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Abstract
Migration scholarship falls into two distinct camps, one devoted to the study of internal migration, the other to international migration. Currently, international migration dominates the academic landscape of migration studies, even though, on a global scale, more people move internally than internationally. Very few attempts have been made to merge the two migration traditions, either in terms of developing common theoretical frameworks (though this convergence was more evident in earlier theorisations of migration deriving from economics and push-pull models), or through studies which analyse the functional links and complementarity between the two migration types. For instance, to what extent can internal and international migration be considered alternative strategies within a migration decision-making framework? How about migrants who are both internal and international migrants, one form preceding the other? This paper is in two main parts. The first overviews various articulations between internal and international migration, both theoretically and empirically. The second part presents a case-study of Italian graduate migration, comparing those who move externally (to London) with those who move internally (from South to North within Italy). A small subsample of graduate non-movers is also included. Analysing the interviews, two terms which surfaced consistently were mentalità, meaning the Italian way of doing things, at a range of levels from the national to the family; and raccomandazione, meaning the necessity to have someone supporting you in order to get a job. Whilst both types of migration were driven essentially by economic factors, the internal movers saw their relocation purely in these terms, and therefore as a ‘forced move’, whereas the emigrants also saw their migration as an adventure and means of self-realisation.
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Introduction: the ‘big divide’ in migration studies

Within the scholarly study of migration there is an almost apartheid-like separation between the study of international migration and that of internal migration. These two migration traditions and literatures seldom speak to each other, although they used to much more in the past, in earlier theorisations of migration. Nowadays, when scholars and researchers speak of ‘migration’ they nearly always mean ‘international migration’ without, however, specifying the ‘international’. Thus, for example, Stephen Castles and Mark Miller’s well-known book *The Age of Migration*, published now in four editions (1993 to 2009), is really an age of international migration. Robin Cohen’s (1995) monumental *Cambridge Survey of World Migration* is a history of international migration. Brettell and Hollifield’s (2000) *Migration Theory* is a book about theories of international migration. More recent texts repeat the same assumption: Cohen and Sirkeci’s (2011) *Cultures of Migration*, or Goldin, Cameron and Balarajans’s (2011) *Exceptional People: How Migration Shaped Our World and Will Define Our Future*, are also only about international migration, omitting any analysis, even any mention, of internal migration.

Yet consider the figures. The United Nations Population Division estimated a total ‘stock’ of 214 million international migrants in 2010; such migrants being defined as those residing outside their country of birth. The same source estimated a total of 740 million internal migrants, nearly three and a half times the total for international migrants. True, measuring internal migration is more tricky than enumerating international movers, who merely have to cross an international border; hence there are huge problems of cross-national statistical comparability in how internal migration is measured in different countries. But we should not get bogged down in detail: what is clear is that, in countries like India, China and the USA, tens if not (in China) hundreds of millions of migrants have moved internally. Indeed, it may well be that there are as many internal migrants in China as there are international migrants in the entire world.

The bifurcation of the study of migration has been influenced by, or is related to, several factors: different data sources, different techniques of analysis, different disciplinary backgrounds of researchers (mainly geographers, regional economists and demographers are interested in internal migration), and different policy agendas (Salt and Kitching 1992: 148; Skeldon 2006: 17). For the past few decades, international migration has been seen as more important from the point of view of international geopolitics, internal politics, migration policy priorities and, hence, funding opportunities. This last point helps to explain the explosion of publications on international migration and the lack of attention paid to internal migration.
This historiography of migration study tells a different story. Early theorisations of migration, from Ravenstein (1885, 1889) on (including, inter alia, Sjaastad 1962; Stouffer 1960; Todaro 1969; Wolpert 1965), were mainly about internal migration, or managed to integrate internal with international migration within the same framework. Particularly notable in this latter regard was Wilbur Zelinsky’s path-breaking ‘hypothesis of the mobility transition’ (1971) which managed to combine, in a multi-stage evolutionary model, not only both internal and international migration, but also other mobility forms such as circulation, commuting and leisure moves.1 It seems that the ‘divide’ between internal and international migration scholarship opened up in the 1980s and 1990s with the globalisation and geopoliticisation of international migration, which then became the dominant form of migration in both the academic and the popular imagination, and remains so today.

Our final introductory point is to problematise the distinction between internal and international migration: the ‘border’ between the two is not always clear-cut, due to the shifting location and variable nature of borders themselves. The case of the EU Schengen Area illustrates a hybrid internal/international border regime: the contrast between the tightly controlled external border of Schengenland, and the internal borders where free movement takes place across what are still international borders but are regarded as open, internal borders within the Schengen territory. Or consider an opposite scenario: the break-up of Yugoslavia and Russia created new borders and ‘converted’ internal migrants into international ones.2 Or the case of colonised Africa where the demarcation first of colonial territories, and then of new nation-state boundaries after independence in the 1960s, cut through areas across which there was once free movement based on local livelihood circuits and tribal and ethnic affiliations (Adepoju 1998). Having said all this, we accept that there exists a valid distinction between internal

1 Which is not to say that the Zelinsky model was not significantly flawed. For recent critiques see King (2012: 139-140) and Skeldon (2012: 157-162).
2 We cannot resist sharing the anecdote about Adolf, whose house now sits on the Latvian-Russian border. Previously his house and plot of land had been part of the Soviet Union, of which Latvia was a part. Adolf was born in 1942, during the period when Latvia was invaded by Nazi Germany, for which his parents evidently had some admiration. The point about Adolf’s house nowadays is that, whilst the dwelling is in Latvia, the outside toilet at the end of the garden is in Russia. Every time Adolf visits his toilet (if he has his mobile phone with him, it texts him the message ‘Welcome to Russia’), he deposits, so to speak, a little bit of himself in another country, outside of the EU. This anecdote is in Malm and Green (2013: 32, 39) with additional detail from Aija Lulle, Department of Geography, University of Latvia, who visited and interviewed Adolf for the Malm and Green book.
and international migration. The fact that an individual moves to a different state does make a difference, in all sorts of ways.

Our paper continues as follows. In the next section we discuss the possible linkages between internal and international migration, in terms of how they may be sequenced in an individual’s migration biography, or functionally related in other ways. We then examine, via the limited literature available, the differentiating factors that distinguish internal from international movers. This leads us into the second half of the paper, which is an empirical investigation of the migration of Italian graduates, both internally from the South to the North of Italy, and externally to the London area in the UK. We examine the differential character and motivations of the two types of migrant, based on interview data with samples of each type, and also compare them with a third sample of graduate non-movers. The case study highlights, amongst other things, the role both of economic factors (above all the search for employment opportunities) and also of non-economic factors such as the Italian mentalità as a push factor (we define mentalità later), the desire for emigration as a quest for self-development, as well as the relevance of emotional ties to family and hometown as factors for non-migration.

**Linking and sequencing internal and international migration**

The separation of the academic study of internal and international migration gives the impression that they are entirely different processes affecting different sets of migrants. In certain scenarios this may be the case, but in others the same individuals or families might be involved in both, while at an aggregate level there are functional linkages between the two migration types.

Where migrants engage in both types of migration, the most logical sequence is *internal leading to international migration*. This fits into the spatial logic of *stepwise migration*, whereby migrants move progressively up the urban hierarchy and then migrate abroad: so from village to town/city within a country, this acting as a springboard for emigration abroad. For a rural-origin migrant, a period spent working in a town or city is often necessary to gather the financial resources and social/business contacts required for the external move.

Amongst the examples noted in the literature of this sequence of internal succeeded by international migration are Turkey (King 1976: 70-72), Thailand (Skeldon 2006: 22-24) and, more intensively researched, Mexico (Cornelius 1992; del Rey Poveda 2007; Lozano-Ascencio et al. 1999; Zabin and Hughes 1995). The Mexican evidence, however, is far from consistent and reveals a diversity of arrangements around the basic internal-to-international sequence. For instance, Cornelius (1992: 162-163) wrote that ‘rather than simply absorbing internal migrants from the countryside... as they have
done for many years, Mexico’s large urban centres are serving increasingly as platforms for migration to the United States’. This conclusion is broadly supported by Zabin and Hughes (1995) who tracked Oaxacan migrants from southern Mexico through intermediate stops in northern Mexican states en route to the US. Other Mexican studies elaborate somewhat different patterns and reach different conclusions. According to Lozano-Ascencio et al. (1999: 140), ‘direct migration from rural areas to international destinations seems to have been the norm in international flows from Mexico to the United States’. A hybrid variation is migration from southern, rural Mexico to the maquiladora towns on the US/Mexican border which combine US capital with low-cost Mexican labour in export-processing industrial estates (Cornelius and Martin 1993). Lindstrom and Lauster (2001) point to yet another interesting sequence whereby intense initial step migration from village to town followed by onward emigration, can lead to the ‘saturation’ of provincial towns by rural-urban migrants who then start emigrating directly from their villages to abroad, facilitated by the social networks established with previous waves of migrants who have already settled abroad.

If we now decouple further the migration trajectories from the individual/family/village scale, so it is not the same individual or source-group of migrants who are moving but geographically and historically separate cohorts, other sequences arise in the ‘internal leads to international’ model. A good example is southern Europe, especially the paradigmatic case of Italy. Rapid industrialisation in the 1950s and 1960s was sustained by internal flows of labour from the Italian South and depressed parts of north-east Italy, but then, when the supply of internal migrants ran dry in the 1970s, the source switched to international migrants coming from poor countries in Africa, South and East Asia and, after 1990, Eastern Europe (King et al. 1997).

