For post-Yugoslav countries, however, the migration data need to be interpreted with caution: high rates of emigration from BiH and Macedonia and high numbers of migrants from Croatia and Slovenia reflect a history of *internal* migration which the events of the 1990s and the break-up of Yugoslavia turned into 'international' migration. The relatively high number of immigrants in Moldova and Ukraine is largely made up of Russians who moved there before the collapse of the Soviet Union. The other figure to draw attention to is the large stock of immigrants in Greece – 1.1 million or one in ten of the population of Greece – which numerically corresponds closely to the stock of emigrants from Greece, 1.2 million, deriving from an earlier postwar history of emigration from Greece to Germany, North America and Australia.

A final way of measuring the scale and relative impact of migration is through remittance flows, the last element on Table 1. The data show that the economic weight of remittances is especially strong in Albania, BiH, Moldova and Serbia, accounting for between 10 and 21% of Gross National Income. Comparison of these figures with the global rankings in the World Bank's *Migration and Remittances Factbook* (World Bank 2011) shows that these are amongst the highest remittance dependency rates in the world, exceeded only by island micro-states.

The papers

In providing an overview of the papers which follow, we do not merely summarise them – this can easily be done by referring to their abstracts. Rather, what we try to do is highlight the significant and original statements that each paper makes. For want of a better alternative, we order the papers geographically: from the north of the region (Ukraine, Moldova, Romania) through Italy and Switzerland and 'receiving' countries of migrants from Eastern Europe and Kosovo respectively, to the Southeast Europe of the Balkans (Albania, post-Yugoslav states, Greece).

In the first paper, **Anna Amelina** makes two significant contributions to conceptualizing the unfolding dynamics of East-West migration in the post-socialist era, taking as her case material the mobility of Ukrainian scientists to Germany. The first contribution is the innovative concept of a *transnational field of science*, created

by the cross-border mobility of scientific personnel, often orchestrated around specific bilateral or multilateral scientific networks, many of which have key personal relationships at their core. The second conceptual advance is to view this transnational scientific space as an *unequal playing field* with an asymmetrical and hierarchical distribution of material, organizational and symbolic resources. Ukrainian mobile scientists define themselves as an *exploited elite*; yet at the same time they are aware of the privileges their transnational connections and experiences give them, especially in their home universities in Ukraine. Gender introduces another dimension into the transnational academic hierarchy, as female mobile scientists are identified as having the most disadvantaged positions – a conclusion which resonates with earlier research on the intra-EU scientific mobility of women (Ackers 2004). In unpacking the complex intersectional relationships involved in this particular form of transnational mobility, Amelina suggests the term *paradoxical ethnicization* to explain the contradictory ways in which Ukrainians (and other Eastern European scientists) are 'welcomed' in German universities, but are then treated (at least in the Ukrainian scientists' eyes) as cheap labour (but this is also manoeuvred by processes of self-exploitation and self-ethnicization), whilst fully being viewed as privileged academics in their home institutions – as one interviewee said, 'My students [in Kiev] say I am their idol'.

The theme of scientific mobility is continued in the next paper, by **Gabriela Tejada, Vitalie Varzari and Sergiu Porcescu**, which is a study of skilled (i.e. graduate) Moldovans abroad and their potential contribution to home-country development. Tejada et al. deploy the notion of *scientific diaspora* to refer to Moldovan postgraduate students, researchers and university-educated professionals working or studying abroad. They emphasize that Moldova has experienced a dramatic loss of its qualified personnel since 1991 due to the country's problematic political transition and low levels of economic and social development. Like Amelina's paper, this one too engages with debates on 'brain drain', 'brain circulation' and 'brain return', but with a different methodological approach. Whereas the previous paper was an in-depth qualitative study of a relatively small number of research participants, the main empirical evidence for Tejada et al. comes

