

**UNITED NATIONS EXPERT GROUP MEETING ON
SUSTAINABLE CITIES, HUMAN MOBILITY
AND INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION**

Population Division

Department of Economic and Social Affairs

United Nations Secretariat

New York

7-8 September 2017

**International Migration, Internal Migration, Mobility and Urbanization:
Towards More Integrated Approaches**

Ronald Skeldon
Maastricht University

International Migration, Internal Migration, Mobility and Urbanization: Towards More Integrated Approaches

Ronald Skeldon

Maastricht University

Background

That migration is the most problematic of the population variables is taken as given. Unlike the unique events of birth and death that define an individual's lifetime, migration can be a multiple event. Its measurement depends entirely upon how it is defined in time and across space. How long does a person have to reside at a destination in order to be defined as a migrant? How far does that person have to travel in order to be so defined? The first is normative, often following multilateral United Nations recommendations with "12 months or more", or "less than 12 months and with the intention to remain for longer than 12 months" the "accepted" norm. The second is a given by the existing divisions of the world into states, in the case of international migration, and the division of those states into political and administrative political divisions, in the case of internal migration. Examples of such divisions are states, provinces, districts, parishes, and so on. As most migrants move over relatively short distances, the smaller the unit used to define "a migration", the greater the number of migrants captured by the data-gathering instrument. An example is given in figure 1. Further complications arise through the system of registering populations where they live: whether on a strict *de facto* basis, where they are found on census or survey night, or on a *de jure* basis, where they usually live at the time of the census or survey. The former captures, or should capture, a much greater range of short-term movements compared with the latter, which should only include longer-term residences.

Despite all the problems inherent in the collection of migration data, significant progress has been achieved over recent years. The compilation of a world origin-destination database, developed originally at the University of Sussex and now much extended and maintained by the United Nations Population Division and the World Bank, has provided the framework for a more precise measurement of global international population movement (Parsons et al 2007, United Nations 2015). These data showed that about 3 per cent of the world's population lived in a state or territory not of their birth and that that proportion had not changed significantly since the 1990s. In 2015, for example, the number of international migrants was estimated at around 244 million. However, this number has to be treated with great caution. This paper will raise some of these issues and then will go on to examine internal migration, arguing that it is the city that articulates integrated patterns of population movement. As the systems of internal and international migration evolve and change, so too, does the nature of the linkages between them, which are explored in this paper. Finally, the paper raises other forms of short-term mobility that emerge from essentially urban cultures and economies.

International migration systems

Quite apart from issues surrounding the variable quality of migration-related data across the world, three systemic weaknesses in the data on international migration exist that need to be kept in mind in any interpretation of the data. The first relates to the specific destinations and origins of the migration,

the second to underestimating the volume of international migration, and the third to the developmental context in which the migration takes place. While the global origin and destination database does provide basic information on the global patterns of international migration, perhaps its major limitation is that it is constrained by the unit that generates the data: the state. Migrants move from country A to country B, which they do because they move from one administrative unit to another, but in reality, they do not, because they move to very specific parts of country B from very specific parts of country A. The evidence for destinations is stronger than for origins. In the United Kingdom in 2015, some 13.5 per cent of the total population was foreign-born. However, that proportion increases to 41 per cent of the total population of central London, which accounted for 37 per cent of the total number of foreign-born in the country (McNeill 2017). Comparing the populations of other large cities in the main destination countries around the world, we find similar patterns with a much higher proportion of foreign-born and/or foreign citizens in the largest cities than in the country as a whole. For example, in 2010, the population of the United States was 12.7 per cent foreign but the populations of New York and Los Angeles were 36.8 and 35.6 per cent foreign-born respectively. In Canada, the proportions of foreign-born in Toronto and Montreal in 2011 were 49 and 33.2 per cent respectively compared with a national proportion of 21 per cent (World Cities Culture Report 2014, also IOM 2015). Although international migrants can be found spread across destination countries, they do tend to focus on urban areas and usually on the largest cities in each country. International migrants are a significant component in maintaining the populations of large cities in the developing world as well as providing key elements in the labour force of these urban economies. Thus, discussions of urbanization in the developed world now have to take into consideration international migration and not just the movements within their own borders.