The second sequence, international then internal migration, has been mainly examined by population geographers in the US and UK. For the most part this trajectory is not regarded as a form of step migration in the way that internal-to-international migration is. Rather, the focus has been on the spatial redistribution patterns of various migrant, refugee and ethnic minority populations within the host country, without linking this to the international migration that preceded these internal relocations. Within the UK, geographers and demographers such as Fielding (1995, 2007), Robinson (1992) and Simpson and Finney (2009) have used linked census records such as the Longitudinal Study to compare the internal migration patterns of different migrant-origin groups. One of their key findings is the contrast between the relative spatial immobility of Black Caribbean populations, confined to certain low-status districts of large cities like London and Birmingham, and the more spatially (and socio-economically) mobile
Indian-origin population, which is both suburbanising and redistributing itself to smaller towns and cities. Similar patterns of immigrant dispersion away from central metropolitan areas of the US, including the creation of ‘ethno-burbs’, are revealed by Belanger and Rogers (1992) and Light and Johnston (2009); see also Nogle (1994) on Canada. A somewhat different internal migration trajectory is exhibited by some refugee groups in the UK, Sweden and the US, where an initial dispersion to peripheral towns where cheaper and vacant housing is available may be followed by a regrouping in large cities where the employment opportunities are better and where other refugees from the same country may be present in larger numbers (Gordon 1987; Hammar 1993; Robinson and Hale 1990).

In a recent paper Mark Ellis (2012) reviews the US literature on the internal migration of immigrants, but also goes one stage further by attempting to point up logical functional linkages between immigrant spatial mobility within the US and other processes of population change. One important knock-on or ‘displacement’ effect occurs when an influx of immigrants into particular regions or urban areas causes an outflow of the native population. Ellis (2012: 198-201) lists a number of hypothetical mechanisms behind this linked-flow effect: labour market competition (i.e. immigrants crowd out the native working class from certain job sectors, causing them to move elsewhere); housing market effects (immigrants are more willing to live at high densities within properties and urban areas, again crowding out the locals); and more cultural effects, such as the contentious notion of ‘white flight’ whereby native whites move out of urban areas in response to the moving in of ‘visible minorities’. Along with other authors (Card 2001; Walker et al. 1992; Wright et al. 1997), Ellis is highly critical of these cause-effect models, pointing out that much depends on data and model specification. A major interpretive dilemma surrounds the issue of displacement versus replacement: in other words do incoming immigrants displace locals from jobs, housing and certain urban districts, or are the locals moving out anyway so that immigrants take up the opportunity to fill vacated housing and employment?

Shifting the focus now to the migrant sending countries, another linked-flow phenomenon can be found whereby international outmigration from certain areas leads to internal replacement flows into these areas of heavy, perhaps excessive, emigration. This phenomenon is especially likely to occur if emigration is sourced mainly from the richer, more urbanised areas of the sending country. Mexico and Morocco, two ‘classic’ emigration countries, provide evidence to support this ‘replacement migration’ process. In Mexico, wage differentials are now greater between Chiapas and Jalisco than they are between Jalisco and the United States: migrants from Chiapas move to
Jalisco to replace the Jalisco workers who have gone to the US (Fitzgerald 2009: 150). And in Morocco, de Haas (2007: 25-26) has documented how internal migrants from poor villages and regions are attracted to the areas of origin of international migrants, where they work in the booming construction industry which is financed by migrant remittances from abroad.

A final stage in the spatial sequencing of internal and international migration comes with return migration. Where do migrants return to, precisely, when they go back to their country of origin? If they return to a place or a region which is different from the place they started out from, then a net internal migration effect is produced via the mechanism of emigration and return from abroad. Plenty of evidence exists to support this pattern: migrants leave from depressed rural areas, but when they return they relocate to urban areas (to a provincial or regional town, or to the capital city) in order to access better employment prospects, living standards and investment opportunities (see Hernández Álvarez 1967 on Puerto Rico and Unger 1986 on Greece).³

Differentiating factors between internal and international migrants

From a source-country perspective, what, if anything, distinguishes internal migrants from emigrants? Research on Mexican migration gives some insights, although the evidence is far from consistent and the situation is complicated by the fact, noted earlier, that many international migrants have a prior history of internal migration within Mexico. It is also the case, following the household economics model, that different members of the same family may be involved in different types of migration – one or more members migrating abroad and others migrating internally.

Zabin and Hughes’ findings (1995: 410-413) confirm what seems to be a widely generalised picture (cf. Balán 1988), namely that emigrants (in Zabin and Hughes’ study, from Oaxaca to California) tend to be male and older compared to internal migrants. Balán’s survey of a broader range of research, including his own work on Bolivian migration to Argentina, enables him to make the following generalisations. Those who are better off tend to migrate further (i.e. abroad) whereas those with fewer resources tend to be limited to shorter-range internal migration. The higher costs (and risks) of international migration largely explain the types of selectivity involved – for

³ Return migration to the country of origin or internally migrating in the country of destination are not the only migration pathways that can be followed. Increasing evidence accumulates for ‘onward migration’ whereby, similarly, migrants move through one country (perhaps staying there for a long time) en route to another. On transit migration see Collyer and de Haas (2012) and Suter (2012), and on the well-researched case of the onward migration of Somali refugees see Bang Nielsen (2004) and van Liempt (2011).
example, with regard to financial backing, education, and family contacts. Hence, Balán re-states one of Ravenstein’s famous ‘laws’ of migration: males are more predisposed to international migration than females, especially when migration is temporary, whereas internal migration to cities from rural areas shows a majority of females.

Linstrom and Lauster’s (2001) study of outmigration from Zacatecas also demonstrates that emigration to (and return from) the US is mainly a form of investment migration, whereas internal migration is a lower-risk strategy geared more towards household survival. Similar results are obtained by del Rey Povada’s (2007) three-way comparison of migration from Veracruz to local towns, to the industrial estates along the US/Mexican border, and to the US. This study finds that migrations to local market towns and to the border are generated by precarious economic conditions at source, whereas the international movers are more wealthy (or less poor) initially, and are more risk- and income-oriented.

Still on the Mexican front, Stark and Taylor (1991) come up with rather different findings, based on a study of migrant and non-migrant households in Michoacán state. Some of their findings support the general picture described above. Migrants to the US were more likely to be male, have greater household wealth (land, animals, machinery etc.) and have kin already in the US, when compared to internal movers and non-migrants. On the other hand, migrants to the US had, on average, fewer years of education (4.1) than internal migrants (6.5), with non-migrants at 3.9 years. Stark and Taylor explain this finding as follows: better-educated villagers are much more likely to migrate to urban destinations in Mexico, where returns to education are likely to be high, or at least tangible, than to low-skill undocumented immigrant labour markets in the US where background education has little value and therefore cannot be capitalised on.

The Italian case

We now pick up selected issues from the foregoing discussion and examine them empirically with reference to recent Italian migration, which has been dominated by widespread concerns about high youth unemployment, rigid labour markets and brain drain.4 We are particularly interested in the comparative dimension highlighted in the previous section of this paper, and wish to address the following general questions:

---

4 For echoes of these debates in the British press see Butler (2013); Hooper (2011); Nowilowski (2011). Also The Guardian carried a two-part special report on the exodus of young graduates and professionals from all the main Southern European countries (Italy, Greece, Spain, Portugal), plus Ireland; 22 December 2011, pp.1, 24-25; 23 December 2011, pp. 28-30.
• What factors differentiate internal from international migration?
• Are the motivations and conditions of the two migrant groups different?
• Does internal migration lead to international migration, or vice versa; and are there any other functional linkages between the two migration types?

Reformulating these questions within the specific context of recent Italian external and internal migration of graduates, we rephrase the questions as follows:

• Why do so many Italian graduates migrate to the UK?
• What are the differences (if any), in terms of motivations and characteristics, between graduates who migrate internally within Italy (from South to North) and those who emigrate to the UK? Why do some graduates choose to stay in their home town?
• Does internal migration lead to subsequent external migration, and what are graduates’ future mobility plans?

The current phase of high-skilled internal and external migration is but the latest in a long series of migration eras and types stretching back nearly 150 years. Italy is undoubtedly one of the great or ‘classic’ countries of emigration sending, arguably, more migrants to a greater variety of destination countries than perhaps any other country. The crude statistics tell of 26 million emigrant departures during the hundred years 1871-1971 (Rosoli 1976), but what is perhaps more important is the historical and geographical diversity of this huge exodus: chain migration and strong local and regional identities make this less of a national mass movement and more a myriad of kinship and social networks orchestrating migration from particular origins to particular destinations. Not for nothing did Donna Gabaccia title her history of Italian emigration *Italy’s Many Diasporas* (Gabaccia 2000).

Simplifying, the main historical phases and types of Italian migration are as follows:

• The ‘Great Migration’ to the Americas, 1880s to 1920s, mainly to the USA, Argentina and Brazil; from all parts of Italy but, especially after 1900, increasingly from the South and Sicily to the US.
• Postwar labour migration, 1950s to early 1970s, mainly to Europe (especially France, Germany and Switzerland) but also to the US, Canada, and Australia; mainly from southern Italy.
• Mass internal migration, South to North, 1950s and 1960s; mainly from poor rural regions to big industrial cities (Milan, Turin, Genoa) and to Rome.
• The ‘new migration’, post-1990s, more highly qualified with many graduates: two streams, South to North within Italy, and abroad to Europe and other key global destinations.

