

Towards a New Map of European Migration

Russell King*

Sussex Centre for Migration Research and School of European Studies, University of Sussex, UK

ABSTRACT

Students of European migration have been hampered by the legacy of those established forms of migration which have been historically most important – settler migrations from Europe to the Americas, guest-worker migrations from the Mediterranean Basin to Northern Europe, and refugee migrations after the World Wars. We need to appreciate that many of the key questions that were asked to frame our understanding of the functioning of migration now have a very different array of answers from the largely economic ones which shaped our earlier analyses. Now, new mobility strategies are deployed to achieve economic and, importantly, non-economic objectives. In the new global and European map of migration, the old dichotomies of migration study – internal versus international, forced versus voluntary, temporary versus permanent, legal versus illegal – blur as both the motivations and modalities of migration become much more diverse. In offering an overview of the new typologies and geographies of international migration in Europe, this paper will be less a rigorous cartography than a qualitative exploration of a changing typology including migrations of crisis, independent female migration, migration of skilled and professional people, student migration, retirement migration and hybrid tourism-migration. These relatively new forms of migration derive from new motivations (the retreat from labour migrations linked to production), new space-time

flexibilities, globalisation forces, and migrations of consumption and personal self-realisation. More than ever, this multiplex nature of human migration and spatial mobility demands an interdisciplinary approach, enriched wherever possible by comparative studies. Copyright © 2002 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Received 7 March 2001; revised 6 July 2001; accepted 1 September 2001

Keywords: Europe; migration; interdisciplinary approach

INTRODUCTION

Established forms of international migration which have historically been very important (nineteenth-century settler migrations from Europe to the Americas, post-war guest-worker migration from the Mediterranean to northwest Europe, refugee migrations post-World Wars) have for too long now shaped our thinking about how migration is conceptualised and theorised.¹ These migrations, and their conceptual codification by writers ranging in time from Ravenstein (1885, 1889) to Sjaastad (1962), Lee (1966), Harris and Todaro (1970) and White and Woods (1980), have led to the assumption, or at least the inference, that all migrants are poor and uneducated. This assumption, when applied to European (and other) migrations today, leads to false characterisations: for instance, to the notion that the essence of a definition of a migrant is someone who is poor, uprooted, marginal and desperate; or to the automatic assumption that all migrants from, say, Bangladesh, the Philippines, Senegal or

* Correspondence to: R. King, School of European Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9SH, UK.

Albania are uneducated and therefore somehow socially inferior to the members of the host societies with whom they interact.²

We therefore need to appreciate that many of the key questions that were frequently asked in order to frame our understanding of the functioning of migration as a historically ubiquitous social process (Why does migration take place? Who migrates? What are the spatial and temporal patterns of flows? What are the effects of migration on the places of origin and destination and on the migrants themselves?) now have a different array of answers than the mainly economic and political ones which shaped our earlier analyses. Even where economic rationales remain paramount, new mobility strategies are deployed to achieve the economic (and other) objectives.

In this paper I attempt to offer an overview of some new geographies and typologies of international migration in Europe. My analysis will not be a rigorous mapping of the new flows, but rather a qualitative, even intuitive, exploration of a range of new, and not-so-new, types of migration and mobility. These relatively new forms of migration derive from new motivations at both macro- and micro-level (the retreat from those Fordist-type migrations which were linked to mass production, and from an individual desire to see migration as a route to a stable industrial job), new space-time flexibilities, various new globalisation forces and new international divisions of labour, and changing views of consumption and self-realisation. Amongst these changes in migration types, patterns and motivations, there are important implications for defining and studying migration which tend to blur further the never-straightforward boundary between migration and mobility, and to melt away some of the traditional dichotomies which have shaped the study of migration in the past. I propose to deal with some of these conceptual and methodological questions first, and then turn to the new geographies and typologies of migration in Europe.

TOWARDS A MORE INTEGRATED APPROACH TO MIGRATION STUDIES

Despite a long history of scholarly study into the field, today migration still tends to remain

a dichotomised and fragmented area of enquiry.

More than 30 years ago the sociologist Clifford Jansen (1969: 60) wrote that migration is a problem of many disciplines: it is essentially *geographical*, involving human movement across space, influencing and changing the environments of both the places of arrival and of departure; it is *demographic*, since it affects the structures of the populations at both origin and destination; it is *economic* to the extent that many shifts in population (especially of workers) are due to economic imbalances between areas; it may be a *political* problem, where states feel the need to control or restrict departure or entry of international migrants and refugees; it involves *social psychology* inasmuch as migrants' motives for leaving and their problems of adapting to the new host society have to be studied; and it is a *sociological* phenomenon since the social structure and cultural systems, again both in the places of origin and arrival, are affected by migration, and in turn affect the migrant.

Anthropologists might feel offended at being left out of the above list, but to some extent their fields of enquiry have been subsumed by Jansen under his definition of migration as a sociological phenomenon; nevertheless, the important recent research by anthropologists on a wide range of migration-related issues to do with culture, identity, transnationalism and gender deserves more prominent mention here (even if nearly all of it post-dates Jansen's overview). And the above list is by no means exhaustive, given the interest shown in migration studies by historians, lawyers and human rights specialists, social policy analysts, philosophers, literary and media scholars and others. As the map of learning constantly evolves, so fresh perspectives are opened up; in recent years, for instance, migration has come to be seen as a crucial element in cultural studies.

The need, therefore, is for an interdisciplinary (rather than a cross-disciplinary or a multidisciplinary) synthesis which brings together and *integrates* a range of perspectives, frameworks, theoretical stances and methodologies in order to study migration (or the various forms of migration) in a manner which is holistic (embedding migration in its social

context) and which recognises its multifaceted diversity. This sounds like a challenging agenda, but it can be (and is being) achieved.³ Too often, on the other hand, does one read papers which attempt to 'model' or 'explain' migrant behaviour by reference to economic or psychological variables which seem to have scant linkage with the reality of the migrant experience in the specific context in which they are being studied; too often are the economic data upon which some analyses are built insufficiently scrutinised (if they are questioned at all) for the accuracy and relevance of the sources. Too often, also, does one come across qualitative research which has insufficient claim to rigour or representativeness; the insights might be valid for the group studied, but often the reaction is – so what? The results generated by a given micro-scale study may be very different from those of similar groups studied elsewhere, but comparative analysis – necessary for migration studies to reach a mature stage as a 'unidisciplinary' or 'post-disciplinary' branch of the social sciences and humanities – is too often lacking.

The interdisciplinary study of migration is only achieved over time: by studying migration assiduously in different contexts, by having benefited from an interdisciplinary formation (something not easy to achieve within the UK university system), and by wide reading and engagement with migration scholars from different disciplinary and interdisciplinary backgrounds. The objective is to overcome single-discipline narrowness – for instance, by exposing the lack of reality and humanity in many econometric studies or by critiquing the myopia of folkloric studies carried out in some tiny corner of the world – and also to be open-minded towards the numerous ideological paradigms which often underlie discipline-based studies (neo-classical economics, Marxist sociology, systems theory in its various forms, theories of transnational identity or hybridity, etc.). Further barriers to an holistic, synthesising study of migration are posed by the division of the migration process into its many fragmented component stages (departure, arrival, return) and by the hegemonic role of national models and discourses of immigration and ethnicity (assimilation, integration, multiculturalism, *ius*

sanguinis, etc.). In short, disciplinary and paradigmatic closure are the enemy of an effective, sympathetic study of human migration (Castles, 2000: 15–25).

DECONSTRUCTING THE BINARIES OF MIGRATION

New forms of mobility and migration, and new integrated ways of studying these mobilities, also imply a reappraisal of the long-standing heuristic divides within the field of migration study. As will become more specifically apparent later on, we need to deconstruct traditional migration dichotomies – or migration dyads as Cohen (1995: 6) calls them. Whilst these binaries perhaps continue to have some use for the beginner to construct a mental map of the field of migration studies, they are less solid devices for understanding migratory phenomena in Europe in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. What are these dichotomies? I would list the following.

