçë.

The younger daughter also married a man from Korçë (in 2000) and straight after moved to Florida on a lottery visa; their daughter was born there in 2002. They both work for a local supermarket, he as a truck driver, she stacking shelves. These are not well-paid jobs by American standards, and besides, they have to pay childcare for their daughter so her mother can work. They plan to bring her husband's parents over to do the childcare, but this has to wait until she and her husband get US citizenship.

The son lived with his parents, first in the village and then in Korçë, until 2001. In Albania he worked as a driver taking people to and from the customs point at the Greek border, but earnings were low. He moved to Athens in 2001, where he works in construction and lives with his sister and

the economic conditions in Albania are more favourable. The eldest daughter also plans to return to Korçë, where she and her husband now have a spacious flat. Hence most of the family members will end up in Korçë: the parents as a result of a local-scale internal migration, the oldest daughter and the son via emigration to Athens. The younger daughter and her family, on the other hand, will not return; their future is set in the United States.

Brief lessons from the Albanian evidence

These three case-histories, although typical of many collected, do not represent the full spectrum of variation and linkages between different family members, different forms of migration (internal, international, temporary, permanent etc.) and different destinations. It also has to be acknowledged that these examples reflect the particular migration networks of southern Albania where, since 1990, there have been strong cross-border linkages to Greece. Compared to other parts of Albania, migration to the US is more important from southern Albania; some of this builds on much earlier migration links. On the other hand, movements to Italy and the UK are less prominent here than they are in Central and North Albania.

Nevertheless, much of what has been presented above in personalised and anecdotal fashion resonates with other studies on Albanian migration. Studies of Albanian migrants in Italy (King and Mai 2004) and in the UK (King *et al.* 2006) both reveal the importance of temporary migration to Greece as a 'first step' in order to finance further more ambitious migration journeys (Italy and beyond) as well as to lay the foundations for internal migration to Tirana or another major urban centre. Probably the most detailed endorsement of our findings (though there are some different perspectives too) comes from Labrianidis and Kazazi (2006) who, based on a questionnaire survey of 324 returnees from Greece (239) and Italy (85), analysed the relationships between migration origin, return migration destination, and internal

migration. These authors found that there was a marked trend for rural-origin migrants to settle in urban areas upon return, often after an interim spell in the origin village followed by a subsequent internal migration. However, they found little evidence of longer-distance internal redistribution: most returnees, whether they resettle in rural or urban destinations back home, did not shift outside of their home region.²⁵ Two other insights from Labrianidis and Kazazi (2006) are noteworthy. First, the combination of internal migration and urban-oriented return migration is leading to over-rapid urban expansion with concomitant strain on services and infrastructures. Second, heavy emigration from southern Albania has created a vacuum which is in part filled by poor internal migrants from the North-East.

Albania's contemporaneous mass emigration and internal migration over the short span of time since 1990 provides an excellent laboratory to study the interlinkages between the two types of movement. The statistical and mapping approach can yield a certain amount of insight, but only when case-histories are collected of individual migrants and their family contexts can we appreciate the full complexity at play. To use a recently-coined metaphor which we find very attractive, these migrants and their siblings, parents, children etc. engage in *fragmented journeys* (Collyer 2007) which can, on the one hand, owe much to chance (*viz.* Skënder's failed attempt to land in Italy followed by his successful entry to Greece), but on the other hand form part of a patchwork of

Conclusion

- groups in the suburbs: a re-examination of suburbanization and spatial assimilation, *American Sociological Review*, 64(3): 446-60.
- Alexander, P. and Chan, A. (2004) Does China have an apartheid pass system?, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30(4): 609-29.
- Allen, J. and Turner, E. (1996) Spatial patterns of immigrant assimilation, *Professional Geographer*, 28(2): 140-55.
- Ammassari, S. and Black, R. (2001) *Harnessing the Potential of Migration and Return to Promote Development. Applying Concepts to West Africa*. Geneva: IOM Migration Research Series, 5.
- Andersson, R. (1996) The geographical and social mobility of immigrants: escalator regions in Sweden from an ethnic perspective, *Geografiska Annaler*, 78B(1): 3-25.
- Asselin, O., Duseau, F., Fonseca, L., Giroud, M., Hamadi, A., Kohlbacher, J., Lindon, F., Malheiros, J., Marcadet, Y. and Reeger, U. (2006) Social integration of immigrants with with