Probably the sequence should be completed by mentioning the transformation of Italy from a country of mass emigration to one of mass immigration in recent decades – the numbers escalating from the first arrivals of Filipinos, Senegalese and Moroccans in the 1970s and 1980s to the highly diverse migrant populations of today. Currently there are 5 million immigrants in Italy (Caritas Migrantes 2012), a number which somewhat exceeds the 4 million nationals now living abroad (Fondazione Migrantes 2012). However, one indication of the scale of recent Italian emigration is the growth in the number of Italians registered as living abroad by more than 1 million between 2006 and 2011 (Fondazione Migrantes 2012). The apparent paradox of the co-existence of large-scale emigration and immigration is explained by the specific jobs done by the immigrants – low-status, often precarious work in agriculture, construction, small industrial workshops and personal services. These jobs are firmly rejected by the majority of the Italian labour force, especially those with university qualifications.

**Method**

The main research technique for this study was the semi-structured interview, administered to a total of 84 research participants, all graduates aged between their mid-20s and late-30s. The limit of five years since graduation was set as a threshold to define ‘recent graduates’ and hence the ‘early-career’ life-stage. Equal numbers of men and women were interviewed across each subsample. There were three subsamples within the total of 84 participants:

---

5 The main immigrant groups (more than 100,000 immigrants), according to the latest Immigrazione Dossier Statistico (Caritas Migrantes 2012) are: Romanians 997,000, Moroccans 506,400, Albanians 491,500, Chinese 277,600, Ukrainians 223,800, Filipinos 152,400, Moldovans 147,500, Indians 145,200, Tunisians 122,600, Egyptians 117,100, Poles 112,000, Peruvians 107,800, Bangladeshis 106,700, and Serbians 101,500.

6 For critical analyses of the Italian labour market and of the particular challenges it poses for young aspiring entrants see, respectively, Reyneri (2005) and Livi-Bacci (2008).
• 38 international movers interviewed in London and other places within the wider London region;
• 24 internal migrants, interviewed in Milan (12) and Rome (12);
• 22 non-mover graduates, interviewed in Milan (7), Rome (8) and Palermo (7).

Thus, whilst London was the base for interviewing the main emigrant sample, field interviews in Italy were carried out in three strategically located major cities: Milan, the largest city in the wealthy North of Italy and the single largest centre of graduate employment in the country; Rome, the national capital, where the main employment sectors relate to the civil service, and to the service sector generally; and Palermo, typical city of the South, where all kinds of graduate-level jobs are scarce.7

Most respondents were accessed through two channels, either through the authors’ personal networks, snowballing out from these, or more anonymously via Facebook groups such as ‘Italians in London’, ‘Sicilians in Milan’, etc. We cannot know to what extent these purposive and non-random sampling approaches contain sources of bias. Certainly we tried to ‘compose’ the UK sample by matching it to the existing profile of young graduates given in the Italian Embassy’s report on the Italian community living in the UK. The Embassy report suggests a large presence of young, highly educated Italians working in finance, service-sector businesses, research, academia, and other skilled occupations (Ambasciata d’Italia 2007). Because of our own networks, we feel we may have over-sampled those working within the academic context, but if anything we feel justified in doing this because the experience of Italian research students and academics is a revealing subplot within the general story of Italian high-qualified emigration. This bias was less evident in the other two subsamples of internal migrants and stayers.

The interviews were carried out during 2008-10. Most interviews lasted about one hour. All of them took place in neutral public spaces such as cafés, usually located near interviewees’ homes or workplaces. With the participants’ approval, the interviews were recorded and subsequently translated and transcribed. All names are pseudonyms.

Most interviews took, or were encouraged to take, a broadly chronological form, recounting migratory (and non-migratory) experiences from the origin of the migratory project up to the present time. Where relevant, some interviewees reflected on earlier mobility experiences, as children or as students. Ice-breaker questions generally involved chit-chat about degree courses or topics of final-year dissertations. The chronological

7 The interviews were done as part of Conti’s PhD thesis: see Conti (2012: 83-105, 231-259) for more methodological details.
structure, which all interviewees seemed comfortable with, unfolded their stories more or less in the following sequence: personal and family background; previous experiences abroad (e.g. as a student on a language course or exchange programme); timing and development of the idea to move; reasons and motivations to migrate; reasons and motivations to choose a particular destination; pre-arrival perceptions and expectations; experiences of departure and initial adaptation to the new place; current assessment of the migratory experience; ongoing links with the new place and back home; future plans. Obviously the interviews with non-movers took a somewhat different form and explored reasons for not moving and whether moving had been a factor of consideration at various stages in the past.

The design of the project, built around three respondent categories – emigrant to the UK, internal migrant from the South to the North of Italy, non-migrant – omits other migratory possibilities, notably within-region migration, say from Venice to Milan, or from North to South. Also, by interviewing migrants only in selected big cities, graduates living in small towns or rural areas are overlooked. We acknowledge these omissions but, for logistical and time reasons, fieldwork could not cover every eventuality, and we were mainly concerned to create a research design that could easily explore the differences (and similarities) between internal and international migrants.

In the next sections of the paper we present some key results from the interview data. We take each subsample in turn – international movers, internal migrants, and stayers – and analyse the main themes emerging from the participants’ narratives, illustrated by typical quotes. In the concluding discussion we return to the research questions outlined earlier and attempt to synthesise our results in a comparative dimension.

**Italian graduate emigration to the UK**

Unlike the Italian emigrations of the past, which were driven above all by rural poverty and unemployment and the desire to get a regular income by accessing any kind of usually manual work, contemporary graduate emigration was interpreted by the respondents with reference to a mix of economic, personal and pragmatic factors. We should also not overlook the fact that this is an ‘easy’ migration in the sense that it is part of the ‘free movement’ space of the EU, so there are no political or institutional barriers to migration, and it is also a low-cost relocation, given the multiplicity of cheap flight connections between different cities in Italy and the UK. Thematic analysis of the participant interviews revealed three dominant narrative themes to ‘explain’ and ‘justify’ the migration to the UK:
• economic factors and career aspirations;
• personal factors relating to self-development;
• cultural and ethical critiques of Italian society or the Italian mentalità.

Before we explore each of these in turn, we point up some common traits of this subsample regarding their prior experiences of international mobility, their preference for the UK as an international migration destination, and how they saw themselves as internationally mobile individuals.

Taking this last point first, participants did not see themselves as emigrants (emigranti) but instead talked about ‘leaving Italy’ and ‘moving abroad’. For them the Italian words emigrare (to emigrate) and emigrazione (emigration) referred to the ‘great migrations’ of the past. We suggest that two interpretations can be put on this differentiation. One is a broadly historical and class distinction: the notion that the ‘age of emigration’ for Italians was in the past and is now over; and the social construction of emigration as something that only poor, uneducated, desperate people do – the rationalisation and motivation for most Italian emigration in the past. The other interpretation related to the ease of the move to the UK as part of general intra-European free mobility (cf. Recchi and Favell 2009) which simply involves an air journey of at most two hours and costing the equivalent of a few hours pay.

Secondly, most respondents in this subsample had prior experiences of living and studying abroad, including being sent as teenagers on summer language courses and, probably more significant, participating in an Erasmus exchange programme as an undergraduate student. Respondents maintained that the ‘Erasmus experience’ was deeply transformative, changing their views, interests and aspirations once they returned to Italy. Study abroad in a northern European country with a better resourced and ‘organised’ university system also made interviewees realise how ‘backward’ and ‘disorganised’ (their words) the Italian university system is in comparison. The following two quotes illustrate these sentiments and reactions.

8 Interestingly, there is an ‘older’ Italian migrant presence in the UK of labour migrants who were recruited to work in the 1950s and 1960s in various manual jobs, notably in the brick industry, as well as an even older tradition of Italians working in the food and catering trade (ice-cream, fish-and-chips, snack bars etc.), but our participants had no social contacts with, and sometimes hardly any knowledge of, these earlier economic migrants who came from different social backgrounds and under very different economic circumstance. On these earlier Italian migrations to the UK see Colpi (1991); Marin (1975); Sponza (1988).
Once you have an experience such as the Erasmus, it is very difficult to go back to your previous life. It changes you, it changes your priorities in life. It changes your perceptions of the things which before you thought were unattainable and then you realised are easily accessible (Guido, aged 30, interviewed in London).

This experience [of Erasmus] was very important because I got the impression of a country [Germany] where everything works, and I had to make a huge effort once I got back to Italy to settle back in (Emiliano, 31, London)

Clearly, participating in an Erasmus scheme can be – often is – a life-changing experience; it triggers high self-reflexivity on ideas and aspirations (Bagnoli 2009); and it can result in a ‘disembedding’ from Italian society and ways of doing things, reflected in the way that Emiliano found it so difficult to resettle in Italy after his Erasmus year in Germany. In a broader sense, spending a significant period of time abroad at a formative stage in the life-course can be seen as a first accumulation of what Murphy-Lejeune (2002) calls *mobility capital*. Provided the experience is positive, the ‘banking’ of such capital reinforces the ‘interest’ in going abroad again at a later point in one’s life.