Process and Product

The field of migration studies consists of two rather distinct branches and, hence, two rather separate literatures: the study of the actual *act* of migration as movement across space (often undertaken by geographers and economists); and the study of the ethnic communities and diasporas that are the *product* of migration (analyses of integration, ethnic relations, cultural characteristics, etc.). Although these two subfields of migration studies are analytically distinct, the linkages between them have been insufficiently explored. Now this is beginning to be rectified by longitudinal or life-history approaches that trace the migrant from origin to destination (and, where relevant, back again), linking pre- with post-migration characteristics, sometimes across more than one generation, and often employing a social networks approach. According to Castles, this dynamic whole, which encompasses all aspects of the *lived reality* of migrants:

'may be referred to as the *migratory process*, a term which underlines that migration is not a single event (i.e. the crossing of a border) but a life-long process which affects all

aspects of a migrant's existence, as well as the lives of non-migrants and communities in both sending and receiving countries.' (Castles, 2000: 15–16)

One might also add that migration influences the lives of other migrants in the destinations. The study of *transnational communities*, for many scholars the new migration paradigm of the last half-dozen years, affords an integration of patterns of movement within the establishment, maintenance and evolution of migrant communities in two or more countries (Glick Schiller *et al.*, 1995; Portes *et al.*, 1999; Pries, 1999; Faist, 2000).

Internal versus International Migration

We have another primary distinction between studies of *internal* and those of *international* migration. Again, rather separate literatures have evolved, with somewhat different conceptual frameworks and models.⁴ Only very recently has research begun to link the two scales: searching for common conceptual models; noting how internal migration is often sequenced or interleaved with international migration; examining how international migrants and ethnic minorities are mobile within the host countries; and realising that, as nation-states become less important, so the distinction between internal and international mobility becomes blurred. This is obviously the case within the European Union, and has particular meaning for third-country nationals for whom different types of European boundaries (e.g. within and outside 'Schengenland') present different (im)permeabilities for their movement and access to rights.

Studies of migration that focus on the household or family have often noted how, within such a unit, different individuals migrate in different ways to different destinations, both internal and international. Often such a division of labour in migration may be gendered, with a difference between men and women as to who goes abroad and who migrates internally.

Another blurring of the difference between internal and international migration occurs when international borders change. The break-up of Yugoslavia or the former Soviet Union,

or the unification of Germany, are examples of significant international frontier shifts which affect migration status, in effect turning internal migrants into international movers, and vice versa. This raises an interesting question: are there internal migrants who are destined to become international migrants at some stage in the future, not through actual movement but through some hitherto unforeseen political event?

Voluntary versus Forced Migration

There is a commonly-used distinction between *voluntary* and *forced* migration. This is the dichotomy used to structure Aaron Segal's *Atlas of International Migration*, for instance, together with a third part on *diasporas* (Segal, 1993). Whilst it is easy to think of migrations which are unequivocally forced (slave migrations, or migrations of 'ethnic cleansing' or of religious persecution), as well as those which are unequivocally voluntary (such as Northern European retirement migrants who settle on the Costa del Sol), in practice many migrations are not so easily categorised. Is a young Filipina woman sent by her family to work as a domestic helper in Rome or Madrid a voluntary or a forced migrant? Segal classifies Asian indentured migration as voluntary – a highly dubious categorisation. Clearly there is a complex continuum of coercion and free-will in migration decisions, as some later examples will testify.

Such a continuum might contain the following stages:

- Migrants of 'free will', who choose to migrate to satisfy largely non-economic life-choice ambitions – for a better education, or to retire to a pleasant scenic or climatic environment.
- Migrants who are encouraged or 'pushed' to migrate by life circumstances, such as 'economic migrants' seeking to avoid unemployment and very low incomes by seeking better-paid jobs abroad.
- Migrants who are more or less compelled to migrate by circumstances which are largely beyond their control – extreme poverty, famine, environmental crisis, political chaos, inter-ethnic tension, etc.

- People who are forced to migrate by others and who therefore have no control over their decision to move – slave migrations, refugees fleeing to save their lives, extradition, abduction, forced repatriation, or children taken abroad by their parents.

However, even between these four types there are blurred boundaries between the 'migration forces' of free-will, encouragement, virtual compulsion and force exerted by violence or threat. Moreover, both 'forced' and 'voluntary' migrants can use similar means of migration (e.g. clandestine border crossing by smugglers) and can have similar impacts on destination areas.

Temporary versus Permanent Migration

Next, we can make a basic distinction between *temporary* migration (followed by return) and *permanent* migration (where there is no return).⁵ This seems a simple enough distinction, but often the intention (to emigrate for good, or to return sooner or later) is quite different from the outcome. Also, there are different degrees of temporariness: one year, five, twenty. Return migrants to Greece are defined by the Greek government as those who have lived abroad for at least one year and been resident back in Greece for at least a year, whereas return studies of the Mexico–US labour migration are based on the notion of return to Mexico after 'settlement', this being defined as three years continuous residence in the United States (Massey *et al.*, 1987: 310; King, 2000: 9). But the time–space continuum of migration/mobility is truly continuous; threshold levels are arbitrary tools for statistical measurement (and perhaps too for policy), but they can obscure more than they reveal. For migrants they can have real significance as they trigger residency, citizenship or other rights. Seasonal and shuttle migration of a to-and-fro kind (weekly, monthly, occasional) must also fit into the continuum, blurring the distinction between migration and other forms of spatial mobility which, although they may not be regarded as 'conventional' migration, nevertheless carry similar sorts of motivation (for instance, economic) and intentionality.

Psychologically, many longer-term migrants

are torn between the desire to return and the desire (or need) to stay: the 'myth of return' (Anwar, 1979) is just one way of expressing this ambivalence. Another is the notion of 'being a migrant' becoming a permanent state of mind: a true home doesn't exist any more. Perhaps we can call this a state of 'migrancy' (Chambers, 1994). The construction of transnational communities can be seen as another expression of this condition of being neither (or both) 'here' and 'there', with the migrant moving back and forth across and within this transnational social and cultural space. For yet others, the true return can never take place, for home is another time, another place – held in the memory by nostalgia but not recoverable because of changes which have occurred in the meantime.

Legal and Illegal Migration

Reflecting the renewed globalisation of migration over the last 20 years, and the increasing perception – in some quarters – of migration as a 'crisis' and 'unwanted' (hence the growing discourse of 'migration control'), we can distinguish between *legal* and *illegal* migration. Whilst this may be an easy distinction to defend in strictly legal terms, once again the dichotomy fails to match many aspects of contemporary migratory reality. Many are unhappy with the term 'illegal' and prefer terms such as 'irregular' or 'undocumented'. There are many ways of interpreting the growth of 'illegal' movement. For some it represents the growing undesirability of 'mass' migrations and the need to control and manage migration in the face of apparently increasing pressures for people to migrate. For others it is almost the reverse – a reflection of the fact that the 'natural forces' of migration will always overcome regimes of control and containment. Hence, is it something to be repressed or a phenomenon to be creatively managed? Moreover, the boundary between legality and illegality is easily crossed. An amnesty or a regularisation law may transform illegal into legal immigrants virtually overnight. Or an apparently unproblematic legal migrant may suddenly become illegal the moment he or she becomes unemployed, is suspected of a petty crime, or fails to

renew the permit to stay. Furthermore, a 'legal' migrant may work in the 'illegal' (or informal) economy; or an 'illegal' migrant may work without hindrance in the legal or formal economy. And who defines a migrant as an 'illegal'? The country of origin, of destination, of transit, or some international organisation?