- Boyle, P., Halfacree, K. and Robinson, V. (1998) *Exploring Contemporary Migration*. London: Longman.
- Brettell, C.B. and Hollifield, J.F. (2000) *Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines*. New York: Routledge.
- Buller, H. and Hoggart, K. (1994) *International Counterurbanization: British Migrants in Rural France*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Cadwallader, M. (1993) Commentary on Zelinsky's model, *Progress in Human Geography*, 17(2): 215-7.
- Carletto, G., Davis, B., Stampini, M. and Zezza, A. (2004) *Internal Mobility and International Migration in Albania*. Rome: FAO, ESA Working Paper 04-13.
- Carletto, G., Davis, B., Stampini, M. and Zezza, A. (2006) A country on the move: international migration in post-communist Albania, *International Migration Review*, 40(4): 767-85.

- Crul, M. and Vermeulen, H., eds (2003a) The Future of the Second Generation: The Integration of Migrant Youth in Six European Countries. Special issue, *International Migration Review*, 37(4): 965-1144.
- Crul, M. and Vermeulen, H. (2003b) The second generation in Europe, *International Migration Review*, 37(4): 965-86.
- de Haas, H. (2006) Migration, remittances and regional development in Southern Morocco, *Geoforum*, 37(4): 565-80.
- de Haas, H. (2007) *The Impact of International Migration on Social and Economic Development in Moroccan Sending Regions: A Review of the Empirical Literature*. Oxford: International Migration Institute, James Martin 21st Century School, University of Oxford. Working Papers, 3.
- de Jong, G.F., Abad, R.G., Arnold, F., Carino, B.V., Fawcett, J.T. and Gardner, R.W. (1983) International and internal migration decision making: a value-expectancy based analytical framework of intentions to move from a rural Philippine province, *International Migration Review*, 17(3): 470-84.
- de Jong, G.F. and Fawcett, J.T. (1981) Motivations for migration: an assessment and a value-expectancy research model, in Jong, G. F. and Gardner, R. W. (eds) *Migration Decision Making: Multilevel Approaches to Microlevel Studies in Developed and Developing Countries*. New York: Pergamon, 13-58.
- de Wind, J. and Holdaway, J. (2005) *Internal and International migration in economic development*. Paper presented to the Fourth Coordination Meeting on International Migration, Population Division of the UN, New York, 26-27 October.
- del Rey Poveda, A. (2007) Determinants and consequences of internal and international migration: the case of rural populations in the south of Veracruz, Mexico, *Demographic Research*, 16(10): 287-314.
- Deshingkar, P. (2005) Maximizing the benefits of internal migration for development, in Laczkó, F. (ed.) *Migration and Poverty Reduction in Asia*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Deshingkar, P. (2006) *Internal Migration, Poverty and Development in Asia*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies and Overseas Development Institute.
- Deshingkar, P. and Grimm, S. (2005) *Internal Migration and Development: a Global Perspective*. Geneva: IOM.
- Ellis, M. and Goodwin-White, J. (2006) 1.5 generation internal migration in the US: dispersion from states of immigration?, *International Migration Review*, 40(4): 899-926.
- Engbersen, G. (2003) Spheres of integration: towards a differentiated and reflexive ethnic minority policy, in Sackmann, R., Peters, B. and Faist, T. (eds) *Identity and Integration*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 59-76.
- Fawcett, J.T. (1989) Networks, linkages, and migration systems, *International Migration Review*, 23(3): 671-80.
- Fawcett, J.T. and Arnold, F. (1987) Explaining diversity: Asian and Pacific immigration systems, in Fawcett, J. T. and Carino, B. V. (eds) *Pacific Bridges: The New Immigration from Asia and the Pacific Islands*. New York: Center for Migration Studies, 453-73.
- Fielding, A.J. (1982) *Contemporary Migration and Development in Asia*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