The third general point we wish to explore concerns the choice of the UK as the preferred emigration destination. Three reasons were commonly articulated when this question was asked in interviews. The first is the chance to learn, or improve, English; an argument which related not just to a better knowledge of what many regard as the most important global language, but also to enhance job prospects on return to Italy. Alessandra (27, London) had been for a job interview in Italy soon after she graduated and was asked at the interview whether she spoke good English. The fact that she did not was a major factor, she thought, in her not getting that job. ‘After that experience’, she said, ‘I said to myself I must go to England and learn better English’. The second reason related to the wide range of professional opportunities available in the UK, and especially in London, seen as a much more open and diversified labour market than that in Italy, including access to career fields which either hardly existed in Italy, or if they do, are almost impossible to enter at immediate post-graduation level. And thirdly, as a global and multicultural city, London offers a diversified and cosmopolitan lifestyle which, again, is seen as unavailable in Italy. These factors are explored in more detail below.
Professional reasons: ‘Italy is a difficult country’

One the whole, we argue for recognition of the concomitant roles played by economic and non-economic factors in structuring Italian graduates’ decisions to move to the UK. Nevertheless, professional motivations had a primary role in the narratives of this subsample: two out of three interviewees specified professional and career factors as the main reason for their migration, and this share rose to four out of five for male participants. The economic ‘pull’ of London and the UK was twinned with the ‘push’ factor of closed labour markets, negative work experiences and unemployment in Italy. As one participant put it, ‘Italy is a difficult country’. Moreover, there was a widespread feeling that a young graduate can achieve more in ‘meritocratic’ Britain than they can in Italy where ‘internal games’ often prevent the best candidate from getting the job. Luca (35, originally from the South of Italy) spoke for many when he said:

The United Kingdom has offered me opportunities I would never have had in Italy. What I love about this country is that they judge you for what you can do... I would never have managed to get the same position in Italy.

Another dimension of the economic motivation is that London, in particular, offers opportunities for employment in certain types of graduate career – finance, marketing, media, etc. – that either hardly exist or are practically impossible to enter as young graduates in Italy. Several participants referred to their ‘desired job’ to demonstrate this point, like Gianni (33, from Sardinia), who worked as a translator and interpreter.

In my sector in Italy there is not a lot of mobility. There is a sort of little mafia at the local level, especially in my region... So I said to myself, sooner or later I have to leave... I started looking for jobs on the internet... Amazingly, I found my first job after just three weeks... What pushed me to leave was the opportunity to do my job [his emphasis]; what I really wanted to do.

Interesting in this quote is Gianni’s use of the word ‘mafia’ to refer not to the formal criminal organisation but to the existence of informal cliques and hence irregularities in accessing certain jobs at the local level.

9 The higher proportion of males who cited economic, professional and career reasons as their main drivers for migrating to the UK can be read as an expression of the continuing importance of the ‘male breadwinner’ role still hegemonic in Italian society. In Italy, ‘landing a good job’ is considered very important in a patriarchal society, which Italy still is to a large extent (Ginsborg 1998).
Despite the widespread discourse of graduate unemployment in Italy, many of the graduates who came from northern Italy already had jobs before migrating. For them, moving to the UK was regarded as a career-making move, enabling them to access broader opportunities and wider global networks that Italian companies could not offer. The following quote from Ferdinando (30), an engineer from northern Italy, is a good example of this mechanism:

Working in the UK enables me to have a global perspective. If you work in Italy, it’s only for the Italian market; if you work in England, because of the professional networks that they have, or because English is the global language, you can aspire to work on projects of a wider scope... and they allow you to grow professionally faster than in Italy... Apart from the fact that getting a job in Italy is not based on merit, which is true.

Ferdinando’s reference to the lack of meritocracy in Italy echoed through virtually all the emigrant graduates’ narratives, nowhere more so than in the subgroup of interviewees who worked in the academic field. These were mainly people who had come to the UK to do postgraduate studies, seeing the futility of trying to get an academic job in Italy, and so developed their research and lecturing careers in UK academia. Many of these interviewees were vitriolic about the hierarchical, closed and corrupt academic system in Italy. Viola (28) gave a more moderated account of her experience in an Italian university before she came to Britain:

My university in Italy was quite good for my field; however there were a lot of things that I didn’t like... This mega-hierarchy in which you have to worship the professor... I just could not see myself there, I needed a break... and I wanted to do my research project the way I wanted; there, if you work under a professor, you have to do whatever they want you to do.

The corrupt state of the Italian academic job market has spawned a substantial critical literature (e.g. Avveduto and Brandi 2004; Morano-Foadi 2006) as well as a wealth of anecdote, some of which is scarcely believable from a UK or Swedish university perspective. Our own direct knowledge of the Italian academic landscape suggests that most of this is true. Italian academia can be characterised as a semi-feudal system where key professors (baroni or ‘barons’) regularly abuse their power through nepotism and the
fixing of concorsi of job hires. The general feeling, as Viola states above, is that you have to ‘stay close’ to ‘your’ professor in the hope that he (usually it is a man) will arrange for you to ‘win’ one of the few posts that become available; or, as Mirella (28) put it, ‘you take his place when he retires or dies’. Those who ‘escape’ this system by going abroad to advance their academic careers have even less chance of getting an academic job in Italy. They are seen as ‘deserters’ or even ‘traitors’ by their erstwhile sponsors and are ‘feared’ by them for accessing new, ‘democratic’ ideas that might upset the existing entrenched system and hierarchy (Morano-Foadi 2006).

Personal motivations: migration abroad as quest for self-realisation
By personal reasons we include those motives mentioned by interviewees when they refer to their private lives – family, relationships, and/or personality traits such as adventure, curiosity, self-discovery etc. Recent studies on intra-European migration have highlighted the relevance of such non-economic personal and lifestyle factors (Favell 2008; Hadler 2006; Kennedy 2010; Scott 2006). Many expressions used by the participants could be interpreted as framing their move to the UK as a rite of passage, part of the transition to full independence and maturity as an individual. Several used phrases such as ‘testing myself’ and ‘explore my limits’. They wanted to move out of the cocoon of the Italian parental home in order to take responsibility for their own affairs without falling back on the safety-net of the family. Their actions were part of a project of self-development and building a sense of individualised identity away from the ‘familiar’ – both in the sense of the family (the meaning of familiare in Italian) and the familiarity of a predictable life-course with the same local friendship networks from childhood and university (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001).

The following three quotes are selected for their typical coverage of these personal motivations:

---

10 The degree of nepotism endemic to Italian universities has been the subject of numerous investigations as well as more quantitative scrutiny. Alessina (2011) has carried out extensive research based on last-name matches of academic staff derived from the Ministry of Education database of 61,000 tenured teachers in 94 institutions, broken down by region of Italy and by academic discipline. He found an extremely high deviation from a random distribution of names, indicating widespread nepotistic hiring practices. The highest rates of same-name coincidence were in southern Italian universities, peaking in Sicily; and in engineering, law, medicine, geography and pedagogy. One spectacular example is in the Economics Department at the University of Bari where there are nine academic staff from the same family (the ‘baron’, his three sons, and five grandchildren).
The idea was to have a bit of adventure, of testing oneself; to go abroad, get some experience... and from that point, I never looked back (Luca, 35).

It was absolutely my choice; I wanted a different experience... I wanted a *challenge* [said in English]. It is very sad this mentality of staying at home, where you can have an easy life... I always tried to fight this attitude of my parents... because you must do something on your own... I always thought that having an experience of living abroad brings a certain *character-building* [English] and I always thought that if you never achieve anything on your own, then what are you going to teach your children in the future (Riccardo, 30).

I liked the idea of getting to know people from all over the world and the fact that I was far from home, from my family... Another reason why I moved here is because in the UK people do more flat-sharing [English word used] compared to Italy, and I did not want to live with my parents until I was 40 (Manuela, 28).

We can note a gender contrast between the first two quotes, from men, and the third, from a female participant. In these and in the narratives of other participants, the idea of strengthening one’s character through emigration was more evident amongst male interviewees who used words like ‘challenge’ and ‘character-building’ (note how these words were said in English in Riccardo’s extract). We infer that the self-imposed need and societal expectation of building a strong personality are projected much more onto males than onto women in Italian society. For females, there was also a desire revealed in the narratives to develop their own identities and independent livelihoods away from their family’s influence, but this was more an expression of migration as a gateway to independence rather than seen in terms of character formation. Furthermore, females tended more often to emphasise getting to know people from different cultures and walks of life, as illustrated in the first part of Manuela’s quote.

Cultural and ethical reasons: against the Italian ‘mentalità’
Around half of the participants in the UK included as part of their narratives extensive passages which articulated a distinctly negative view of Italy: a kind of ‘inverted patriotism’ or ‘disidentification’ with their home country (Dickie 2001). These critical considerations often emerged in relation to their experience or knowledge of irregularities in job recruitment procedures, which had left them frustrated and disillusioned, but also widened to include
the perception of Italy as a country of moral and cultural decay, especially the political class. Interviewees also expressed deep pessimism as to whether improvement will occur in the future. Marco and Arianna, below, give typical accounts of this critical stance: both see Italian society as backward, static, and offering little hope to young people.

I think that for Italy this is a very sad period... it's a miserable time for Italy. I see my friends who have stayed here: for sure, they eat very well, they dress well, but they have a life which, in my opinion, is backward, 50 or 100 years old. They all live at home with their parents... There is a psychological condition in Italian society which is very miserable at the moment (Marco, 30).

There is a socio-political situation in Italy which I don't like... In my opinion, Italy is an old society which is folded in on itself... there is no investment in young people, and you can see this from the policies, from what happens when you look for a job... It's like they are doing you a favour in giving you a job (Arianna, 26).