from an online survey (*N*=197) of the Moldovan scientific diaspora. Following the post-1990s rise in the popularity of the transnational paradigm as a relevant theoretical framework for examining how migration interfaces with development, Tejada et al. recognize scientific diaspora as *communities of knowledge* with the potential to act as agents of change in their home countries. Here there focus is less on remittances (a key element of low-skilled Moldovan migrants' contribution to poverty alleviation and the national balance of payments), and more on knowledge circulation, business investment, and return migration or return visits. On the whole, skilled Moldovans consider themselves professionally or academically successful and well-integrated abroad; however, this does not prevent them from cultivating active transitional links with their home country, nor from having aspirations to help in its development. The areas that the scientific diaspora see as promising include joint scientific research, academic exchange and knowledge sharing, and business development. However, only 1 in 10 of the survey respondents plans to return to Moldova within the next five years. The main perceived barriers to return are the lack of encouragement from the Moldovan government, political instability, the hostility of local society towards successful emigrants and returnees, a general climate of mistrust, low incomes, and inadequate infrastructure.

Romania is the third country in this sequence of northern Black Sea countries with very high rates of recent emigration. **Bruno Meeus** develops a highly original analysis which refreshingly departs from conventional linear descriptions of emigration, labour market insertion, (non-)integration, remittances and their use for development. Based on a critical political-economy theoretical stance, his conceptual take is to view Romanian work migration as a form of welfare which supports the withdrawal of state support of vulnerable people in the neoliberal era. The Romanian migration is thus seen as underpinning a 'grassroots' *transnational labour market and welfare system* which has become a structural element of Romanian society, economy and government policy. The systematic nature of Romanian migration functions as a 'spatial vent' (Samers 2002) which creates a *safety valve* for the population's survival. But, and here's the rub, the safety valve is located in the southern EU countries of Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece, all of whose economies

are now in profound crisis, with severe austerity measures choking off, at least for the time being, employment opportunities. In these stricken Mediterranean economies, local employers' ability to hire Romanian workers in sectors such as construction, small industries, and domestic and care work, is hit by shrinking incomes, falling profits and, in particular, the collapse of the building industry. As the Mediterranean safety-valve closes, Romanian migrants are put in a double squeeze by the fact that the financial crisis has hit the Romanian economy as well, which Meeus illustrates with a case-study of the Bistrita Valley (ex-)industrial region. Caught between a rock and a hard place, most Romanian migrants hunker down and stay put rather than return; or they look for new, more favourable opportunities in Northern Europe.

Romanians (997,000), Ukrainians (224,000) and Moldovans (148,000), alongside Albanians (492,000) and Poles (112,000), are some of the largest migrant communities in *Italy* (data from Caritas-Migrantes 2012). Surveys with these migrant groups provide the raw material for the next paper in this issue, by **Eralba Cela, Tineke Fokkema and Elena Ambrosetti**, which examines the relationship between transnational orientation (the dependent variable) and integration and duration of residences (hypothesized independent variables), for Eastern European migrants (the groups enumerated above) living in Italy. Reflecting the special issue's commitment to methodological pluralism, these authors carry out a principal components analysis of the above-mentioned dependent and independent variables, along with a battery of control variables (age at migration, gender, partner and parent status, religion, and country of origin). Data come from a special questionnaire survey, the Integrometro study, carried out during 2008–09 with a sample of 3484 East Europeans in Italy. *Transnational orientation* was measured by several individual variables including remittance-sending, return intention, and feelings of belonging to the home country. *Duration of residence* was a single-factor variable. *Integration*, the most complex of the three main operational variables, was captured by a wide range of measures which could be divided into *economic integration* (employment status, education, perceived economic condition) and *socio-cultural integration* (language proficiency, friendship patterns, acceptance of exogamous marriage, feelings of belonging to Italy, etc.). The main original

contribution of this paper lies in its findings. In a nutshell, transnationalism is positively related to economic integration and negatively related to socio-cultural integration; and transnational behaviour decreases with length of residence in the host country. Amongst the stand-out control variables, men are more transnational than women.