Blurring the Distinction

To sum up this part of the discussion, the multiplicity and variety of types of migration and movement observable today blur the distinction between the migratory dyads, turning them into continua and mixing them up into new matrices and combinations rather than preserving them as readily identifiable polar types. The old certainties – if ever they were certainties – disappear. How voluntary is voluntary migration? How temporary is temporary? What is meant, exactly, by illegal migration? How is movement within the EU's 'Schengenland' to be defined: as internal or international migration? For individuals who are frequently on the move, circulating between two or more countries, according to fixed or irregular rhythms and circuits, are they engaging in 'true' migration? Or is this some other kind of spatial mobility?

Finally, I address the wider question: is migration the *exception* or the *norm*? On a world scale, about 150 million people are reckoned to be international migrants, less than 3% of the world's population (International Organization for Migration, 2000: 5). On the other hand, in Europe (and other parts of the more developed world), only a minority of people are born, live their lives, and die in the same community or settlement; some kind of migration inevitably takes place. I wonder how many of you, reading this paper, have never engaged in some kind of migration. We should also remember that there are many people and cultures in the world whose very existence is based on migration or on a history of migration: nomads, transhuman shepherds, Roma, international business executives, and so on. So are migrants therefore still to be regarded as the 'others' who are different from 'us'? Or is it the case that all of us are, in some way or another, migrants or the product of migration? Is it not the case that migrants are the perfect

exemplars of the post-modern condition? And if so, does this not bring migration studies from the fringes of the social sciences and the study of humanity in to its very core? The post-modernist emphasis on permeability of borders, connectivities and identities lends itself by nature to the study of migration; and the study of migration, in response, shifts its focus to a new emphasis on culture, subjectivity and identity, reflecting the general cultural turn in the social sciences in the past couple of decades (Cohen, 1995: 8).

NEW MOTIVATIONS AND SETTINGS FOR MIGRATION

At a more concrete level, new connectivities, new space-time flexibilities, and the embedding of migration/mobility within the forces of globalisation, have served to blur the correlative conception of migration as a measurable spatio-temporal phenomenon (i.e. a movement across a threshold distance for a specified threshold of time). New mobilities have emerged which confound the conventional divide between migration on the one hand and other forms of human spatial mobility on the other – travel, tourism, circulation, commuting. Globalisation and the post-1989 New World Order create new geographies of movement into and around Europe – from new globe-spanning migrations which have no historical precedent, to local-scale cross-border dynamics where none existed for half a century before.

The motivations, too, have fundamentally changed. Under the earlier migration epochs of European transatlantic settlement and post-war European labour migration, linked to the relatively fixed parameters of the respective productive regimes of colonialism and Fordism, the migration variables were more or less certain – the destination, the type of job, the level of pay, the means of transport, the likelihood of stay or return. Now migrants' motives, and the outcomes of their actions, are far more diverse, as are their geographical origins, destinations, routes and modes of travel. As 'Fortress Europe' imposes its own logic of migration control, new migration processes and patterns open up, driven by new market dynamics. Migration has become

a new global business with a constantly shifting set of agents, mechanisms, routes, prices and niches. Very different from the Fordist labour migration system of Europe in the 1960s and early 1970s, the new migration regimes of the 1980s and 1990s were based on fast-evolving European and global conditions: the escalation of push pressures from the global South, the new-found economic prosperity of southern Europe (combined with ease of entry), and the removal of the Iron Curtain as a barrier to emigration (only for it to be partly replaced by a West European set of barriers to immigration including a new 'Fortress Europe' frontier along the border of the former Soviet Union). Episodic migrations of crisis and flight from political turmoil and environmental catastrophe add to the cocktail of new migration factors.

Consistent with the post-Fordist 'privatisation' of migration and with the creation of a kind of 'migration plc' come other market concepts: growth in the number of agents, intermediaries, traffickers, and a pricing structure for each route, each origin nationality and each destination country. Within this new privatised, semi-illegal international migration regime, some migrants set off with no particular destination country in mind: they go where the agents and smugglers take them, or abandon them. Others are able quite explicitly to 'shop' for opportunities and destinations, measuring the costs and benefits of risk, insecurity, quality of life, anticipated income, cultural (un)familiarity, and existence of social and kin contacts.⁶

These types of migrant, described above, are still largely to be characterised as 'economic migrants' although they do differ from the classic 'labour migrant' type where recruitment is managed by the host country. Another difference is the diverse educational, skill and status levels of recent immigrants to Europe, whether they come from (say) Morocco, Kurdish areas of Iraq or Bangladesh. Many are highly educated and some have considerable professional experience, but the opportunities available to them are severely restricted to the low-status jobs rejected by West European nationals. Rhode (1993) has described this phenomenon as 'brain waste'; highly educated migrants and refugees are attracted

to menial jobs in Europe because the pay they get, even for cleaning houses or selling newspapers at street corners, is much higher than pursuing a professional career in their home countries where jobs are often extremely scarce and incomes very low and unreliable.

Yet, perhaps reflecting their more educated background and their possession of a kind of anticipatory socialisation into West European culture by their consumption of global media and images of Western lifestyles, their motives are not necessarily purely economic. For many of these migrants, moving to Europe, by whatever means (and often the price is very high), is part of a dream of self-realisation. Their migration may be a gesture of escape, an adventure, a rite of passage (King, 1996). Shuttleworth and Kockel (1990), in their study of young Irish emigrants, have described this type of emigration as 'emigration as walk-about'. Hence to the traditional economic motivation of labour migration we add other rationales: excitement, experience, leisure, 'seeing the world'. Migration itself becomes a desirable act rather than an economic means to an end: a consumption good rather than a strategy which satisfies the production needs of another country's economy or the private survival needs of an individual migrant; and the projection of an individual's identificatory experience beyond what are perceived as the restricting confines of his or her own country.

NEW EUROPEAN MIGRATIONS: SOME EXAMPLES

To list fully all 'new' forms of migration affecting Europe is beyond the scope of this paper, quite apart from the issue of what is new and what is not. What I have tried to do in the preceding sections of the paper is to set out some of the new contexts for recent migratory phenomena and to link these to the need for changing approaches to how we define and study migration/mobility. Let us now be more specific and examine a selection of new migration types and flows in Europe. The following is by no means an exhaustive list and is subject to the caveats drawn above. The list extends and elaborates some of the types identified by Cohen (1997) and its time-frame is roughly the last 15 years, since the European

migrations of Fordism, family reunion and post-Fordist economic restructuring (King, 1993a; Blotvogel and King, 1996; Koser and Lutz, 1998).

Migrations of Crisis: Refugee, Irregular and 'Illegal' Migrations

One of the main features of the global and European map of migration since the mid-1980s has been the strong growth in refugee migrations, especially in respect of people who do not satisfy the 1951 UN convention definition of a 'well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion', and who are thus condemned to remain asylum-seekers or displaced persons. The UN definition of refugees is being rendered out-of-date by political, religious, ethnic and environmental crises. At the same time, there has been a sharp increase in the phenomenon of 'illegal' or irregular migration. An estimated 500,000 foreigners entered the EU clandestinely in 2000, five times the number estimated to have entered in 1994 (Ratnesar, 2001). Of course, such estimates must be regarded as highly approximate given the obvious problems of measuring clandestine migration, but few would dispute the general trend to a marked increase. This has happened in response to strong push factors operating from the countries of origin, and in the context of increasingly harsh regimes of immigration control imposed by West European states, including stricter criteria and more rigid and mechanistic processing of asylum-seekers' claims for refugee status. Two main mechanisms of irregular migration can be recognised: deliberate illegal entry (forged documents, landing on remote southern European coasts, crossing poorly guarded borders, etc.); and legal entry (e.g. on a tourist visa) followed by overstaying. Increasing evidence exists for the orchestration of illegal entry by semi-criminal organisations - mafia groups, traffickers and agents at various points in key smuggling routes. Laczko and Thompson (2000) and Salt (2000) have provided useful overviews of human smuggling and migrant trafficking in Europe, including conceptual issues, bibliographic surveys and statistical estimates.