As a result of this disidentification with the Italian way of life, half of this subsample of respondents saw themselves as 'outliers' to Italian society (cf. Gladwell 2008). The term that was frequently called upon to express this lack of identification and rejection of Italy, especially in the context of explaining the decision to leave, was mentalità. Meaning rather more than just 'mentality', mentalità has multi-layered and multi-scalar meanings. Its core meaning refers to the 'Italian way of doing things', a key feature of Italians' national identity. In the different contexts in which the term was used in the participant narratives, it manifests itself at three levels:

- the national character of Italy as a gerontocracy built on hierarchies and excessive bureaucracy, and incapable of change;
- the provincial mentality of all towns and cities which are inward-looking and wallow in their own individual self-importance;
- the mentality of family, which expects adult children to stay close to their parents, eventually get married and have children, and support the parents in their old age.

11 Such views also resonate with academic studies of the moral decay and cultural stagnation of Italian society and politics. See, inter alia, Altan (2000); De Monticelli (2010); Dickie (1996; 2001); Zinn (2001).
In the following interview extract, Andrea (male, 35) picks up on the theme of mentalità and the chimera of the Italian ‘good life’, seen ultimately as rather shallow:

The argument is not only about getting a job, it is about realising your own life; because in my case I was working and having a ‘good life’ [in Italy], but I did not feel at ease... I disagreed with everything and everybody. I disagreed with the local values, with the mentalità...

At a certain point, I couldn’t take it anymore. It was OK to have a good life but in fact it was not a good life – I was not happy there.

Andrea’s testimony clearly indicates that not sharing the social and cultural norms of one’s country can be a significant reason to migrate, and to stay away. As these considerations appear not to be region- or gender-specific, we can assume that such feelings are conditioned above all by personal values and individual subjectivities. Migration thus offers, for those who need it, an existential kind of freedom, the freedom to live and pursue a desired style of living free from Italy’s distinct and constraining norms and patterns. The term mentalità can be used here to explain a double dynamic: on the one hand, migration functions as an escape from the multi-level national, provincial and family mentalità; on the other, the interviews suggest that a special type of mentalità, more idealistic and anti-conformist, is needed in order to migrate.

**Internal graduate migration: South to North**

Contemporary internal migration within Italy is a heterogeneous phenomenon which is little studied; indeed internal migration dynamics have been largely overlooked since *il grande esodo*, the great rural exodus of the 1950s and 1960s that accompanied northern Italy’s economic and industrial boom. The recent reprise of South-North migration has been on a scale to rival that of the past: between 1997 and 2008, 700,000 are estimated to have left the South, at least a quarter of them graduates (Scalella and Balestrieri 2010).

This section analyses key themes in the narratives of 24 graduate internal migrants who moved to either Milan or Rome, including five who moved from Rome to Milan. As noted earlier, Rome is the main recruiter of public sector jobs, whilst Milan is economically more dynamic, especially for private sector employment. Rome is regarded as an incomparably beautiful city in which to live, but it is also a ‘southern’ city in many respects, plagued by corruption, bureaucracy and inefficiency. Milan, on the other hand is seen as Italy’s archetypal ‘Eurocity’ (cf. Favell 2008) or, as one of the interviewees put it, the ‘Italian New York’.
As with our earlier account of international migrants, our analysis of the interview transcripts revealed three dominant themes framing accounts of internal migration:

- the ‘culture of migration’ in the South: a long history of outmigration means that migration becomes the norm;
- the overwhelming need to find a job: getting a job in the South is frustrated by the general shortage of graduate-level employment, the ‘closed-shop’ nature of many job sectors, and the widespread pernicious practice of raccomandazione;
- the notion of migration to the North of Italy as ‘forced’ migration, and the emotional cost of this.

We take each theme in turn, illustrating with typical interview extracts.

A culture of migration in the South

With the exception of the five graduates from Rome who had moved to Milan, most of the southern-origin graduates had already considered the inevitability of migrating north during their early student years. Respondents were acutely aware of the South’s long history of people leaving, either for the North of Italy or to emigrate abroad, and most people in the South have ancestors and relatives who have emigrated, often spread across a variety of destinations. Our interview evidence shows a strong peer-pressure to leave the South, especially for male graduates who are pressed into a more explicit ‘provider’ role and therefore have to do their best to find a reasonable job soon after graduating. In the quote below, Silvio (37), who had moved from Cosenza in Calabria to Rome, reflected on the scale of migration amongst his cohort of fellow-students:

In my course 30 people graduated, and of these perhaps only three stayed in Calabria afterwards... During my first year as a student I shared a flat with five engineering students who are all working elsewhere now... For everyone it’s the same.

Part of the rationale that characterises internal migrants’ choice of destination was shaped by the degree subjects they studied and the related job opportunities and career pathways. The two main destination cities that were chosen for the interviews, Rome and Milan, respectively the political capital and the economic capital of Italy, offer different career options: the former, civil-service employment accessed through centrally administered concorsi, public examinations; the latter a much wider range of employment
sectors. Pietro (27), who moved from Rome to Milan and whose field was design, contrasted the buoyancy of his field of work in Milan compared to the situation in Rome:

If we make a comparison, for every ten studios in Rome, there are 200 in Milan... there is much more demand for designers here [in Milan]. There is also more competition, but this is not too much of a problem because there is so much work here, enough for everybody.

Alessia (33), who had also made the Rome-Milan move, drew attention to the broader contrasts between the two cities, and also threw in a rather revealing personal remark at the end of this extract:

Rome is much less dynamic; there is nothing one can do about that. It is an obvious thing to say but the fact that Milan is closer to Europe makes it more international. Once somebody told me that Milan was like a little Italian New York... and it is a bit like that. It is a city where one does not go in order to settle down but to do some temporary experience and then you can see... You can come, find the man of your life and stay, or go back, or go abroad... it is a good starting point.

Another interviewee, Piera (27), who had moved from Calabria to Rome, found that, indeed, Rome was not much different from her home region in many respects, and so she was contemplating another move, further north or even abroad.

I moved up here to Rome, but I realised that here is the same too because since I arrived, the working conditions are not much better than in the South... One needs to move further north or abroad to see a difference... because the situation in Rome is still the same.

The perception and experiences of the South (especially Calabria, Italy’s poorest region), the Centre (in the form of Rome), and the North (typified by Milan and its large region of Lombardy), are close to the statistical reality of the distribution of economic well-being across the regions of Italy (Dunford and Greco 2005). Milan and Lombardy can be considered somewhat analogous to London and the South East in terms of their respective national geographies of employment and wealth, and in particular the opportunities for fast career development. In other words, this is where you move if you want to get ahead in life, not necessarily for good, as Alessia says, but at a
fairly early career stage so that your career can get a boost, which can then be taken elsewhere. Fielding (1992) theorised this as the ‘escalator region effect’. He was referring to the accelerator effect of internal migrants within the UK, but the same effect can be observed from our data both with regard to London’s attraction for international skilled migrants, and within Italy with reference to Milan.

Getting a job and the role of *raccomandazione*

The importance of the employment dimension in graduate internal migration is evident already from some of the quotes in the previous subsection: the ‘culture of migration’ in southern Italy is, after all, economically driven by the historical poverty of this region, as several Italian and other studies have shown (Bonifazi 1999; Ciriaci 2005; Dunford and Greco 2005; SVIMEZ 2010). Among the many revealing macroeconomic statistics contained in the SVIMEZ Report on the Economy of the Mezzogiorno (South of Italy) are the following:

- mean GDP per capita in the South in 2009 was 58.8 per cent the level of the Centre-North;
- average annual economic growth during 2000-08 (i.e. up to the recession) was 0.6 per cent in the South compared to 1.0 per cent in the Centre-North;
- during the first recession year of 2009 the decline in employment was 3.0 per cent in the South vs. 1.1 per cent in the Centre-North;
- unemployment (2009) was 23.5 per cent in the South against 9.5 per cent in the Centre-North.

Part of the structural basis of the problem of graduate outmigration in the South of Italy lies in the fact that, whilst there has been South-North convergence in educational performance and in the production of graduates, this convergence has not happened on the economic front. Hence the production of a ‘surplus’ of graduates who cannot be employed within the South. Graduate and youth unemployment approach 40 per cent in the South, despite the fact that 40 per cent of southern graduates leave the region to find work (SVIMEZ 2010).

Returning to our own interview survey data, professional considerations – accessing work and incomes which are commensurate with graduates’ qualifications and expectations – can be clearly identified as the single most important reason to move by internal migrants. As with the international migrants’ subsample, two-thirds of the internal migrants declared this to be the primary motive for their northward migration; and, once again, a higher proportion of males.
One moves for a job, for work, that’s all. You move to where you can find a job... When you are looking for a job in the South, you immediately realise that there is hardly any work here, and that in order to make a living, you have to move elsewhere. It's sad, but that’s how it is (Tiziano, 28, moved from Bari to Rome).

Whilst some respondents departed immediately after graduating, sensing the futility of trying to get a graduate-level job locally, others, like Tiziano, tried their luck in the South first, but ended up by leaving because they became discouraged by the extremely low rates of pay and often irregular working and business practices. Tiziano again:

After graduating, I started looking for jobs with the idea of working in the South... with the idealistic intention to work in my city [Bari]... I thought ‘let's try’... I had an opportunity so I started to work in a small company... But then, I started to have problems with my boss, plus the company had financial problems... we were faced with situations which were not very clear [legally], so in the end I decided to leave.

Angela (28, Calabria to Rome) experienced similar demoralising experiences with trying to find work in her home region; she describes these in her quote below and also points to the endemic problems of nepotism and favouritism in job allocations in the South.

The working environment in the South is de-qualifying. For me it was a devastating experience. I felt I virtually had to thank my employer for giving me a job for 300 euros a month! To tell the truth, I think employers in the South really take advantage of people... they take advantage of the hunger that there is for jobs, especially among graduates.