- social mobility of 'immigrants' in England and Wales, *European Journal of Population*, 11(2): 107-212.
- Fielding, A.J. (2007) Migration and social mobility in national and international urban systems, in Geyer, M. S. (ed.) *International Handbook of Urban Policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 107-37.
- Frey, W.F. (1996) Immigration, domestic migration, and demographic balkanization in America: new evidence for the 1990s, *Population and Development Review*, 22(4): 741-63.
- Gans, H. (1992) Second-generation decline: scenarios for the economic and ethnic futures of the post-1965 American immigrants, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 15(2): 173-92.
- Gardner, K. (1995) *Global Migrants, Local Lives: Travel and Transformation in Rural Bangladesh*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Geyer, H.S. and Kontuly, T.M. (eds) (1996) *Differential Urbanization*. London: Arnold.
- Glazer, N. and Moynihan, D. (1963) *Beyond the Melting Pot*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Glazier, J. (1998) *Dispersing the Ghetto*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- migrants tend to return to their country of origin after all, in King, R., Mai, N. and Schwandner-Sievers, S. (eds) *The New Albanian Migration*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 93-117.
- Labrianidis, L. and Kazazi, B. (2006) Albanian return-migrants from Greece and Italy: their impact upon spatial disparities within Albania, *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 13(1): 59-74.
- Labrianidis, L. and Lyberaki, A. (2004) Back and forth and in-between: Albanian return-migrants from Greece and Italy, *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 5(1): 77-106.
- Lee, E.S. (1966) A theory of migration, *Demography*, 3(1): 47-57.
- Leontidou, L. (1990) *The Mediterranean City in Transition: Social Change and Urban Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lever-Tracey, C. and Holton, R. (2001) Social exchange, reciprocity and amoral familism: aspects of Italian chain migration to Australia, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(1): 81-99.
- Levitt, P. (1998) Social remittances: migration driven local-level forms of cultural diffusion, *International Migration Review*, 32(4): 926-48.
- Li, S. (2004) Population migration and urbanization in China: a comparative analysis of the 1990 Population Census and the 1995 National One Per Cent Sample Population Survey, *International Migration Review*, 38(2): 655-85.
- Light, I. and Bonacich, E. (1988) *Immigrant Entrepreneurs: Koreans in Los Angeles*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lindstrom, D. and Lauster, N. (2001) Local economic opportunity and the competing risks of internal and U.S. migration in Zacatecas, Mexico, *International Migration Review*, 35(4): 1232-56.
- Liversage, A. (2005) *Finding a Path: Labour Market Life Stories of Immigrant Professionals*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School PhD Series 34.2005.
- Logan, J.R., Alba, R. and Leung, S. (1996) Minority access to white suburbs: a multiregional comparison, *Social Forces*, 74(3): 851-81.
- Lozano-Ascencio, F., Roberts, B. and Bean, F. (1999) The interconnections of internal and international migration: the case of the United States and Mexico, in Pries, L. (ed.) *Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 138-61.
- Lucas, R.E.B. (2005) *International Migration Regimes and Economic Development*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Mabogunje, A.L. (1970) Systems approach to a theory of rural-urban migration, *Geographical Analysis*, 2(1): 1-18.
- Massey, D., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A. and Taylor, J.E. (1993) Theories of international migration: a review and appraisal, *Population and Development Review*, 19(3): 431-66.
- Nair, P.R.G. (1989) Incidence, impact and implications of migration to the Middle East from Kerala (India), in Amjad, R. (ed.) *To the Gulf and Back: Studies on the Economic Impact of Asian Labour Migration*. New Delhi: International Labour Organisation, 344-64.
- Nijkamp, P. and Voskuilen, M. (1996) International migration: a comprehensive framework for a survey of the literature, *European Spatial Research and Policy*, 3(1): 5-28.
- Nogle, J.M. (1994) Internal migration for immigrants to Canada, *International Migration Review*, 28(1): 31-48.
- Park, R.E. (1928) Human migration and the marginal man, *American Journal of Sociology*, 33(6): 881-93.
- Piore, M.J. (1979) *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor and Industrial Societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Poot, J. (1986) A system approach to modelling the inter-urban exchange