Crisis-driven migrations affecting Europe as a destination can occur in any part of the world. Since 1990 they have emanated from the Gulf War, the persecution of Kurdish populations in Turkey and Iraq, war and famine in various parts of Africa, and the break-up of the former Yugoslavia. In the last of these cases, war and ethnic cleansing led to massive displacements of population, both within the region and, more particularly, the 1 million Bosnians who became refugees in Western Europe in the early to mid-1990s, many of whom have now been pressured to return in the wake of the 1995 Dayton Agreement which ended hostilities in Bosnia and provided for the planned repatriation of the displaced and refugee populations.

The Albanian emigration of the last ten years is a good example of how the notion of 'crisis' can differentially interact with migration, producing a continually evolving dialogue between the two terms (Pastore, 1998):

- Firstly, the mass exodus of 1991 can be seen as a direct response to the Albanian political, economic and social crisis accompanying the abrupt post-Communist transition. This is an obvious point, but a deep understanding of the Albanian context is necessary to comprehend fully the resultant dynamics of migration to Italy and Greece. To view Albanians fleeing their country in the early 1990s as either refugees or economic migrants fleeing political chaos and economic collapse is too simplistic. As Mai (2001) shows in an interesting analysis of the role of Italian television in the Albanian emigration, the collapse was also a moral and an ethical one. Young Albanians, in particular, were suffering a collective identity crisis which counterposed a forced, ethicised identity of the heroic nature of work in an Albanian society that was projected by Enver Hoxha to his information-starved people as 'paradise on earth', with the increasing identificatory appeal of *la dolce vita* on the other side of the Adriatic.
- But the migration of the early 1990s provoked further crisis in Albania, leading to both short- and longer-term instability. The key to this vicious cycle of linkages was the investment of migrant remittances in infor-

mal pyramid savings schemes which collapsed in early 1997, bankrupting the majority of the Albanian population and provoking a second mass exodus. Longer-term effects of emigration on the re-making of the Albanian crisis, according to Pastore (1998), were the establishment of criminalised emigration rackets and the demographic distortion of the Albanian population by the emigration of so many young people.

- Thirdly, the Albanian migrations were also seen as a crisis for the Italian and Greek states: how were they to deal with the tens of thousands of migrants entering the country without legal documents and by whatever means they could find? As Lazaridis (1996) and Zinn (1996) have shown, policy paralysis, dithering and contradictions have been the main reactive outcomes in both countries. This has had the effect of prolonging and almost institutionalising the 'crisis' nature of the Albanian immigration into a kind of semi-permanent feature of the Italian and Greek political and press discourse, which tends overwhelmingly to stigmatise Albanians as 'criminals' (Jamieson and Silj, 1998; Lazaridis and Wickens, 1999). On the one hand this might be thought to be a negation of the very meaning of the term 'crisis'; on the other, it asks important questions about how media representations of migrants come to be constructed, and about the power of such representations to influence public opinion.

'Sisters are Doing it for Themselves': Growth in Independent Female Migration

Until the early 1980s, there was an overwhelming and regrettable trend to consider women migrants as dependants or followers of 'primary' male migrants – to use Cohen's (1997) phrase, as the 'baggage of male workers'. Numerically and sociologically (Cohen's words again), we have entered a new phase of female migration, characterised by the independent migration of females in response to the needs of the European and global service economies.

Campani (1995) and Phizacklea (1998) have

been important voices in the debate on the contemporary global and European contexts for female migration. 'Sex, marriage and maids' describe, somewhat over-simplistically, the three sectors of activity which are important for female migrants in Europe (Phizacklea, 1998: 31–4), but few data are available to quantify the relative importance of these three female migratory types – the migration (including trafficking) of sex-workers, the international bride trade, and the migration of domestic and care workers. More broadly, it is important to realise how the demand for women migrants has increased through the centrality of the types of service activities in post-industrial society which have traditionally been associated with female labour or are those which only women are willing to supply (Campani, 1995: 546).

There has been quite an impressive amount of literature on female migration experiences in Southern Europe published since the late 1990s; of particular value are the collections edited by Anthias and Lazaridis (2000) and Ribas Mateos (2000). Anthias notes that women migrants provide the flexibility and low cost that appeals both to global capital, and to middle-class households seeking to hire domestic help: 'they are located in or within a secondary, service-oriented, hidden (economy) ... that reproduces an ethically and gendered divided labour market' (Anthias, 2000: 25). Against this structuralist perspective are a number of ethnographic documentaries which tell a variety of stories – of exploitation and empowerment, of patriarchy and liberation, of isolation and solidarity, of sacrifice and achievement (for some accessible studies in English, see Andall, 1998, 1999, 2000; Chell, 1997, 2000; Escrivà, 1997; Lazaridis, 2000; Zontini, 2001). More often than not, women are the social glue which holds the ethnic community together, especially in national communities (e.g. Filipinos in Spain and Italy, Cape Verdeans in Italy) where women migrants were the pioneers and where they remain in numerical dominance. Moreover, they are playing increasingly active roles in processes of integration with the host society, becoming important agents of cultural change. Undoubtedly, migrant women in Southern Europe are at the forefront of the interesting

work being done in gender issues in migration in recent years.

Playing the Global Labour Market: Skilled and Professional Migrants

This type of migration has been thoroughly researched by Salt (1984, 1992) and Findlay (1993) since the mid-1980s. Hence it is questionable how new it is for the European setting, although new flows of skilled migration have emerged from Eastern Europe since 1989 (Rhode, 1993). Findlay and Salt write about professionals, business executives, accountants, engineers, consultants and the personnel of international organisations. To these I would add sports stars and entertainers. The flows, by and large, are not one-way but multidirectional and temporary, although East-West flows are likely to be more permanent and unidirectional. This is a fluid type of migration which merges with (and is tending to be substituted by) business travel and short-term contract and trouble-shooting visits (Salt and Ford, 1993). Highly-skilled and professional migration also overlaps, at the individual level if not conceptually, with the next two types I am going to consider: cross-border shuttle migration and student migration.

The movement of skilled persons lies at the heart of attempts to integrate Europe through the free movement of people, goods, services and capital *within* the EU. This increasing ease of movement for elites and highly-skilled labour creates a polarisation of migration types with, at the other end, 'poor' immigrants and asylum-seekers from outside the EU. This emerging hierarchical division is one of the clearest contrasts opening up in the new map of European migrations (Koser and Lutz, 1998: 2).

Here and There and Back and Forth: Shuttle Migration

The bipolar fixity of conventional studies of migration – based on an origin, a destination, and a more-or-less definitive and statistically measurable relocation between the two – has been challenged both by the heightened role of mobility in (European, Western) society at large (Urry, 2000), and by new geographies and temporalities of movement (Cwerner,

2001). Now, many movements are multiple and spatially capricious – in Kevin McHugh's catchy words, 'inside, outside, upside down; backward, forward, round and round' (McHugh, 2000).

The dual role of borders and frontiers is interesting here: on the one hand the removal of frontiers within the EU facilitates an intensification of mobility between and across the states of the Union; on the other, the juxtaposition of countries at different levels of economic development and with different social and cultural systems, notably inside and outside the EU frontier, creates the conditions for new dynamics of movement. Much of this may be 'illegal', but much of it represents an accommodation of new economic mobility types to the visa and access regimes that are imposed by the EU.