[...]

The problem is the raccomandazione... You really need to be connected to someone in the South... because if you have connections, at least you have a chance. The little work that there is, gets hijacked in this way... There are five jobs available and those jobs are already allocated; that’s how it is.

Many other participants in this subsample complained about raccomandazione. One more example:
There is no meritocracy. The candidate who gets the job is always the one connected to this or that person... and this makes me so angry. It’s like hitting your head against a wall [trying to get a job without connections] (Piera, 27, Cosenza to Rome).

Scholarly work on the ‘societal embarrassment’ (Zinn 2001: 167) of raccomandazione tends to approach the phenomenon from two angles. One view – and this is the interpretation articulated, in various formulations, by the internal-migrant respondents from the South – sees it as a result of the structural problem of too many people chasing too few resources, be they jobs, services, business licenses or building permits. Angela’s quote above is one expression of this interpretation. In other words, because of the shortage of jobs in the South, those few that there are, are fully absorbed by clientelistic networks. This is contrasted with the North of Italy where there is a higher supply of jobs and therefore the impact of raccomandazione is greatly reduced. Paolo (35), a lawyer who had moved from Bari to Milan, gave an articulate rendering of this contrast:

The difference between the South and North of Italy as regards the labour market is that in the South all labour gets absorbed into clientelistic networks... and even then there may be only one post available for three preferred [i.e. ‘recommended’] candidates so that, even if you are one of those three, it is not for sure that you will get the job... In the North, some jobs are still allocated through clientelistic logics, but others remain open to other people and this makes a huge difference...

It is also worth noting that in this South-North structural-regional mapping of raccomandazione, Rome is usually regarded as part of the ‘southern mentality’, as Alessia (33), an Art History graduate who had moved from Rome to Milan, emphasised from her own personal experiences:

I did 15 job interviews in Milan – that would never have happened in Rome! It is a difficult moment to try to get a job in my field but at least this interest in my CV makes me feel positive about the future... My field is very small and even here [in Milan] it works a little bit by word of mouth, but at least it works! It is not like in Rome where you have to go somewhere because a friend of a friend needs to make a telephone call for you... Here in Milan at least they evaluate your profile for the job.
The second interpretation of raccomandazione draws on deeply embedded ‘southern’ social characteristics, above all the historically entrenched clientelistic and mafia networks arising out of a long history of colonisation, marginality, and exploitation by both outsiders and insiders. This provides the historical setting for the observed political behaviour of local and regional elites who strive to control all aspects of social, economic and political life through networks of patronage, clientelism, brokerage and reciprocal favours, backed up sometimes by veiled or explicit threats of exclusion, reprisals or even violence (Faraoni 2010; Piattoni 2001).

Whilst generally highly critical of the culture of raccomandazione, some participants freely admitted to ‘playing the game’: these included especially non-migrants, whom we will look at presently, but also some internal migrants. This was the case of Angela, quoted earlier, who revealed that she belonged to a well-established and fairly wealthy family – this was part of the reason why she initially stayed on in the South after finishing her degree. However, as her narrative suggests, the absolute scarcity of graduate jobs in the South affects even those graduates whose families are high up the social ladder and who might be thought to be ‘well-connected’.

A forced migration?
The collective impression from the internal-migrant narratives is that moving north is fundamentally a labour-driven process, with issues surrounding jobs and careers dominating the accounts. For two-thirds of this subsample, it was explicitly nominated as the main reason for moving, and it featured as an ancillary factor in virtually all of the remaining third. Yet, a clear contrast can be drawn in the ‘tone’ of the narratives between the two sets of interviewees thus far discussed. Internal migration is framed in fatalistic terms: given the nature of the southern Italian labour market, there is little alternative but to move. Whereas moving to the UK, also driven by professional considerations to a large extent, was articulated more in terms of personal development and excitement – a ‘break’ from Italy. Moving within Italy certainly does not entail that same sense of existential change and adventure.

Some respondents saw themselves as ‘forced’ to move because their professional specialism hardly existed or was underdeveloped in the South. For some of this subgroup, the choice was between taking a local job that did not appeal or match their specialisation, or migrating north. The two quotes below illustrate this dilemma of choice faced by two participants:

I did not leave Naples because there was nothing to do there. I left because the kind of study programme I had chosen, I thought it was necessary to acquire a different kind of professional experience...
Moving back to Naples is difficult now because the job I do here in Rome [project manager] does not really exist there. Before I came to Rome, I won a concorso in Naples to work in a bank, but I didn’t take it because I knew I would get bored doing that (Renato, 30, moved from Naples to Rome).

I am one of the few who could afford to go back to Sicily if I wanted to. My father has a business and I could go back and work with him and have a comfortable life. But I believe one should do the job one likes... because of the importance of work. So I decided to follow my passion and move here to Milan (Valerio, 28, Palermo to Milan).

The support of family – traditionally stronger in the South than in the North of Italy where a more individualistic lifestyle is becoming accepted – was often evident in these ‘southern’ migrant interviews. They echo the recent finding from the SVIMEZ (2010) report on the South which states that family resources are often necessary to support young people’s professional aspirations. Valentina (32) had moved from Naples to Rome and worked in customer relations; she was typical of those who acknowledged the crucial financial support of her parents:

I was very lucky because my parents supported me financially throughout... If they hadn’t, it would have been completely different... what your parents can offer you is important.

Looking at the historical development of internal migration in Italy, this current pattern of family material support represents a significant difference from the past, when migrants left the South because of chronic poverty and lack of household resources. It could be argued that this change reflects the deep economic and social transformations which have taken place in Italy, and especially in the South, in the last 50-60 years – a period which has witnessed, by and large, the end of mass poverty across the country, a transformation which was especially significant for the rural South (Pugliese 2002). The irony was that mass outmigration, especially during the 1950s and 1960s, was an influential factor in poverty eradication, removing unemployed and destitute peasants and rural labourers, relieving pressure on land, and funneling back support for family members left behind in the form of remittances. In contrast, our data indicate that nowadays the families of Italian graduates who have migrated do not expect to get anything in return, such as remittances. If anything is expected, it is more to do with family loyalty and emotional support, actualised through frequent home visits.
Despite the relatively short distances involved, especially to Rome, half of the internal-migrant graduates talked about the emotional challenges of their move. This emotionality was partly related to the fact that they felt forced to leave, and hence their feelings ran high about being wrenched away from their home towns. A different interpretation might be that the more emotionally-charged individuals choose to move internally, in order to be able to stay at least reasonably close to home and family, whereas those less tied to family and relationships were more predisposed to migrate abroad. The obligation to stay fairly near to parents and other kin was expressed by both male and female interviewees. Silvio (37, Cosenza to Rome) spoke for many when he said:

One moves out of necessity… You do it because you have no choice… But I always think about what I have given up by moving here to Rome – I think about my loved ones back home, and about the fact that, while you are away, your parents get old and you are not there… I think a lot about these things.

Alongside keeping in touch with parents and other family members were relationships with partners, boyfriends and girlfriends. Interestingly, ‘love’ as a factor in migration patterns and decisions has been given surprisingly little attention in the academic literature (King 2002; Mai and King 2009). In this subsample one third of interviewees, nearly all of them females, discussed their move to the North in the context of their romantic relationships. Remember, in a much earlier quote, how Alessia mused about finding the ‘man of her life’ in Milan. In most of the cases where relationships were important to the interviewee, the relationship in question had been formed during university years. But the gendering of these narratives about relationships is worthy of comment: it was the female participants who were following their boyfriends/fiancés, never the other way round. Two examples:

I was primarily looking for jobs in Rome, but I sent a few applications to Milan, since my fiancé is from Milan… If I wasn’t in a relationship with him, I would have never looked for jobs outside of Rome (Linda, 28, Rome to Milan).

12 It is worth mentioning here that the participant samples were drawn up on the basis of their being mostly unmarried and without children, so the role of romantic relationships in their mobility decisions is limited to that of un-formalised relationships and does not include parenting.
My prime motivation was sentimental: my boyfriend was here, he was from Rome and plus, when I looked for jobs here, I found one very soon, so I moved (Michela, 30, Salerno to Rome).

This interview material supports the general insights provided by studies on gender aspects of careers as they intersect with skilled migration, which indicate that females are much more likely to follow their male partners than vice versa (Ackers 2004; Kofman et al. 2000).

The non-migrants: reasons for staying
Scholars of migration, whose job it is to explain why migration takes place, all too rarely pay heed to the counterfactual question: why do so many people not migrate? (see Fischer et al. 1997; Malmberg 1997). Reasons for non-migration should, we argue, be examined alongside the reasons why people do move. Hence we now look at our third and final subsample, the non-migrant graduates, specifically the 22 ‘stayers’ interviewed in Milan, Rome and Palermo. Since home-town differences do not appear to have a significant effect on how these graduates narrate their decisions to stay put, we present a generalised picture rather than deal with each city in turn. We see this subsample as a small and therefore not necessarily statistically representative ‘control group’ against which to compare the various themes emerging from the collective narratives of each of the two migrant samples.

One final important preliminary point: the fact that members of the non-migrant sample have been immobile this far does not preclude the possibility that they might become migrants later on.

As with the prior two groups, three main narrative themes emerged from the collection of interview material. One was about barriers and obstacles to migration. The other two focus more on reasons to stay – what might be termed ‘ties’ or ‘moorings’ to their home place. These were professional reasons to stay – in other words the fact that these participants had found jobs which satisfied their exigencies – and the various emotional attachments to home, including family, friends, relationships and a general sense of ‘being at home’.