For the next set of papers we now move across the Adriatic Sea to the Western Balkans. **Bojana Babić** offers unique insights into the ongoing dynamics within the migration–development nexus in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Based on a close involvement with events on the ground, including interviews with returnees and community development workers in six municipalities, three in the Federation of BiH and three in the Republika Srpska, she reveals the incongruencies in perception of development possibilities and results between development policy staff on the one hand, and returnees and locals on the other. The paper is built around a case-study of the *Center for Local Development and Diaspora* (CLDD), a local development model sponsored by the City of Stockholm (reflecting the fact that Sweden hosts 80,000 people of Bosnian origin). Whilst the CLDD staff perceive initiatives to be underway, particularly in the involvement of some refugee migrants in Sweden in rebuilding houses and allied infrastructures, the view of returnees, and many diasporans, is that only their own remittances, savings and personal/family networks have been effective in supporting the population in BiH. There are complaints about local corruption and calls for structural reform and more efficient and transparent involvement of the BiH authorities.

One of the strengths of the paper by **Bashkim Iseni**, on the shifting transnational orientations of the Albanian-speaking population in Switzerland, is the quantity of ethnographic and interview evidence that it draws on. Long-term participation by the author, himself a member of the Swiss Albanophone community since 1991, is combined with three interview-based studies carried out in the mid-late 2000s and in 2011. Although the main focus of the paper is Albanians from Kosovo, reference is also made to migration from the ethnic-Albanian populations of Montenegro, Macedonia and southern Serbia.

Setting the scene, Iseni identifies three waves of Albanian migration to Switzerland. Low-skill migration from the ethnic-Albanian regions of the Former Yugoslavia (FY), which corresponded to the most underdeveloped parts of FY, started in the mid-1960s and continued until 1973. Migration was temporary, and overwhelmingly of men. After a lull during the oil crisis and its aftermath, these emigration channels were reactivated during the 1980s; again mostly men remitting to their families left behind. The third wave was triggered by the conflict in Kosovo and consisted of asylum seekers and refugees, culminating in the main exodus in 1999. These departures were more family-based, and were accompanied by family members joining earlier-settled labour migrants. Woven into the latter stages of this chronology was the increasing diasporic political activism of the Kosovan Liberation Army, whose main followers came from the Kosovan diaspora in Switzerland.

The main fulcrum around which the paper's analysis is hinged is the switch in *transnationalism* from a strong *orientation to the territories of origin* before the 1990s to an increasing *focus on integration in Switzerland*. Long-delayed family reunion and a final 'settling down' in Switzerland have redefined the nature of transnationalism: remittances and a plan to return have been replaced by investment in families' future in Switzerland. Now, for the first generation, transnationalism means annual return visits; definitive return is made unlikely by the poor living conditions and economic prospects of post-conflict Kosovo, which are even more unappealing to the Swiss-born second generation.

With the next paper, by **Ivaylo Markov**, we zoom in to the ethnic-Albanian area of western Macedonia (FYROM) to look in more detail at the local dynamics of migration, remittances, development and social change in this region of traditionally high emigration. Unlike Iseni, who concentrated his interviews in the destination country, Markov's fieldwork (54 interviews plus participant observation and photographic documentation) was in the area of origin, from which migrants go to, return from, and shuttle back and forth between, a variety of destination countries – Switzerland, Austria, Germany, and more recently, Italy.

Four concepts guide his analysis: the *culture of migration*, which not only denotes the intense migration outflow from this area but also is ingrained in people's

everyday lives and imaginations; *social remittances*, which connote the transformations in patterns of consumption, social ranking, interpersonal relations and behaviour in the places of origin; *social network theory*, employed to grasp the relations between emigrants, returnees and non-migrants; and *transnationalism*, in order to describe the back-and-forth nature of migrants' movements within their transnational social spaces. However, Markov is critical of the use of 'transnationalism' within the ethnic-Albanian (and wider Balkan) context because of the assumption of equivalence of state, nation, nationality, ethnicity and citizenship. Finding 'translocal' too spatially confining a substitute concept, Markov follows Pichler (2009) in opting for the term 'transterritorial', which more adequately conveys the meaning of a non-national, non-local Albanian ethnic space combining different places of migrant origin and destination. The migration history of this Albanian ethnic space – male labour circulation to German-speaking countries during the 1960s and 1970s, followed by family reunion abroad and then renewed emigration in the two post-Yugoslav decades – justifies the use of the transterritorial concept since, in the rest of Macedonia, local rural-urban migration, rather than emigration, has been the norm.