In particular, since 1989 there has been a sharp rise in cross-border shuttle migration across the eastern frontier of the EU; this has tended to replace the mass East-West migrations originally feared by the West as soon as the Iron Curtain was dismantled. Although some instances of cross-border shuttle migration are of fairly long standing (e.g. that of Slovenians to Trieste), others have risen with dynamic new rhythms during the 1990s, for instance the migration of Poles to Germany (Igllicka, 2000). Igllicka distinguishes shuttle or pendular migrants (who stay for less than three months) from short-term migrants (more than three months, less than one year), long-term migrants (more than one year), and settler migrants (such as the *Aussiedler*). Cross-border shuttle migration can be for short-term work opportunities, for instance in construction or agriculture, or for trading – buying and selling of goods with different prices and market situations either side of the border. It is important to emphasise how this type of movement is facilitated by, and represents an adaptation to, the availability of tourist visas; it is also important to realise that many trips are multipurpose, combining tourism and shopping with trading and short-term work.

Student Migrations: from the Year Abroad to the 'Big OE'

Student migrations are a long-overlooked but

increasingly important form of European mobility. Whilst there are some historical parallels (the medieval wandering scholar, or colonial patterns of student migrations to France, the UK, the Netherlands, etc.), since the 1980s student mobility within Europe has been strongly promoted by the European Commission via schemes such as the Erasmus and Socrates exchanges, whose initial aims – which look unlikely to be achieved, at least for the foreseeable future – were to have one in ten students studying at a university in another EU country.⁷ Since the launch of the Erasmus scheme in 1987, around 750,000 university/third-level students have spent a period of 3–12 months studying abroad; this figure covers the academic years 1987–88 to 1999–2000. Numbers have grown steadily year-on-year, with a seven-fold increase in annual movers between the late 1980s and the late 1990s.

On a broader front it is important, once again, to recognise the variety of migratory subtypes under this general category. Student migrations are an important part of the internal mobility of young adults within European countries, particularly the UK, where there has been a continuous tradition of ‘going away’ to university (in many other European countries the dominant tradition has been for university students to live at home). Surprisingly, the migrational significance of students going to university has scarcely been studied. This significance lies in two areas: the initial move to university, and the implications of this for subsequent national population distribution (do students tend to stay on in their university towns, return home, or move elsewhere?). For international student migrations, such as those involving a ‘Year Abroad’ at a foreign university, the same questions arise: do students tend to preserve their affective and institutional links to their Year Abroad destination, or are their future migration propensities unaffected?

It is also possible to see student migration as a subset of youth migration motivated by a mixture of broader educational goals and experience/travel/pleasure-seeking, perhaps facilitated or interleaved with casual or temporary work. Amongst European students, especially those from northern countries, the ‘gap year’ between school and university, or

between graduation and employment, exemplifies this, as does young Australian and New Zealanders’ predilection for their ‘Big Overseas Experience’. Here, again, we see complex overlappings of socio-economic and mobility types (students/workers/tourists, but also travellers, drifters, hobos ...) which defy neat migratory and motivational categorisations (Bianchi, 2000).

Love Migrations: the Transnationalisation of Intimacy

The explanation of contemporary migrations increasingly with reference to individual and personal factors (which, nevertheless, at a societal scale have considerable significance) opens up other possibilities. Students and tourists travel, study abroad, have sex, fall in love.⁸ Their subsequent locational behaviour and mobility/migration regimes may be more related to this libidinal factor than to any other. Indeed, love migration can probably be found in all types of migration. Maybe, as far as migration factors are concerned, ‘love conquers all’. The possibility for the initiation of such ‘transnational intimacy’ is greatly increased by mass travel, study abroad, and tourism; whilst the accelerating speeds and technologies of travel and communication in a shrinking Europe increase the chances of such transnational love being maintained.

Technology apart, several important global sociological factors lie behind the growth of love migrations within (and outside) Europe. The expansion of linguistic competence is one factor (young Britons are an exception here: hiding within their global language, they are less multilingual than their other European counterparts). Another is the linked expansion of the ‘global experience’ industries (tourism, travel, leisure, education, networking) with the extension of youthful attitudes and lifestyles to later ages. Together these factors produce an expansion of individual transnational interfaces resulting from mobility and migration; the major cities (London, Paris, Brussels, Frankfurt, Barcelona, Rome, Geneva – the list is much more extensive), especially those with explicit multinational functions, are the principal nodes for this intensification of cross-national personal contact, relationships, part-

nerships and marriages. My conclusion is simple: do not underestimate the libidinal factor in migration. You read it here first.

Heliotropes and Rural Idyllists: Migrations of Environmental Preference

Finally, there has been a steady growth in what we might call *environmental preference migration* (Williams *et al.*, 1997). These are migrations that are the very antithesis of being economically motivated, and are undertaken by those who prioritise quality-of-life and aesthetic considerations over income. Having said that, they are often undertaken by those who can *afford* to take such choices, such as people of wealth or independent means, including retired persons. These are 'lifestyle migrations' in which a move to a pleasant rural landscape or a sunnier climate enables certain individuals to enjoy a more relaxing and healthier life in a culture which is somewhat different from and more appealing than their own. There are, however, many variants on this theme, including those who wish to 'escape to the sun' by settling in a Spanish Mediterranean coastal resort (O'Reilly, 2000), those who are 'international counterurbanisers' such as the British home-owners in rural France studied by Buller and Hoggart (1994), and Kockel's (1991) 'countercultural migrants' – Dutch and Germans who have settled along the remote western seaboard of Ireland in order to pursue 'alternative' rural lifestyles.

Heliotropic migrants – Northern Europeans who spend varying amounts of time during the year living and relaxing in the warm south – illustrate very well one of the dimensions along which the divide between migration and more frequent forms of mobility is particularly difficult to draw. The spectrum of movements ranges from tourism through seasonal residence to permanent relocation to a holiday area, such as international retirement migration (Williams and Hall, 2000). In some recently completed work I carried out with Tony Warnes and Allan Williams (King *et al.*, 2000), we found that British retiree migrants to southern Spain and the Portuguese Algarve generally had extensive prior experience of visiting the region on holiday before making the semi-permanent retirement move.⁹ Re-

peated holidays in sunny seaside resorts had frequently led to a progressively more committed engagement with a destination which was seen as both enjoyable and desirable, and as increasingly familiar. Often the purchase of a flat or holiday villa as a second home became a stepping-stone to a more-or-less permanent transfer of residence upon retirement.

These forms of movement and dual place connections are not dissimilar to movement patterns associated with other kinds of transnational community, although the motivations behind the establishment of such transnational communities may be very different. In contrast to diasporic communities spawned by refugee scatterings or transnational communities built out of labour migrations, the British on the Costa del Sol (or the Germans in Majorca, or whatever) are engaging in migration and resettlement as a 'lifestyle activity'. They have become heliotropes, permanent sun-seekers, and all the evidence suggests their numbers are set to grow (King *et al.*, 2000).

CONCLUSION

This paper has attempted to map out both some new migratory forms and processes in Europe, and the attendant conceptual and methodological challenges of how to approach their study. These new forms of migration derive from new international divisions of labour, the new European geopolitics after the Cold War, new motivations of migrants (above all the retreat from labour migrations linked to Fordist production systems), new space-time flexibilities and technologies, and the relatively new notion of migration as consumption and self-discovery. Thus, and in a variety of ways, migration processes in Europe (and globally) have certainly become more diverse in the past 20 years or so. Whilst the structural underpinnings of the new migrations have been implicit throughout much of the foregoing account, there remain some reservations about how new these migrations are. Koser and Lutz (1998: 4–5), for example, cautioned against *a posteriori* descriptions of newness and pointed out that historical analysis often exposes the arbitrariness of the application of the term 'new' to a social phenomenon such as changing migration. Nevertheless, they seem to

have been broadly happy with the appellation 'new', and theirs is not the only book on European migration to include this word in its title (King, 1993b; Thränhardt, 1996).