Barriers and obstacles
We saw earlier that, for the graduate emigrants in the UK, learning and improving their English was one of the most cited reasons to go to this destination. Looking at the other side of the language coin, for some stayers not being able to speak other languages was considered a key obstacle to emigrating. Roberto (26), an IT engineer in Rome, stated:
The differences are simple: those who are immobile, it’s because they don’t speak any foreign languages…

Alessandro (37), an architect in Milan, voiced similar considerations:

A strong factor [in explaining why I haven’t moved] is the language, in the sense that I like to speak Italian! I know some English but when I speak it I speak like an Italian, I cannot engage in deep conversation… So speaking another language is a big limitation.

Clearly, then, whilst for some learning another language is an incentive to migrate, for others linguistic limitations are used as a reason for staying put. This probably reflects wider attitudinal characteristics concerning interest in experiencing and interacting with other cultures. The issue of prior mobility is relevant here. Although the interview data do indicate that respondents who had a prior accumulation of ‘mobility capital’ were more likely to be international migrants, some non-movers had also been abroad for study purposes before. The difference was how these earlier visits had impacted upon them. Whereas the emigrant graduates referred to their Erasmus study abroad as a turning-point in their lives, those participants who were non-migrants yet who had been abroad tended to ‘normalise’ or downplay such experiences. Maurizio (30), from Palermo, said:

I did the Erasmus for three months in Scotland; it was a very nice experience, fine from a personal point of view, but apart from that, I never took into consideration the idea of moving.

By contrast Lorenza (31), an archaeology graduate from Palermo, found her earlier attempt at living elsewhere quite painful, cutting it short and returning to her home city.

Well, in fact yes, I did consider leaving Palermo for my studies. I tried for a few months when I was 19 to live in Viterbo [a town in Central Italy] in order to follow a specialised course in art restoration. I started university there but I did not manage to integrate well. I felt homesick and after six months I decided to move back to Sicily.

Professional motivations: the ambiguous role of raccomandazione
In their discussion of ‘Should I stay or should I go?’ Fischer et al. (1997) argue that, for most people in Europe it is fully rational not to consider migrating because they have accumulated too many location-specific advantages where
they are. For recent graduates, perhaps the most important of these is a decent job. Of the 22 respondents in this subsample, 16 had what can be considered relatively good and stable occupations in different fields, whilst six had more precarious positions in insecure and flexible employment. None was unemployed, although unemployment was considered by many stayers as a hypothetical reason why they would consider moving.

I never really thought seriously about leaving Milan... because the dilemma is there only when you don't have a job, obviously... If I did not have a job, yes, I would consider moving, but it has to be a necessity; as a voluntary choice, I wouldn't [think of going away] (Milena, 31, Milan).

Christina expressed a somewhat analogous view: in her case, consideration of moving away from Palermo depended on her employment situation (she worked freelance in the NGO sector and hence her professional life was rather insecure) and whether she was dissatisfied with life in her home city:

I thought many times about going away from Sicily... but I realise now that I tend to think in this way when I am upset... At present, since I started to work again, I don't feel the need to move, because here in Palermo I have my family, my friends, this is my city.

Other interviewees were more secure in their professional life. Marco (30), who had recently gained a university position in Palermo, acknowledged his good fortune and the 'help' of his supervisor in winning the concorso for a permanent post. He also admitted that there were others with better CVs than himself who remain unemployed.

I am here and I am very lucky; I make 1500 euros per month... Many people leave because they don't even make 1500 euros a year... I had a chance to take part in a concorso for a researcher post at my university. My supervisor was a member of the internal commission and he told me to apply. I studied a lot and I got the job... I was very anxious about the exam because I know very well that, as another professor wisely used to say, we are a generation that will only get one chance... In my case my only regret is that I never invested in any alternative somewhere else... I put everything into my job here. I consider myself a fortunate case, the exception to the rule, with my 1500 euros a month. I know that there are many people with a better CV than mine who cannot get a job.
In his extract, Marco half-admits that his supervisor was instrumental in leveraging him into the post that was open to national (theoretically international) competition. One third of the stayers referred to the practice of *raccomandazione*, often however using the softer word *conoscenze* (acquaintances, ‘people you know’). Alessandro (37, Milan) stated:

In Italy the work environment is very tough, because it is all based on the *conoscenze* you have. If you don’t know people, you can’t get a job... Working any other way is very difficult.

Earlier we saw very clearly how the *mentalità* of Italy, part of which includes the semi-corrupt practice of *raccomandazione*, was an important push factor in many graduates’ migration to the UK, especially those from the South. Switching for a moment back to the London data, here is Rita’s powerful diagnosis of the problem:

If you stay in Italy, the only way to get a job is through a *raccomandazione*. When you’re looking for work, people tell you that you need a *raccomandazione*. If you try to stay in Italy and to work without a *raccomandazione* then you are an idiot because either you make it your life’s goal to go against the system, or you end up staying at home with your parents until you are 50 (Rita, 29, originally from the South).

However, rather than regard *raccomandazione* as an isolated negative social practice in Italy, it is important to appreciate its wider cultural resonance. Dorothy Zinn (2001) argues that the *raccomandazione* in Italy is a ‘total social fact’ which affects all aspects and levels of Italian society and which therefore encompasses many different practices and beliefs, of varying levels of moral degradation. In other words, it is part of the DNA of Italian society – a key part of the Italian way of doing things, at all levels. An in-depth diagnosis of this problem is beyond the scope of this paper, but a couple of important, if contentious, theoretical perspectives can be mentioned. In an early, controversial study of a small town in southern Italy, Edward Banfield (1958) developed the thesis of *amoral familism* to explain the lack of civic consciousness in that part of Italy. In a situation of poverty and scarcity, above all of employment and income, as well as a weak presence of state authority and welfare, people’s behaviour was totally dictated by family interests. Putting the family always first, Banfield argued, was ‘amoral’ for society as a whole. The logic of amoral familism was that, in a tough ‘external world’, only the family, and perhaps very close friends of
the family, could be relied upon to help you, to the detriment of the proper, transparent functioning of the town’s society as a whole. Much later, Robert Putnam (1993) widened and extended the analysis to the regional contrast in economy, society and politics between the South on the one hand, and the Centre-North on the other. Putnam, too, diagnosed the lack of civic values as an embedded characteristic of the culture of the South. Hence the reliance on raccomandazione and networks of ‘friends’ and ‘contacts’ to get everything done in a context, again, of scarcity and where state institutions are weak and themselves corrupted. So, in the South we find also that public provisions and services, such as housing policy, transport, social and welfare services of various kinds etc., are generally of low quality compared to other parts of Italy and North-West Europe. In the North of Italy, Putnam argued, a longer tradition of community life, going back to a long history of independent city-republics, generated local civic pride and the legacy of cooperation for mutual benefit, as well as more efficient institutions and governance.

Family, friends, relationships and place
Apart from work and career considerations, the other set of reasons that non-migrant graduates drew on to justify the reluctance to depart was their strong sense of attachment to family, friends and home town. Migrating, in other words, has an emotional cost which, for some, is too high to pay: it means creating distance from family and friends and the suspension of a number of social activities with them, or a marked decrease in the frequency of such encounters, limited to rare return visits.

The relative importance of friends might be subject to change over the life-course. Since our target population was recent graduates who were not yet married, respondents stressed their friends and social lives at the home place as important, and also their relationships with their parents, rather than talking about spouses and children. After marriage and children, it is obvious that prerogatives switch away from friends somewhat, towards the newly formed family (La Valle 2007).

The crucial role of the family in Italian society has been the subject of a vast literature, which tends to stress the relative strength of family ties here in comparison to other western countries (see, inter alia, Altan 2000; Banfield 1958; Dalla Zuanna 2001; Gambino 1998). More specifically, recent studies have indicated that young Italians have a relationship of reciprocal dependence on their parents based on a general communion of shared values and expectations (Sartori 2007). Indeed, young Italians have been ‘accused’ by some scholars of being too similar to their parents, and therefore incapable of acting as a force of change and innovation in society (Buzzi et al. 2007; Livi-Bacci 2008). Moreover, the Italian family is generally
considered the main supplier of social security in Italy, as parents fulfil a dual role as both affective and financial providers for their children, who often live with them through their 20s and into their 30s and even beyond.

This last point was evident in the interviews with non-migrants, most of whom were living in the parental home or, in a few cases, in family-owned property. Claudia (28, Rome) summed up a typical perspective on the ‘protected’ nature of this lifestyle:

The benefit of being at home is to be safe, both economically and emotionally... When you are at home with your parents you are protected from anything that can happen to you.

In addition to simply living with one’s parents and benefiting from their financial and other support, other respondents felt a sense of duty to staying close to them for reasons of care. Remember how Silvio, an internal migrant in Rome, had earlier expressed his regret at being away from his parents in Calabria as they aged. Stayer respondents also talked extensively about their duties of care – for instance Ilaria (28, Rome), who also deployed the ‘family mentality’ notion discussed earlier:

I feel the responsibility of staying here because of my parents... My brother is already abroad... and my parents think that caring for them is a more female duty... it is a matter of mentality – my family is like that.

Amongst the stayers, this duty of care was indeed mainly expressed by female participants (nine out of 11 referred to this), confirming the continued gendering of family care responsibilities in Italian society (Sartori 2007).