The evidence to support specific origins of international migrants is more problematic. While data to support areas of concentration in origins are convincing, these areas need not be the largest urban areas of the country concerned. For example, the migrations from Pakistan or Bangladesh to the United Kingdom mainly come not from the largest cities but from small towns in quite isolated agricultural regions in these countries, in Mirpur and Sylhet districts respectively. Collecting information on origins essentially has to come from origin countries themselves depending upon local knowledge on where people are known to be leaving in large numbers. Destination countries cannot feasibly collect sub-national origin data through their census and surveys, given the sheer number of potential destinations, even in cases where the number of origin states to any destination is limited. Perhaps all that could be possible would be to identify the migrants by state of birth and whether they were from the largest city or not. However, in an era in which skilled migration has emerged as a key component in international flows, it seems intuitive that “the skilled” will have been prepared in urban areas as it is there that the main educational institutions of a country are to be found. Thus, rather than a series of state-to-state flows, the reality is likely to be primarily one of movement among cities. The urban origins of international migration have yet to be truly mapped.

The second of the three notes of caution on data on international migration is that the 244 million is an underestimate, not so much because many migrants were somehow “missed” out of enumeration systems but because of the importance of return migration as an integral part of international migration systems. Return migrants are clearly registered in their country of birth and hence as non-migrants. The

question is, of course, how important is return? The simple answer is that we do not know but that almost certainly it will vary from flow to flow with the incidence of return being lower for poor rural areas or states where conflict-induced migration is more prevalent. Economic historians have generated convincing evidence that return rates of 30 to 40 per cent were common during the Great Migration across the Atlantic from Europe to the Americas in the nineteenth century (Baines 1991, Nugent 1992, Hoerder 2012). With the developments in the technologies of transportation since that time, it might be reasonable to expect return rates to be greater, although any such statement has to remain a hypothesis only at this stage and will have to be considered in the context of other forms of mobility that have emerged in recent years and will be discussed below. It is also known that the skilled migration systems are characterized by a high degree of “churn” or turnover within relatively short time spans, in which return migration will be an unknown part (Skeldon 2017). Thus, the total number of people who have moved internationally is going to be significantly larger than the simple stock figure of 244 million given in the global database for 2015. Pertinent to the earlier discussion is whether return migrants who might have originated in small towns and rural areas return to their specific origins or to regional or national urban centres.

The third cautionary point relates to the common division of the world into global “north” and “south” with the data showing the importance of so-called south-south flows. However, like the migration itself, the level of development of countries changes over time. Many of the countries in the so-called “Global South”, particularly among those in eastern Asia, have emerged as dynamic advanced economies that have come to challenge those in the “Global North”. Simple global binary divisions distort the underlying realities and more nuanced divisions are required in order to make sense of the links between migration and development.

Internal migration systems

The issue of the global database on international migration underestimating the number of international migrants was raised above. However, that underestimate pales into insignificance if we try to examine all migration or both internal and international migration. Most migrants move within the boundaries of their own country as internal migrants. Thus, the key questions are how to measure internal migration and how many internal migrants exist in the world. Around the year 2000, UNDP came up with the global estimate of 740 million internal migrants, an estimate they admitted was “conservative” (UNDP 2009). Clearly, the more populous the country, the greater the number of internal migrants, and in the large, populous countries, UNDP took the largest of administrative units, states in India or provinces in China, for example, to define internal migration. However, as seen in the introduction to this paper, to go down to districts or townships as the migration-defining spatial unit would markedly increase the number of migrants so defined. Hence, the search for a meaningful and consistent definition of an internal migrant is largely illusory.