This diversification and (albeit contested) newness of migratory forms encourages both the reassertion of some basic tenets of migration study, and opens up the potential, indeed the necessity, of new methodological approaches.

Firstly, I reiterate my earlier plea for an integrated interdisciplinary approach which also recognises paradigmatic plurality and the value of mixed methodologies – combining, for instance, economic analysis, class analysis, studies of ethnicity and culture, and attempts to capture the richness of the human experience of migration.

Secondly, the need for comparative analysis remains paramount if studies of migration are to rise above the ideographic. Comparisons can be between migratory groups (in the same country), or across countries (comparing similar or contrasting migratory groups), or across time.

Thirdly, we need to recognise what I would call the double embeddedness of migration; at the individual scale, migration must be embedded in a migrant's life-course (and in some cases of the life-course of the family, even across generations); and at the macro scale, the study of migration must be embedded in the societies and social processes of both the countries/places of origin and of destination.

Fourthly, it has to be acknowledged that many of the new forms of migration/mobility surveyed or mentioned in this paper are inadequately captured by statistics, if at all. There is a tendency for migration not to be documented if it is not seen as problematic. Hence less and less reliance can be placed on data sources such as Eurostat or the OECD's SOPEMI database for measuring human spatial mobility in Europe. More reliance will need to be put on primary research surveys carried out on the new migratory forms.

As well as new data-frames, new terms and metaphors are required to describe the new mobility types which challenge the binary polarisation of origin and destination and the semi-permanence of the common notion of migration. Regarding new metaphors of mi-

gration, I am much attracted by the notion put forward by Ribas Mateos (2001) of the 'Mediterranean caravanseraí' – a common space for migrant groups and flows where they can arrive, stay a while, and then move on to other destinations, perhaps returning for a later staging stay prior to other moves. To borrow a current EU mobility term, migrants become *stagiaires*, interposing migrations and journeys with periods spent sojourning and working in a variety of destinations. In his book *Sociology beyond Societies*, John Urry (2000) goes much further: for him, mobility is the metaphor of contemporary global society. He goes the whole globalisation hog by concentrating his entire 'post-society' analysis on migration, mobility and interfaces, setting aside social structures and processes. Life is a trip engaged on by contemporary, capitalist nomads moving through fluid, deterritorialised spaces; the place-specific metaphors are spaces of movement, pausing and meeting – the hotel lobby, the motel, the airport transit lounge (Urry, 2000: 26–32). Urry would certainly agree with Berger's (1984) statement that migration is the quintessential experience of our time, even more so at the dawn of the new millennium.

But we should be careful not to be carried away by such hyperbole. The shrinking of a borderless Europe is the privilege of a relatively small section of European society – perhaps above all those lucky academics who are amongst the greatest beneficiaries of this travelling, networking, conferencing, migration culture as they move about their spatially extensive but socially restricted 'small world' (Lodge, 1983). Of course a globalised Europe is far from a borderless utopia, as any Albanian or Moroccan migrant will affirm (Urry, 2000: 13, 22).

Throughout this paper we have seen how the traditional binaries of migration study have been bridged and broken up by new flexible and evolving mobility patterns. How to handle, for instance, cross-border shuttle migration (is it really migration?); or how to categorise migrations driven by poverty as voluntary or involuntary; or how to unravel the space-time configurations of long-stay tourism, foreign second-home ownership, residence abroad and expatriacy? We have also seen how legal versus illegal is a particularly

blurred dichotomy of migrant reality. Illegality seems to be constructed in an illogical (but perhaps also cynical) way by host societies which seem willing to exploit cheap migrant labour (and even be structurally dependent upon it) yet at the same time to deny the legal and civic existence of migrants. In this way, migration into Europe has become more and more of a global business (cf. Salt and Stein, 1997) which has its own set of private market mechanisms – competition, prices, agents, brokers, buyers and sellers of migrants and migration services.

Moreover, there are other, less often recognised migration dichotomies than those discussed and deconstructed in this paper. Migrations can be spectacular or mundane, or, as noted a little earlier, regarded as problematic or non-problematic. By and large, the mundane, unproblematic forms of movement are left unrecorded and often unstudied. The spectacular, problematic ones get all the attention, although here it must be stressed that the nature of the ‘spectacle’ is often exaggerated and distorted by its media portrayal and politicisation. Even the notions of ‘home’ and ‘away’ or ‘abroad’ have become blurred. Members of transnational communities may feel ‘at home’ in two or more places (or not feel at home anywhere). Furthermore, one can be ‘homeless at home’, as evidenced by Jansen’s (1998) narratives of post-Yugoslav identities; or one can be ‘transnational at home’, without ever having migrated, as Golbert (2001) demonstrates in her study of Ukrainian Jews.

These new, more diverse and flexible varieties of mobility/migration pose obvious challenges for migration policy, especially within the mind-set of ‘Fortress Europe’, and for attitudes towards regulation, governance and citizenship (Pugliese, 1995; Geddes, 2000). The issue is further complicated by the fact that, in contrast to earlier generations of migrants (for example the European ‘guest-workers’ of the 1960s who were functionally and sociologically rather homogeneous and whose migration was highly regulated), many national migration flows into Europe nowadays are mixed flows made up of refugees, economic migrants, people with high skills and those with no skills. Moreover, many

migrants change categories in order to maximise the success of their migration project, or they may move between destinations for the same reason. All these facets of the contemporary map of European migration sit uneasily with regulatory regimes of migration management and control. National bodies regulate contiguous space, whereas migrations function in network space. States want to ‘sedentarise’ and ‘integrate’ migrants (or certain accepted categories of them), but mobile people with multiple place affiliations and hybrid or cosmopolitan identities have no wish to fit in to the ideology of one national identity. Meanwhile, all around Europe there seems to be a constantly shifting discourse as to the desirability of migration, now very much related to economic, labour force and demographic projections for the next few decades (see, for instance, Visco, 2000).

Finally, in stressing the importance of the new migratory circumstances of a post-industrial, post-modern Europe, I draw attention again to movements motivated above all by non-economic, or only partly economic, considerations – those linked to life-cycle such as student and retirement migrations, both of which have potential for future expansion. Within the same vein, the migration of children has scarcely been studied, at least from the child’s perspective (Dobson and Stillwell, 2000). Quite rightly, women have become an important new focus for migration research in Europe, recognising their central role in the migration process and as cultural agents in the structuring of ethnic communities and their relation with host societies. On this, as on so many other topics in the unfolding map of new migrations, much still needs to be done. These are exciting times to be a migration researcher in Europe!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is a revised version of a keynote address to the conference on ‘Strangers and Citizens: Challenges for European Governance, Identity, Citizenship’, University of Dundee, 17–19 March 2001. Earlier versions were presented and discussed at the conference on ‘Old Differences and New Similarities: American and European Immigration in Com-

parative Perspective' (Italian Academy, Columbia University, New York, 12–13 November 1999) and at 'New Patterns, New Theories: A Conference on International Migration' (Nottingham Trent University, 11–13 September 2000). I thank contributors to the discussions following the presentation of the paper at these three fora, and also the many postgraduate students in Migration Studies at the University of Sussex for their stimulating conversations – Clara Guillo, Nick Mai, Enric Ruiz-Gelices and Chris Whitwell will all recognise their own individual inputs somewhere in the text.