A similar gendering amongst the admittedly small sample of non-migrants (22) was evident in their discussions about the importance of relationships in ‘fixing’ them where they are. Once again, nine out of the 11 female respondents said that being in a relationship was a significant reason not to migrate. Ilaria, again: ‘Surely the thing that keeps me here the most is my boyfriend.’ Daniela likewise:

As I am in a relationship here, I also think about what my boyfriend would find in another place, and considering I spent a lot of time building this relationship, I try to carry it on (Daniela, 28, Rome).
Contrast these statements with the narratives of the 11 males, where partners and girlfriends fade into the background, like the example of Giovanni (28, Milan), whose basketball mates seem more important to him:

It would have bothered me a lot not to be able to carry on many relationships with my friends... It is not only what you build personally, it is also what you build outside working hours that matters. For example, I have always played in a basketball team: not professionally, but I enjoy it and I wouldn’t want to leave that...

Finally, there are interesting remarks in the interviews about the importance of place, reflecting also, of course, family links which are inevitably place-specific, but also the wider spatial immobility of Italian society and its attachment to locality, often rooted over several generations. Data reported by Gugliemi (2007) reveal that, amongst young Italians aged 15-35, home towns have the priority as the main source of identity and attachment, followed by Italy as a country, and then Europe. Gugliemi’s survey findings support the more in-depth historical and sociological analyses of Cento Bull (2000) and Gabaccia (2000) on the importance of the local and regional sense of belonging as part of the making of Italian identity. The following quote from Mario (32, Palermo) illustrates this point in a rather evocative way:

It’s a matter of personal identity: I am Sicilian first, and then Italian... For historical reasons, the Sicilians you meet are 90 per cent the sons and daughters of the other Sicilians... Here in Sicily we make a distinction between *siciliani di scoglio* and *siciliani di mare* [literally, ‘sea-rock Sicilians’ and ‘sea Sicilians’]: the former are those who stick to their homeland even if they are looking towards the sea, and the latter are those who take to the sea and leave.

These considerations are not unique to Sicilians, even though being from a peripheral island region might exacerbate such feelings. In fact, respondents from Milan and Rome made similar remarks, confirming the generality of the association of one’s identity with one’s spatial surroundings and family roots.
Concluding discussion
This paper has provided a rather unique study comparing the motivations and characteristics of international migrants, internal migrants and non-migrants amongst a sample of 84 Italian graduates interviewed in London, Milan, Rome and Palermo. The uniqueness of our study mainly resides in the fact that this is a comparative analysis carried out in a developed-country context, whereas existing comparative studies are limited to poorer emigration countries such as Mexico.

A second claim to uniqueness is the relevance, highlighted in the interview data, of non-economic factors such as mentalità as a push factor for emigration, raccomandazione for internal migration, and emotional and family ties for non-migrants. These personal and cultural factors, rarely highlighted in the established literature on migration, sit alongside the still-very-important dimension of employment, career development and income levels as a constellation of factors which still heavily condition graduates’ propensity to migrate or, if they can satisfy these aims in situ, to stay put.

A third issue which our study had drawn attention to, although we have not made it a main focus of our analysis, is the gender differentiation apparent in some aspects of the themes narrated. Amongst emigrants to the UK, males were more outspoken in their references to ‘self-development’ and ‘character-building’ whereas females referred to the benefits of emigration to a cosmopolitan metropolis like London more often in terms of ‘experiencing multiculturalism’ and meeting people from diverse cultures. Meanwhile, amongst those who stay in Italy, either as internal movers or non-migrants, females talked much more than males about caring duties towards their parents and about investing in relationships with partners and boyfriends.

The final general point to highlight concerns the way that the ‘double embeddedness’ (King 2002) of migrants’ narratives – first in their individual life-histories and second within the structural parameters of Italian society, including the underdeveloped and clientelistic labour market and the difficult and prolonged transition from higher education to decent employment – plays into ongoing epistemological debates within migration studies about the interplay of structure and agency (Bakewell 2010) deriving from structuration theory (Giddens 1984).

After these general points, we now pick up the more specific research questions which underpin our empirical analysis and which were set out earlier. These were threefold and related, firstly, to the explanation of the large graduate migratory flows to the UK, especially the London area; secondly to the differences in motivation and characteristics between international migrants, internal migrants, and non-movers; and thirdly to whether there are any stepwise links between internal and international moves.
The high level of Italian graduate emigration to the UK is driven by a powerful combination of push, pull and facilitating factors. The main push factors range from an individual-level difficulty of finding acceptable employment in Italy to a generalised and multi-level dissatisfaction with life and society in Italy – the syndrome of *mentalità* that we have now referred to (reflecting the interviewees’ frequent use of the term) many times. Clearly, holding a negative view of the home country and a pessimistic vision of its future ‘development’ significantly shape emigration decisions, as well as the attractions of life in the global city of London: all this despite the fact that Italy is not a poor country and has much to offer in terms of culture and lifestyle. As compared to other European destinations, London is seen as the perfect place to be for the ‘Eurostar’ generation – an international ‘escalator’ region where Italian (and other) graduates can accelerate their incomes, careers, and professional development in ways that are seen as impossible in Italy (cf. Favell 2008; Fielding 1992). The facilitator factors have to do with ease of movement, above all the dense network of airlines, many of them offering low fares, linking the main airports as well as dozens of provincial ones in Italy to several key airports in the UK.

There is one more important and distinguishing characteristic uniting the graduates who emigrate: from the narrative evidence it appears that they are idealistic, anti-conformist and disembedded from the Italian ‘mentality’ in its various manifestations, above all provincialism, clientelism and nepotism. These critiques were most vehemently expressed by the ‘academic’ subsample of graduate emigrants, whose extremely negative view of Italy’s corrupt academic system can be seen as a key factor behind the country’s current wave of brain drain (Morano-Foadi 2006). Emigrant graduates shared a discourse which exhibits the importance of individuals’ subjectivities in their decisions and narrativisations about migration: they accounted for their decisions in an ‘individualised’ fashion, emphasising their active role in the process and the importance they attach to self-development and self-discovery (cf. Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001; also Giddens 1991).

Nevertheless, having said this, the emigrants’ ingrained sense of ‘belonging’ to Italy, or their fundamental identity as ‘Italians’, were not questioned. As studies of political dissidence indicate (eg. Ranciere 1999), even those who are in major disagreement with the mainstream culture of their country and leave it to go abroad can paradoxically find their sense of belonging to their home country in their very conditions of dissidence. This idea resonates in our study of Italians in the UK who, despite their trenchant criticism of Italy, never declared that they do not ‘feel’ Italian. Rather, they saw themselves as a different ‘kind’ of Italians – as having a different *mentalità* to their peers who remain in Italy (Bartolini and Volpe 2005: 103).
Compared to international migrants, internal migrants hold less negative views of Italy. A quarter of internal-migrant interviewees expressed a distinctively negative view of Italy, compared to half of international migrants. Instead, internal migrants’ critiques were more regionally-specific, levelled at the South. They were fatalistic rather than aggressive in tone, pointing to a historically embedded combination of shortage of decent jobs and the clientelistic practice of _raccomandazione_ controlling access to the few opportunities that did come up.

On the whole, graduates migrating from the South of Italy to Rome and Milan did so purely for economic reasons – to improve their chances of finding employment and advancing their careers, which they saw stifled in the South, if not condemned to unemployment. Personal and non-economic motivations were downplayed, compared to the accounts of the emigrants in the UK. Using Fielding’s (1992) notion of the ‘escalator’ region, Milan was seen as having this effect within the perceptual economic geography of Italy; not so Rome which was seen as somewhere to try to find a secure civil service job, with few or very slow promotion openings. Interviewees felt (and we would tend to agree) that, as long as Italy’s North/South divide persists, which seems very likely, internal graduate migration will continue and might even increase in the future.

Regarding the non-movers, the evidence suggests that these graduates stay in their home towns because of the strength of certain kinds of ‘mooring’ ties. They have acquired work positions which they find at least satisfactory, and they also cherish the kind of life-balance available locally, surrounded by family, partners, and lifelong friends. Such emotional and relationship factors were more often stressed by female graduates. Although irregular practices in the employment field were acknowledged by stayers, on the whole this group was a more ‘comfortable’ category of individuals, compared to migrants, as regards their views of themselves as Italian citizens and residents.

What of future moves? The stayers naturally anticipate staying put, although a few acknowledged that they may have to move if they have no work. Internal migrants were ambivalent about returning from the North to the South. Three (out of 24) actually intended to return; others mentioned that they would like to go back given the opportunity, above all to be closer to family and friends, but they thought that, objectively, a return is unlikely to occur. None of the internal migrants wanted to go abroad to work, although a small number thought that they might have to do so, due to a lack of career development opportunities in Italy. Thus, at least from our data, there is no evidence for graduates engaging in internal-to-international stepwise migration – a common sequence in Turkey, Mexico and other countries. The likely future migration pathways of the emigrants
in the UK were more diversified. Half of this sample saw their futures in the UK or elsewhere abroad; a quarter thought that a return to Italy would be difficult and therefore unlikely; leaving only a quarter seeing themselves as likely to return.

A final question concerns whether the case of Italian graduate migration shows evidence of replacement migration. Do the migrants who move from South to North within Italy act as a replacement labour force for the northern graduates who have gone abroad? We feel that intuitively this is the case although we have only slender evidence to back up this impression. Our sample design required equal numbers of interviewees from northern, central and southern Italy to be interviewed in London, so the sample by its very nature cannot pick up the northern majority that we feel exists, based on our general knowledge of young, educated Italians in and around London. A different kind of survey, based on accessing special records (like embassy files), or setting up an online questionnaire, would be required to answer this question with more confidence.
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