In the rest of the article the impacts of this intense emigration on the territory of origin are documented, with a sensitive feel for the landscape aesthetics wrought by large-scale investments in housing ('Alpine' and 'Mediterranean' styles contrast with the local vernacular architecture), consumer goods, businesses and community projects. With family reunion and family migration, however, some of the dynamics change, and new dilemmas and shifts in transnational orientations take place (the same changes as described by Iseni in the preceding paper). The summer return visit becomes the opportunity to display wealth and social prestige through expensive cars and lavish weddings, since only in the eyes of other local-origin migrants and the non-migrant population can the status achievements of migration be displayed and appreciated. The co-existence of two types of migration – one where entire families go abroad, and the other when only the men work abroad, coming home at regular intervals – gives rise to complex social networks and family and household structures. Declining patriarchy and changing gender relations are also evident.

Albanians, but this time from the Republic of Albania, are also the focus of the next article, by **Domna Michail**. Her innovation is to provide an empirically-grounded account of the impact of the Greek financial crisis on Albanian immigrants in this country. There has been much anecdotal comment in the Greek and international media concerning the effects of the Greek economic meltdown on the country's million-plus immigrants, especially the Albanians who make up around 60% of the immigrant population (see, for example, 'Albanians in Greece: Heading home again', *The Economist*, 14 January 2012); but little by way of concrete and rigorous research. Michail uses a questionnaire approach (*N*=217) supported by in-depth interviews (*N*=35) to first- and second-generation Albanians in various parts of Greece to answer two main research questions. First, what has been the impact of the crisis on migrants' livelihoods, legal status and family development projects? Second, what is the second generation's positionality with regard to issues of 'return' to Albania, identity and belonging? Research was carried out during 2010–11, hence during the third year of the crisis.

At a time when (to quote one of Michail's interviewees) 'there is not enough bread, even for the Greeks', Albanians' employment opportunities have certainly shrunk. This leads to a series of negative ramifications for the immigrants: falling incomes, declining material standards, inability to send remittances, and antagonism between Albanians and Greeks over the little work available. Unemployment threatens legal status, so a rise in insecurity occurs. Albanian families in Greece exist in a state of limbo, no longer able to sustain a decent standard of living there, but equally unlikely to be able to create a new and viable livelihood back in Albania, which remains poor and disorganized. Michail concludes by pointing to a new *transnational rupture* within Albanian migrant families. In an earlier phase, during the early and mid-1990s, families were split when the men migrated and their wives, children and parents remained in Albania. Then family reunion and family formation took place in Greece. Now, the older generations (the middle-aged migrants and their parents, in those cases where the latter have followed the former in Greece) think of a possible return to Albania, but the second generation sees its future in Greece or elsewhere in Europe.

In the final paper, **Jennifer Clarke** shifts the analysis to the meso scale and looks at the role and efficacy of *migrant organizations* in Greece as *transnational actors* capable of promoting change and development in migrant countries of origin. A comparative perspective is provided by bringing in reference to migrant organizations in the UK and the Netherlands. Compared to these two latter countries, where both immigration and the founding of migrant organizations started much earlier, and where migrant organizations can be counted in their thousands, in Greece there are an estimated 128. Moreover, in Greece such organizations are mainly volunteer-run and exist on a shoestring, lacking government or NGO funding; whereas in the UK and the Netherlands many such organizations benefit from government funding and have paid, professional personnel in their employ. However, the most stunning of Clarke's findings is that none of the Greek migrant organizations seems to be engaged in any form of home-country development initiative; their main functions relate to assisting recent migrants with food, shelter and, where relevant, asylum advice; lobbying the government on migrant issues; putting on cultural events in Greece; and teaching the Greek language.

Notes

1. Funding for the travel expenses, accommodation and conference fees of selected workshop presenters was provided by a grant from IMISCOE to the Sussex Centre for Migration Research, and by a contribution from MIM (Malmö Institute for Migration, Diversity and Welfare).