It is not only the spatial units used to define migration that are problematic but the questions asked to derive length of residence at the destination raise other problems. Few countries around the world have registration systems that record changes in usual place of residence and the migration data are generated through retrospective instruments that collect the relevant information through one or more of three questions: birthplace; place of residence at a fixed time in the past, generally one year or five

years ago; and last place of usual previous residence before coming to present place, generally asked in association with another question on length of time since moving from that last place of usual previous residence. The volume of internal migration collected varies markedly by which question has been asked. Birthplace, on which the international migration above is based, generates the least satisfactory and lowest estimates but is the easiest to ask to provide a reliable answer. The last place of usual previous residence provides the best estimates of most recent migrant flows, although its utility depends upon the detail of information collected on the length of residence. If that is collected by year up to five years, the question can provide useful information on short-term movements, even more so if the data collected specify residences of less than one year by month. However, this level of detail can be impacted by respondent error and memory lapse and is more complicated to ask in the field, and the middle question using a single question on place of usual residence at a specific time in the past is perhaps the best compromise solution. A useful calibration of various methods is available from the 1992 National Migration Survey of Thailand (Chamratrithirong 1995). Using a fixed point of five years before the census gave a national estimate of 8 per cent of the population having moved to a destination within that time period. However, using a last place of usual residence from six months to five years gave an estimate of 14.6 per cent as having moved in that period. Applying a yet finer one-month to five-year definition further increased the proportion of the population that had moved within the period to 22 per cent. These data confirm the findings of a large number of micro, anthropological-type studies of migration across the developing world that show that very significant numbers of people move for short periods of time and over quite short distances (Skeldon 1990). The idea that most people do not move or are fixed at a specific location might be appealing but it is wrong. Mobility is an inherent characteristic of all populations unless specific policies or other factors are in place that limit or control that mobility.

Nevertheless, some peoples appear to move more than others and in different ways from others, which appears to be closely linked with the level of development in each country, which, in turn, is linked with the distribution of the population in each country. Despite all the difficulties with the measurement of internal migration as sketched above, considerable progress has been made towards the construction of analytical models that allow the comparison of patterns across space. See particularly the work of Martin Bell and his colleagues, which shows that certain systematic trends and patterns can be identified irrespective of the scale of the data and the type of question applied (Bell et al 2015a, 2015b, Rees et al 2016). Nevertheless, the types of migration captured do vary depending upon the scale. For example, in a country such as India, migration using small-area data is dominated by movements for marriage, with a very different gender balance and educational characteristics compared with migration generated from the large spatial units of the state which are still dominated by more educated migration with a greater male dominance.

Urbanization, transitions and linkages between internal and international migration

Central to the consideration of internal migration is the sectoral pattern by urban and rural. Not all countries provide origins by sector and the boundaries between the sectors often change to make longitudinal comparison problematic. Boundary changes, not just sectoral but also of the basic spatial units themselves, have proved to be an extremely difficult problem to deal with that has to be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Again, local knowledge is key in order to make any necessary

adjustments and avoid drawing misleading results. Nevertheless, the overall trend has been a redistribution of population from rural to urban areas. This “urban transition” has become one of the key indicators of development, always accepting that rural-to-urban migration has not been the only, or even the dominant, internal flow in any country at certain times during the transition to an urban society. Rural-to-rural, urban-to-urban and urban-to-rural flows also play a role, although as populations become concentrated in urban areas, migration out of and within the rural sector declines as movements within the urban sector come to dominate. Movement up the urban hierarchy from smaller to larger urban places has been significant through the urban transition with the emergence of the megacity a common pattern. A number of developed economies have also seen fluctuations with phases of “counterurbanization” occurring, although this reversal appears itself to have been reversed with the reinvention of the central parts of industrial cities in many parts of Europe perhaps associated with the shift towards economies based increasingly on information technology and where the largest cities are the centres of innovation (Champion 2001).