NOTES

- (1) Curiously, each of these evolved in ways somewhat different to those originally expected and defined by the terminology: for instance 'settler migrations' involved a lot of unanticipated (and unrecorded) return, and 'guest-workers' generally ended up by staying and transforming themselves into more or less settled ethnic communities (King, 2000).
- (2) I nominate these examples of particular nationalities because recent work on these migrant groups in Europe has demonstrated that they often have high levels of education and professional expertise which, by and large, they are compelled to leave behind when they take up what are (for them) much more remunerative jobs as cleaners, building labourers, street-hawkers or farm workers in destination countries such as France, Italy or Greece: see, for example, Chell (1997); Knights (1996); Lazaridis and Wickens (1999); Riccio (2001). Whilst experiences and reactions differ between and amongst the various migrant nationalities, some are able to draw strength from their own cultural values and self-knowledge of their own multilingualism and cosmopolitan experiences – see, for instance, Riccio (2001) and Zinn (1994) on the Senegalese in Italy.
- (3) See, for instance, a number of recent books which attempt an interdisciplinary analysis of the general field of international migration: Brettell and Hollifield (2000), Faist (2000), Hammar *et al.* (1997), and Papastergiadis (2000).
- (4) Although it is also true, as Cohen (1995: 5) points out, that some of the early pioneering studies of migration as a generic process sought to minimise or overlook this distinction (cf. Lee, 1966; Petersen, 1958; Ravenstein, 1885, 1889; Zelinsky, 1971).
- (5) Except, perhaps, after death. The burial place of migrants has particular symbolic meaning, the implications of which have scarcely been considered by researchers.
- (6) The term 'migrant shopping' comes originally, I believe, from a workshop paper prepared by Robin Cohen (1997). Enlarging Cohen's notion, the 'shopping market' for migrants functions in two directions. Firstly, individual countries shop for migrants within a global market in order to satisfy certain needs characterised by domestic labour supply shortfall. The UK, for instance, has recently recruited nurses from Spain and the Philippines. According to Cohen, the two countries which have perfected the system of 'immigration shopping' are Australia and Canada. They have structurally linked their economic development, manpower and immigration departments and are intent on finding selected migrants to fill slots in their labour market, including business entrepreneurs who bring investment and create new wealth and jobs, and skilled labour migrants for the labour-short IT sector. The second expression of the migrant shopping market is where individual migrants shop around for possibilities and opportunities in different countries, often moving on when better economic or social openings become available in another country. Andall (1999) presents a well-worked case of this type of migrant shopping in her study of Cape Verdean women in Europe, whilst Guiraudon (2000) tackles the issue of 'venue shopping' on the part of asylum-seekers, also in the European context.
- (7) To be more precise, the target proposed by the then European Commission in 1987 was that, by 1992, a tenth of EU graduates would have spent at least three months of their higher education in another country. By 1992 the achieved figure was 4% rather than 10% (Adia *et al.*, 1994: 2, 39). Although the 10% objective was reaffirmed in 1997, this was accompanied by a statement that its achievement would be unlikely, due above all to financial pressures on students (Jallade *et al.*, 1997). Meanwhile, the total European population of students has grown considerably.
- (8) At a recent Erasmus conference in Spain, the Italian philosopher and semiologist Umberto Eco said that the main benefits of the EU's Erasmus programme were as much sexual as cultural. According to Eco, student exchanges and bi- and multi-lingualism encouraged mixed marriages and relationships across Europe's national frontiers. See report in *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 6 July 2001.

- (9) This experience of holidaying in the region prior to the migration upon retirement was less important in the other two southern European destinations we surveyed, Malta and Tuscany. Here, career links, family ties and military service were common additional factors (King *et al.*, 2000: 94–5).

REFERENCES

- Adia E, Stowell M, Higgins T. 1994. *Higher Education Sans Frontières: Policy, Practice and the European Student Market*. Heist and UCAS: Leeds.
- Andall J. 1998. Catholic and state constructions of domestic workers: the case of Cape Verdean women in Rome in the 1970s. In *The New Migration in Europe: Social Constructions and Social Realities*, Koser K, Lutz H (eds). Macmillan: Basingstoke; 124–142.
- Andall J. 1999. Cape Verdean women on the move: 'immigration shopping' in Italy and Europe. *Modern Italy* 4: 241–258.
- Andall J. 2000. Organising domestic workers in Italy: the challenge of gender, class and ethnicity. In *Gender and Migration in Southern Europe*, Anthias F, Lazaridis G (eds). Berg: Oxford; 145–171.
- Anthias F. 2000. Metaphors of home: gendering new migrations to southern Europe. In *Gender and Migration in Southern Europe*, Anthias F, Lazaridis G (eds). Berg: Oxford; 15–47.
- Anthias F, Lazaridis G. (eds) 2000. *Gender and Migration in Southern Europe*. Berg: Oxford.
- Anwar M. 1979. *The Myth of Return*. Heinemann: London.
- Berger J. 1984. *And our Faces, my Heart, Brief as Photos*. Writers and Readers: London.
- Bianchi RV. 2000. Migrant tourist workers: exploring the 'contact zones' of post-industrial tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism* 3: 107–137.
- Blotevogel HH, King R. 1996. European economic restructuring: demographic responses and feedbacks. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 3: 133–159.
- Brettell CB, Hollifield JF (eds). 2000. *Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines*. Routledge: London.
- Buller H, Hoggart K. 1994. *International Counterurbanization: British Migrants in Rural France*. Avebury: Aldershot.
- Campani G. 1995. Women migrants: from marginal subjects to social actors. In *The Cambridge Survey of World Migration*, Cohen R. (ed.). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge; 546–550.
- Castles S. 2000. *Ethnicity and Globalization: from Migrant Worker to Transnational Citizen*. Sage: London.
- Chambers I. 1994. *Migrancy, Culture and Identity*. Routledge: London.
- Chell V. 1997. Gender-selective migration: Somalian and Filipina women in Rome. In *Southern Europe and the New Immigrations*, King R, Black R. (eds). Sussex Academic Press: Brighton; 75–92.
- Chell V. 2000. Female migrants in Italy: coping in a country of new migration. In *Gender and Migration in Southern Europe*, Anthias F, Lazaridis G. (eds). Berg: Oxford; 103–123.
- Cohen R. 1997. *Seven Forms of International Migration: a Global Sketch*. Background Paper for the Summer School on Key Issues in Migration Research, Ydra, Greece, 4–17 May 1997.
- Cohen R. (ed.). 1995. *The Cambridge Survey of World Migration*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Cwerner SB. 2001. The Times of migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27: 3–31.
- Dobson J, Stillwell J. 2000. Changing home, changing school: towards a research agenda on child migration. *Area* 32: 395–401.
- Escrivà A. 1997. Control, composition and character of new migration to south-west Europe: the case of Peruvian women in Barcelona. *New Community* 23: 43–57.
- Faist T. 2000. *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*. Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- Findlay AM. 1993. New technology, high-level labour movements and the concept of the brain drain. In *The Changing Course of International Migration*. OECD: Paris; 149–159.
- Geddes A. 2000. *Immigration and European Integration: Towards Fortress Europe?* Manchester University Press: Manchester.
- Glick Schiller N, Basch I, Szanton-Blanc C. 1995. From immigrant to transmigrant: theorizing transnational migration. *Anthropological Quarterly* 68: 48–63.
- Golbert R. 2001. Transnational orientations from home: constructions of Israel and transnational space among Ukrainian Jewish youth. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27: 713–731.
- Guiraudon V. 2000. European integration and migration policy: vertical policy-making as venue shopping. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 38: 251–271.
- Hammer T, Brochmann G, Tamas K, Faist T (eds). 1997. *International Migration, Immobility and Development: A Multidisciplinary View*. Berg: Oxford.
- Harris JR, Todaro MP. 1970. Migration, unemployment and development: a two-sector analysis. *Economic Review* 60: 126–142.