2. UN figures for 2009–10 commonly quoted are 214 million international migrants worldwide (i.e. people living in a country other than that of their birth) and 740 million internal migrants.

3. For a useful textbook which clearly distinguishes between different types of migration and thresholds and techniques for measuring migration in its various forms (including internal migration), see Boyle, Halfacree, and Robinson (1998).

4. There have been subsequent refinements, including HDI variants more oriented to measuring poverty or gender inequality – see UNDP (2009, 208) for a useful chart of these variations. However, the basic HDI remains the standard and most widely used measure.

5. Although concerns over likely 'excessive' migration resulted in multi-year 'transition periods' before free movement for work became fully operational in the case of the 'southern' enlargement in the 1980s (Greece in 1981, Spain and Portugal in 1986) and the major 'eastern' enlargement in 2004 (the so-called A8 countries) as well as the accession of Bulgaria and Romania (A2 countries) in 2007.

6. However, in the current period of deep financial crisis, Greek emigration, especially of highly educated graduates and professionals, has started again as a response to rising unemployment and falling living standards. The impact of the crisis on immigrants in Greece is examined by Domna Michail in her paper in this issue.

7. See UNDP (2009, 171–2) for the detailed evidence. For example, Albania's overall HDI ranking is 28 places higher than its per capita GDP figure.

Notes on contributors

Russell King is Professor of Geography and Founding Director of the Sussex Centre for Migration Research at the University of Sussex, and during 2012–13 Willy Brandt Professor of Migration Studies at Malmö University in Sweden. He has been the Editor of the *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* since 2000. He has researched many types of migration in different parts of the world over the past 35 years; recently he has coordinated research projects on gender, migration and development in Albania and on return migration to Greece. Two recent books include *Out of Albania* (Berghahn 2008, with Nicola Mai) and *Remittances, Gender and Migration* (I.B.Tauris 2011, with Julie Vullnetari). Recent articles on migration have appeared in *Global Networks* (2008 and 2011), *Population, Space and Place* (2010 and 2012), *Economic Geography* (2011) and *Mobilities* (2009 and 2011).

Maja Povrzanović Frykman is Professor of Ethnology and teaches at the Department of Global Political Studies at Malmö University in Sweden. Based on previous work undertaken at the Zagreb Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Research, her main areas of research include war-related experiences, as presented in the edited collection *War, Exile, Everyday Life*, articles in *Current Anthropology*, *Ethnologia Europaea*, *Ethnologie Française*, and chapters in the Greenwood collection *Daily Lives of Civilians in Wartime Twentieth-Century Europe* and in *Blackwell Companion to the Anthropology of Europe*. Theoretical interest in place and identity enabled her to connect war-related research with concepts and

practices in the domains of diaspora and transnationalism. Her research on intra-ethnic differences between labour- and refugee-migrants from Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina resulted in edited collections *Beyond Integration: Challenges of Belonging in Diaspora and Exile* and *Transnational Spaces: Disciplinary Perspectives*, chapters in the Ashgate book *The Bosnian Diaspora*, the Routledge book *New Approaches to Migration? Transnational communities and the transformation of home* and articles published in a number of international journals. Her current project, which is funded by The Swedish Research Council, deals with the material practices of migrants.

Julie Vullnetari is a Post-Doctoral Research Fellow at the Sussex Centre for Migration Research in the School of Global Studies, University of Sussex. Her research interests focus around migration and development; the interaction between migration, gender and age; the dynamics between internal and international migration; and migration and care drain. More recently she has been researching everyday life during communism and border communities. She has published widely on these topics in journals such as *Global Networks*, *International Migration* and *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*.

References

Ackers, L. 2004. Managing relationships in peripatetic careers: Scientific mobility in the European Union. *Women's Studies International Forum* 27, no. 3: 189–201.

Basch, L., N. Glick Schiller, and C. Szanton Blanc. 1994. *Nations unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments and deterritorialized nation-states*. New York, NY: Gordon and Breach.