This transition to urban societies and the associated shifting patterns of migration has also been associated with the transition to low mortality and low fertility to the extent that migration, both internal but increasingly international, accounts for demographic support in so many parts of the developed world.¹ Sustained fertility decline ultimately impacts upon migration through changing age profiles of populations, generating decreasing numbers in the cohorts most likely to migrate. The data on both Japan and the Republic of Korea (figure 2) clearly illustrate this trend but evidence from the United States and from the United Kingdom and other parts of Europe also indicates decreasing internal migration (Champion and Shuttleworth 2016, Bell 2015a, Skeldon 2013). Demographic shifts need not be the sole deterministic factor in this equation but the supply of that ultimate resource, population, provides the context in which other factors may operate. The changing nature of the economy towards one based upon information technology has already been raised, but the nature of the housing market and changing personal tastes that have seen the emergence of other forms of mobility, to be discussed below, are also likely to be important.

In this changing matrix of migration, the cities are enduring destinations. Internal rural-to-urban and urban-to-urban migrations are augmented by international migration, and probably from primarily urban origins, with many of relatively short duration. Traders have circulated among cities for centuries but also established depots for the collection and distribution of goods around which communities of longer-term migrants evolved, often intermarrying with host populations. In areas colonized by foreign populations, cities were the gateways for settlers, the centres of administration and the hub for the generation of capital that funded the railways and roads that facilitated the penetration of the hinterland. International migrations generated internal migrations across the Americas, Australasia and large parts of other continents impacted by colonialism. In origin countries, migrants from rural areas to cities continue their migrations overseas after periods of residence sufficient to accumulate capital for the move. Or, once direct links have been established between a village or small town, direct migration

¹ It is not simply the direct contribution of the number of migrants to a population but, with higher fertility than the native population of developed countries, their contribution to the number of births is also a factor. For example, in England and Wales, where the foreign-born represent about one eighth of the population, foreign-born mothers currently account for about one quarter of all births.

from these specific origins to overseas destinations can take place but it is generally through the largest cities, which are the links to transportation systems to overseas destinations. Where large numbers of migrants enter into “gateway” or “arrival” cities (Saunders 2010), not only will some move on into the hinterland but others, perhaps the majority, remain in the city and “push” prior migrants or native populations out towards the periphery, in a process of extending suburbanization, or to other parts of the country. Hence, international migration is linked to internal migration and internal migration is linked to international migration in complex, ever-changing and evolving patterns of human movement. For more detailed assessments of these linkages in Asia and more widely, see Skeldon 2006, King and Skeldon 2010, and Lozano-Ascencio, Roberts and Bean 1999.

New mobilities

While migration is seen as a change in the usual place of residence of an individual, that is rarely a single, simple movement. People move on and back; they move over the short-term as well as for longer-term sojourns. As was made clear from the start of this paper, the instruments we use to capture the movement of people can only capture a part of the whole process of mobility. In the discussions of migration, and of migration and development in particular, the focus on the minority of those who move, the international migrant, has produced a very partial and deceptive, and arguably distorted view of the whole process. The more recent inclusion of internal migration into the equation goes in the right direction, especially in the realization that the “two” migration systems, at least to the extent that they can be separated, act in concert as suggested above. Yet, one other form of mobility, mainly international but also internal, needs to be introduced into the discussion: the movement of tourists.

Tourists are not generally considered to be migrants as they do not bring about any redistribution of population. They are short-term movers for recreational purposes who go home after a few days or weeks at the most. Yet, the emergence of the “gap year” and programmes for working holidaymakers has extended this category into a grey area that begins to overlap with other circular forms of mobility. It has emerged as one of the largest industries in the world, accounting for one in eleven jobs worldwide and 7 per cent of world exports (UNWTO 2015), and is particularly important for the populations of small islands and marginal areas, which otherwise have few other resources. It also has links with migration both into and out of areas. It attracts into an area the skilled required to manage the hotels and all the accompanying services and recreational activities demanded by the visitors. Conversely, mass tourism, by increasing property prices and putting pressure on non-tourism-related industries can “push” people to leave. The example of Venice illustrates the case, with a population decline of almost 30 per cent from 367,000 in 1970 to 261,000 in 2011, even if it experienced a slight increase to just under 265,000 by 2014.² Venice is perhaps an extreme example but many of the UNESCO World Heritage sites are under pressure from the influx of tourists, who need specialist services and this results in increasing prices for local populations that may lead to both immigration and emigration of people. The key point is that this form of short-term mobility impacts on other types of population movement in a variety of ways.