- of workers in New Zealand, *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 33(3): 249-74.
- Portes, A. (1997) Immigration theory for a new century: some problems and opportunities, *International Migration Review*, 31(4): 799-825.
- Portes, A. and Bach, R.L. (1985) *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, A. and Zhou, M. (1993) The new second generation: segmented assimilation and its variants among post-1965 immigrant youth, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530: 74-96.
- Pryor, R.J. (1975) Migration and the process of modernization, in Kosiński, L. A. and Prothero, R. M. (eds) *People on the Move: Studies on Internal Migration*. London: Methuen, 23-37.
- Pryor, R.J. (1981) Integrating international and internal migration theories, in Kritz, M. M., Keely, C. B. and Tomasi, S. M. (eds) *Global Trends in Migration: Theory and Research on International Population Movements*. New York: Center for Migration Studies, 110-29.
- Rath, J. (ed.) (2002) *Unravelling the Rag Trade: Immigrant Entrepreneurship in Seven World Cities*. Oxford: Berg.
- Ravenstein, E. (1885) The laws of migration, *Journal of the Statistical Society*, 48(2): 167-227.
- Ravenstein, E. (1889) The laws of migration, *Journal of the Statistical Society*, 52(2): 214-301.
- Robinson, V. (1992) The internal migration of Britain's ethnic population, in Champion, T. and Fielding, T. (eds) *Migration Processes and Patterns. Vol 1: Research Progress and Prospects*. London: Belhaven, 188-200.
- Robinson, V. and Hale, S. (1990) Learning the hard way: the government programme to resettle the Vietnamese refugees in the UK, *Espace, Population, Sociétés*, 1990-2: 207-20.
- Rodríguez, V. and Egea, C. (2006) Return and the social environment of Andalusian emigrants in Europe, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 32(8): 1377-93.
- Salt, J. (1989) A comparative overview of international migration trends and types, *International Migration Review*, 23(3): 431-56.
- Salt, J. and Kitching, R. (1992) The relationship between migration and development, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*

at the international conference on Migration and Development: Future Directions for Research and Policy, New York, Social Science Research Council, 28 February - 2 March.

Sriskandarajah, D. (2005) *Migration and Development*. Geneva: Global Commission on Migration.

Stampini, M., Davis, B. and Carletto, G. (2005) *Familiar Faces, Familiar Places: the Role of Family Networks and Previous Experience for Albanian Migrants*. Rome: FAO ESA Working Paper 05-03.

Stark, O. and Taylor, J.E. (1991) Migration incentives, migration types: the role of relative deprivation, *The Economic Journal*, 101(408): 1163-78.

Stouffer, S.A. (1960) Intervening opportunities and competing migrants, *Journal of Regional Science*, 2(1): 1-26.

Thomas, B. (1954) *Migration and Economic Growth: A Study of Great Britain and the Atlantic Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomson, M. and Crul, M. (2007) The second generation in Europe and the United States: how is the transatlantic debate relevant for further research on the European second generation?, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(7): 1025-41.

Todaro, M.P. (1976) *Internal Migration in Developing Countries*. Geneva: International Labour Office.

90 Esc. 714/26 from West[(.rmanyon?,)]TJ/TT8 1 TJ0 -1.13 TD.0002 Tc0 TEkislansnce

- (ed.) *Population Movements: Their Forms and Functions in Urbanization and Development*. Liège: Ordina Editions, 19-46.
- Zelinsky, W. (1993) Reply to commentary on Zelinsky's model, *Progress in Human Geography*, 17(2): 217-9.
- Zelinsky, W. and Lee, B. (1998) Heterolocalism: an alternative model of the sociospatial behaviour of immigrant ethnic communities, *International Journal of Population Geography*, 4(4): 281-98.
- Zeza, A., Carletto, G. and Davis, B. (2005) Moving away from poverty: a spatial analysis of poverty and migration in Albania, *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans*, 7(2): 175-93.
- Zhou, M. (1992) *New York's Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of an Urban Enclave*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zolberg, A. (1989) The next waves: migration theory for a changing world, *International Migration Review*, 23(3): 403-30.

Appendices