Boccagni, P. 2012. Even a transnational social field must have its boundaries: Methodological options, potentials and dilemmas for researching transnationalism. In *Handbook of research methods in migration*, ed. C. Vargas-Silva, 295–318. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Boyle, P., K. Halfacree, and V. Robinson. 1998. *Exploring contemporary migration*. London: Longman.

Brunnbauer, U. 2012. Labour migration and transnationalism in the Balkans: A historical perspective. In *Migration and identity: Historical, cultural and linguistic dimensions of mobility in the Balkans*, ed. P. Hristov, 11–24. Sofia: Paradigma.

Bryceson, D., and U. Vuorela, eds. 2002. *The transnational family: New European frontiers and global networks*. Oxford and New York, NY: Berg.

Caritas-Migrantes. 2012. *Immigration statistical file 2012*. Rome: Idos [in Italian].

Castles, S., and M.J. Miller. 2009. *The age of migration*. 4th edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cerase, F.P. 1974. Migration and social change: Expectations and reality. A study of return migration from the United States to Italy. *International Migration Review* 8, no. 2: 245–62.

Dannecker, P. 2009. Migrant visions of development: A gendered approach. *Population, Space and Place* 15, no. 20: 119–32.

de Haas, H. 2010. Migration and development: A theoretical perspective. *International Migration Review* 44, no. 1: 227–64.

Delgado Wise, R., and H. Marquez Covarrubias. 2009. Understanding the relationship between migration and development: Toward a new theoretical approach. *Social Analysis* 53, no. 3: 85–105.

Faist, T. 2000. *The volume and dynamics of transnational social spaces*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fielding, A. 1993. Migration, institutions and politics: The evolution of European migration policies. In *Mass migration in Europe: The legacy and the future*, ed. R. King, 40–62. London: Belhaven-Wiley.

King, R. 1993. European international migration 1945–90: A statistical and geographical overview. In *Mass migration in Europe: The legacy and the future*, ed. R. King, 19–39. London: Belhaven-Wiley.

King, R., and R. Skeldon. 2010. Mind the gap! Integrating approaches to internal and international migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36, no. 10: 1619–46.

Levitt, P. 2001. *The transnational villagers*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Levitt, P. 1998. Social remittances: Migration driven local-level forms of cultural diffusion. *International Migration Review* 32, no. 4: 926–48.

Levitt, P., and N. Glick Schiller. 2004. Conceptualizing simultaneity: A transnational social field perspective on society. *International Migration Review* 38, no. 3: 1002–39.

Mitchell, K. 1997. Transnational discourse: Bringing geography back in. *Antipode* 29, no. 1: 101–14.

Pichler, R. 2009. Migration, architecture and the imagination of home(land): An Albanian-Macedonian case study. In *Transnational societies, transterritorial politics: Migrations*

in the (post-) Yugoslav region, 19th – 20th century, ed. U. Brunnbauer, 213–35. Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag.

Pries, L., ed. 2001. *New transnational social spaces: International migration and transnational communities in the early 21st century*. London: Routledge.

Povrzanović Frykman, M. 2008. Southeast European connections: Towards an ethnography of immigrants' transnational practices. In *MESS and RAMSES II, proceedings of the Mediterranean ethnological summer school*, ed. J. Repič, A. Bartulović, and K. Sajovec Altshul, vol. 7, 147–67. Ljubljana: University of Ljubljana.

Portes, A. 2003. Theoretical convergences and empirical evidence in the study of immigrant transnationalism. *International Migration Review* 37, no. 3: 874–92.

Samers, M. 1999. 'Globalization', the geopolitical economy of migration and the 'spatial vent'. *Review of International Political Economy* 6, no. 2: 166–99.

Smith, R.C. 2006. *Mexican New York*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tsianos, V., and S, Karakayali. 2010. Transnational migration and the emergence of the European border regime: An ethnographic analysis. *European Journal of Social Theory* 13, no. 3: 373–87.

UNDP. 2009. *Human development report 2009. Overcoming barriers: Human mobility and development*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Van Hear, N., and N.N. Sørensen, eds. 2003. *The migration–development nexus*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.

World Bank. 2011. *Migration and remittances factbook*. Washington DC: World Bank.