² Data from national statistical sources, at: <http://population.city/italy/venice/>

It can be argued that tourism or travel for recreational purposes is not new. The importance of pilgrimage in every major part of the world and throughout history has taken people out of the confines of their towns and villages to participate in a broader community. What is new is that from the late 20th century, the scale of the activity has become a mass appeal as it has developed not just in Europe, North America and Australia but also among the emerging new middle-income groups in Asia, Latin America and parts of Africa. From 435 million tourist arrivals in 1990, the annual total increased to 1,186 million in 2015 and 1,235 million in 2016 (UNWTO 2015, UNWTO 2017). These are not measures of individual tourists but of arrivals who spent at least a night in the destination country. Thus, a single individual taking several holidays a year or visiting multiple countries will be registered multiple times. Also, confusingly, the figures also seem to include a proportion (14 per cent in 2015) who entered for “business and professional” purposes, suggesting an overlap with the skilled migrant system raised earlier in the paper. Despite these difficulties with the data, the basic points are simple: tourists are an integral part of development around the world and are linked to other forms of population movement. One of the linkages is most commonly ignored: if only a tiny fraction of the number of arrivals enter legally but stay on to become irregular migrants, significant numbers of people are involved. Tourism as a channel for irregular migration cannot be discounted.

The marked increases in global tourism from the last decade of the 20th century have been associated with two main trends: first, the emergence of “budget airlines” that provided low-cost travel regionally and increasingly transregionally, and second, a change in tastes. Migration has been associated historically with the diffusion of ideas about what to consume, which were essentially about “things” (Trentmann 2016). At a certain level of development, tastes change, to the extent that “events”, rather than material things per se, are seen as more desirable and tourism emerges to fulfil this role. Thus, mobility becomes a central part of consumer culture and short-term circulation begins to substitute for longer-term “migrations”, which was originally envisaged by Zelinsky (1971) some decades ago in his hypothesis of the mobility transition, even if not entirely in the way currently presented. Whether this trend is a factor in the decline in internal migration in the developed world outlined earlier in this paper must await future research but it further emphasizes the interlinkages between different types of mobilities. Tourism is embedded in a complex matrix of other forms of human movement, thus making it difficult for policy makers. Migration policy, complicated enough as it is, cannot be separated from policies that contribute to other forms of human movement and the interrelationships need to be appreciated if effective approaches are to be introduced to “manage migration”.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to review the various instruments that are used to measure migration. It reviewed the macro-level data for the study of international migration supplied through the United Nations Population Division and what it included and excluded. Particular attention was given to urban destinations and urban origins of international migration and the need for sub-national data and analyses. The paper then went on to look at internal migration, again, assessing the various instruments, with attention being drawn to the importance of measuring short-distance and short-term circulation. The tendency to consider international migration separately from other forms of mobility persists and the argument was made that human mobility is best conceived as a system that integrates internal and international migration within a single framework. Finally, attention was given to mass mobility in the

form of tourism, which has significant linkages to other forms of internal and international migration and needs to be built into the global framework of migration, and particularly into the debates on migration and development and on policies to manage migration.