- Iglicka K. 2000. Mechanisms of migration from Poland before and during the transition period. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* **26**: 61–73.
- International Organization for Migration 2000. *World Migration Report 2000*. IOM and the UN: Geneva.
- Jallade J-P, Gordon J, Lebeau N. 1997. *Student Mobility within the European Union: A Statistical Analysis*. DG XXII of the European Commission: Brussels.
- Jamieson A, Silj A. 1998. *Migration and Criminality: the Case of Albanians in Italy*. Ethnobarometer Working Paper 1: Rome.
- Jansen C. 1969. Some sociological aspects of migration. In *Migration*, Jackson JA (ed.). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge; 60–73.
- Jansen S. 1998. Homeless at home: narratives of post-Yugoslav identity. In *Migrants of Identity: Perceptions of Home in a World of Movement*. Rapport N, Dawson A (eds). Berg: Oxford; 85–109.
- King R (ed.). 1993a. *Mass Migrations in Europe: the Legacy and the Future*. Belhaven Press: London.
- King R (ed.). 1993b. *The New Geography of European Migrations*. Belhaven Press: London.
- King R. 1996. *A Celebration of Migration*. University of Sussex Research Papers in Geography 25.
- King R. 2000. Generalizations from the history of return migration. In *Return Migration: Journey of Hope or Despair?*, Ghosh B. (ed.). United Nations and the International Organization for Migration: Geneva; 7–45.
- King R, Warnes AM, Williams AM. 2000. *Sunset Lives: British Retirement Migration to the Mediterranean*. Berg: Oxford.
- Knights M. 1996. Bangladeshis in Rome: the political, economic and social structure of a recent immigrant group. In *Questioni di Popolazione in Europa: una prospettiva geografica*, Gentileschi ML, King R (eds). Pàtron: Bologna; 129–142.
- Kockel U. 1991. Countercultural migrants in the west of Ireland. In *Contemporary Irish Migration*, King R (ed.). Geographical Society of Ireland Special Publication: Dublin; 6: 70–82.
- Koser K, Lutz H (eds). 1998. *The New Migration in Europe: Social Constructions and Social Realities*. Macmillan: London.
- Laczko F, Thompson D (eds). 2000. *Migrant Trafficking and Human Smuggling in Europe*. IOM: Geneva.
- Lazaridis G. 1996. Immigration to Greece: a critical evaluation of Greek policy. *New Community*. **22**: 335–348.
- Lazaridis G. 2000. Filipino and Albanian women migrant workers in Greece: multiple layers of oppression. In *Gender and Migration in Southern Europe*, Anthias F, Lazaridis G (eds). Berg: Oxford; 49–79.
- Lazaridis G, Wickens E. 1999. 'Us' and the 'Others': ethnic minorities in Greece. *Annals of Tourism Research* **26**: 632–655.
- Lee ES. 1966. A theory of migration. *Demography* **3**: 47–57.
- Lodge D. 1983. *Small World*. Penguin: Harmondsworth.
- Mai N. 2001. 'Italy is beautiful': the role of Italian television in the Albanian migratory flow to Italy. In *Media and Migration: Constructions of Mobility and Difference*, King R, Wood N (eds). Routledge: London; 95–109.
- Massey D, Alarcón R, Durand J, González H. 1987. *Return to Aztlán: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico*. University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- McHugh K. 2000. Inside, outside, upside down, backward, forward, round and round: a case for ethnographic studies in migration. *Progress in Human Geography* **24**: 71–89.
- O'Reilly K. 2000. *The British on the Costa del Sol*. Routledge: London.
- Papastergiadis N. 2000. *The Turbulence of Migration*. Polity: Cambridge.
- Pastore F. 1998. *Conflicts and Migrations: a Case Study on Albania*. Centro Studi di Politica Internazionale: Rome.
- Petersen W. 1958. A general typology of migration. *American Sociological Review* **23**: 256–266.
- Phizacklea A. 1998. Migration and globalization: a feminist perspective. In *The New Migration in Europe: Social Constructions and Social Realities*, Koser K, Lutz H (eds). Macmillan: Basingstoke; 21–38.
- Portes A, Guarnizo LE, Landolt P. 1999. The study of transnationalism: pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* **22**: 217–237.
- Pries L. ed. 1999. *Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Pugliese E. 1995. New international migrations and the 'European fortress'. In *Europe at the Margins: New Mosaics of Inequality*, Hadjimichalis C, Sadler D (eds). Wiley: Chichester; 51–68.
- Ratnesar R. 2001. Sea of promise. *Time Europe*. 12 February.
- Ravenstein EG. 1885, 1889. The laws of migration (I and II). *Journal of the Statistical Society* **48**: 167–235; **52**: 214–301.
- Rhode B. 1993. Brain drain, brain gain, brain waste: reflections on the emigration of highly educated and scientific personnel from Eastern Europe. In *The New Geography of European Migrations*, King R (ed.). Belhaven: London; 228–245.

- Ribas Mateos N (ed.). 2000. *Female immigration in Southern Europe*. Special issue of *Papers: Revista de Sociologia* 60.
- Ribas Mateos N. 2001. Revising migratory contexts: the Mediterranean caravanserai. In *The Mediterranean Passage: Migration and New Cultural Encounters in Southern Europe*, King R (ed.). Liverpool University Press: Liverpool; 22–40.
- Riccio B. 2001. Following the Senegalese migratory path through media representation. In *Media and Migration: Constructions of Mobility and Difference*, King R, Wood N (eds). Routledge: London; 110–126.
- Salt J. 1984. High-level manpower movements in North-West Europe and the role of careers. *International Migration Review* 17: 633–651.
- Salt J. 1992. Migration processes amongst the highly-skilled in Europe. *International Migration Review* 26: 484–505.
- Salt J. 2000. Trafficking and human smuggling: a European perspective. *International Migration* (Special Issue on Perspectives on Trafficking of Migrants) 38: 31–56.
- Salt J, Ford R. 1993. Skilled international migration in Europe: the shape of things to come? In *Mass Migration in Europe: the Legacy and the Future*, King R (ed.). Belhaven: London; 293–309.
- Salt J, Stein J. 1997. Migration as a business: the case of trafficking. *International Migration* 35: 467–491.
- Segal A. 1993. *An Atlas of International Migration*. Hans Zell: London.
- Shuttleworth I, Kockel U. 1990. *Aspects of Irish Migration in the 1980s*. University of Glasgow Applied Population Research Unit APRU Discussion Paper 90/3.
- Sjaastad LA. 1962. The costs and returns of human migration. *Journal of Political Economy* 70: 117–130.
- SOPEMI 1995. *Trends in International Migration: Annual Report 1994*. OECD: Paris.
- Thränhardt D. ed. 1996. *Europe: A New Immigration Continent*. Lit Verlag & Transaction: Münster.
- Urry J. 2000. *Sociology beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-First Century*. Routledge: London.
- Visco I. 2000. *Immigration, Development and the Labour Market*. Paper prepared for an International Conference on Migration Scenarios for the 21st Century, Rome. 12–14 July 2000.
- White PE, Woods RI (eds). 1980. *The Geographical Impact of Migration*. Longman: London.
- Williams AM, Hall CM. 2000. Tourism and migration: new relationships between production and consumption. *Tourism Geographies* 2: 5–27.
- Williams AM, King R, Warnes AM. 1997. A place in the sun: international retirement migration from Northern to Southern Europe. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 4: 115–134.
- Zelinsky W. 1971. The hypothesis of the mobility transition. *Geographical Review* 61: 219–249.
- Zinn DL. 1994. The Senegalese immigrants in Bari: what happens when the Africans peer back? In *Migration and Identity*, Benmayor R, Skotnes A (eds). Oxford University Press: Oxford; 53–68.
- Zinn DL. 1996. Adriatic brethren or black sheep? Migration to Italy and the Albanian crisis. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 3: 241–249.
- Zontini E. 2001. Family formation in gendered migrations: Moroccan and Filipino women in Bologna. In *The Mediterranean Passage: Migration and New Cultural Encounters in Southern Europe*, King R (ed.). Liverpool University Press: Liverpool; 231–257.