References

- Baines Dudley 1991, *Emigration from Europe 1815-1930*, London, Macmillan.
- Bell, Martin 2015a, Elin Charles-Edwards, Dorota Kupiszewska, Marek Kupiszewski, John Stillwell, Y. Zhu, Internal migration and development: comparing migration intensities around the world, *Population and Development Review*, 41(1): 33–58, 2015
- Bell, Martin 2015b, Elin Charles-Edwards, Dorota Kupiszewska, Marek Kupiszewski, John Stillwell, Y. Zhu, Internal migration data around the world: assessing contemporary practice, *Population, Space and Place*, 21(1): 1–17.
- Champion, Tony 2001, Urbanization, suburbanization, counterurbanization and reurbanization, in Ronan Paddison (ed.), *Handbook of Urban Studies*, London, Sage, pp. 143-161.
- Champion, Tony and Ian Shuttleworth 2016, Are people changing address less? An analysis of migration within England and Wales, 1971–2011, by distance of move. *Population, Space and Place*.
- Chamrathirong, Aphichat, et al. 1995, *National Migration Survey of Thailand*, Salaya, Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University.
- Hoerder, Dirk 2012, Migrations and belongings, in E. S. Rosenberg (ed.), *A World Connecting 1870-1945*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, pp. 435-599.
- IOM 2015, *World Migration Report 2015, Migrants and Cities: New Partnerships to Manage Mobility*, Geneva, International Organization for Migration, 2015, at: http://publications.iom.int/system/files/wmr2015_en.pdf
- King, Russell and Ronald Skeldon 2010, Mind the gap: integrating approaches to internal and international migration, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 36 (10): 1619-1646.
- Lozano-Ascencio, Fernando, Bryan Roberts and Frank Bean 1999, The interconnections of internal and international migration: the case of the United States and Mexico, in Ludger Pries (ed.), *Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- McNeill, Robert 2017, An overview of the number, population share, geographic distribution and citizenship of migrants in the UK, Briefing, Migration Observatory, University of Oxford, at: <http://www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/briefings/migrants-in-the-uk-an-overview/#kp2>
- Nugent, Walter 1992, *Crossings: The Great Transatlantic Migrations, 1870-1914*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press,

- Parsons, Christopher R, Ronald Skeldon, Terrie L. Walmsley and L. Alan Winters 2007, Quantifying international migration, a database of bilateral stocks, in Çağlar Özden and Maurice Schiff (eds.), *International Migration, Economic Development and Policy*, Washington, The World Bank, pp. 17-58.
- Rees, Philip, Martin Bell, Marek Kupiszewski, Dorota Kupiszewska, Philipp Ueffing, Aude Bernard, Elin Charles-Edwards, John Stillwell 2016, *The impact of internal migration on population redistribution: an international comparison*, *Population, Space and Place*.
- Saunders, Doug 2010, *Arrival City: How the Largest Migration in History is Reshaping Our World*, London, Heinemann.
- Skeldon, Ronald 1990, *Population Mobility in Developing Countries: A Reinterpretation*, London, Belhaven Press.
- Skeldon, Ronald 2006, Interlinkages between internal and international migration in the Asian region, *Population, Space and Place*, vol. 12: 15-30.
- Skeldon, Ronald 2013, *Global migration: demographic aspects and its relevance for development*, Technical Paper No. 2013/6, United Nations Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, December, at: http://www.un.org/esa/population/migration/documents/EGM.Skeldon_17.12.2013.pdf
- Skeldon, Ronald 2017, High-skilled migration and the limits of migration policies, in Mathias Czaika (ed.), *High-skilled Migration: Drivers and Policies*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, forthcoming.
- Trentmann, Frank 2016, *Empire of Things: How We Became a World of Consumers, from the Fifteenth Century to the Twenty-first*, London, Allen Lane.
- UNDP 2009, *Human Development Report 2009, Overcoming Barriers: Human Mobility and Development*, New York, United Nations Development Programme and Palgrave Macmillan, p.1.
- United Nations 2015, *Trends in International Migrant Stock: Migrants by Destination and Origin*, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, at: <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates15.shtml>
- UNWTO 2015, *Tourism Highlights 2016 Edition*, Madrid, United Nations World Tourism Organization, at: <http://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284418145>
- UNWTO 2017, *Sustained growth in international tourism despite challenges*, Press release, at: <http://www2.unwto.org/press-release/2017-01-17/sustained-growth-international-tourism-despite-challenges>
- World Cities Culture Report 2014*, London, World Cities Culture Forum, p. 232, at: http://www.worldcitiescultureforum.com/assets/others/World_Cities_Culture_Report_2014_hires.pdf
- Zelinsky, Wilbur 1971, The hypothesis of the mobility transition, *Geographical Review*, 61(2): 219-249.

