

Synergy of Migration Theories: Theoretical Insights

Vilmante Kumpikaite, Ineta Zickute

Kaunas University of Technology
K. Donelaicio st. 73, LT-44029, Kaunas, Lithuania
e-mail: vilmante.kumpikaite@ktu.lt, ineta.zickute@ktu.lt

crossref <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.23.4.1240>

Topic of migration is often discussed in nowadays. However, it is quite complicated phenomenon. Causes of migration can be understandable “deeper” after classifying and summarizing the main theories in an appropriate way. The most of scientists agrees that migration’s theory, which could explain all aspects and reasons of migration, will never be created because of confusing variety of processes included in it. However, the purpose of this article was not to propose such single theory. Various consistent patterns and correlations can be seen in the migration’s movements. After classifying and summarizing these aspects, it is possible to understand the causes of migration “deeper”. Thus, the authors of this paper tried to analyze, sort out migration theories and to put them together. In the first part of this article, Economic equilibrium, Heckscher-Ohlin, Todaro and Harris-Todaro, Human capital, Early decision-making, Dual labor market, Self-selection, Family migration, Relative deprivation, Motivation decisions, Rational expectation, Consumption, Network, Cumulative causation, Migration systems, Zelinsky, Skeldon, Migration hump and Push and pull theories of migration were analyzed. In the second part, all above mentioned theories according to their features, similarities and period were classified in the Neoclassical, New, International movement solvents and Spatio-temporal transition theories groups. It should be noted that not all above mentioned theories could be directly attributed to one group. Some theories, as Early decision-making theory, could be attributed to both Neoclassical theory (because of personal factors) and New theory (because of family characteristics included in personal factors) of migration. Finally, theories groups were associated with interrelationships and summarized in to one integrated Push and pull model. Push and pull model has been developed by a lot of scientists continuously: Ravenstein, (1889), Lee, (1966), Altbach, (1998), Mazzarol & Soutar, (2002), and many others (Wang, 2010). Many theorists have followed footsteps of migration Push and pull model. These theories have been improved and supplemented with new push or/and pull factors. Thus, it can be said that most migration theories can be combined together. Push and pull model of discussed migration theories could be one of suggestions how to integrate theories into one model. This integrated model of theories could reveal the reasons for migration wider and deeper. Proposed model can be used as integrated and complex model seeking to understand migration theories and the main migration reasons based push and pull motives deeper.

Keywords: *migration, theories of migration, classification of migration theories, Push and pull model, Neoclassical theories of migration, New theories of migration.*

Introduction

Migration processes were analyzed recently by Grundey & Sarvutyte (2007); Sarvutyte & Streimikiene (2010); Kumpikaite (2009); Kaminska *et al.*, (2011). However, it is very important and actual during rapid globalization influence on labour market, economics and organization. Such globalization impact was analyzed by Kryk (2009); Tvaronaviciene & Kalasinskaite (2010); Ciarniene *et al.*, (2008). A lot of analysis is done for defining the causes of migration. Migration processes were analyzed by Altbach (1998); Bauer & Zimmermann (1999); Borjas (2008); Calvo (1978); Cordon & Findlay (1975); Chiquiar & Hanson (2002); de Haas (2007, 2010); Doeringer & Piore (1971); Fields (1975); Harris & Todaro (1970); Haug (2008); Heckscher (1949); Jennissen (2004); Johnson (1971); Kubursi (2006); Lee (1966); Liebig (2003); Mabogunje (1970); Martin

(1993); Maslauskaite & Stankuniene (2007); Massey (1993); Myrdal (1957); Ohlin (1933); Piore (1979); Ravenstein (1889); Roy (1951); Runciman (1966); Sjaastad (1962); Smith (1776); Wang (2010); Zelinsky (1971).

Analysis of scientific literature shows that there are a lot of migration theories created up to this day. Unfortunately, it is not enough to analyze different theories separately. Despite a huge interest, discussions and analysis of the migration process, there is a problem of integrated and complex migration model lack. Such integrated model, which includes various migration theories, could to reveal overall view of migration process. It is understandable that it would be difficult to propose overall single migration theory of migration causes. However, the purpose of this article is not to propose such single theory. The aim of the article is to combine migration theories into one integrated

model, which could reveal the reasons for migration wider and deeper.

To achieve the aim of the article, there are three tasks to be solved:

- to characterize mostly found migration theories in the scientific literature;
- to classify migration theories in the groups and associate theories groups with interrelationships;
- to combine migration theories together into one model.

The object of the research is migration theories.

Methods used in this paper are scientific literature analysis, grouping, systematization, and summarizing of information.

The article consists two parts. In the first part, various migration theories are analyzed. In the second part, all analyzed migration theories are classified into the groups, theories groups are associated with interrelationships, and there is proposed the integrated model of migration theories.

Migration theories

There are a lot of migration theories created up to this day. This article includes theories which are mostly found in the scientific literature.

One of the first Neoclassical theories of migration can be named Smith (1776) and Ravenstein (1889) Economic equilibrium theory (Bauer & Zimmermann, 1999). This theory shows the distribution level of labor and capital, which affects migration processes. The main reason of migration is difference in wages. Characteristic of low wage has regions dominated by surplus of labor and less extent of capital while regions dominated by shortage of labor and higher injections of capital are characterized by high wage. Workers emigrate from low wage regions to regions where wage is higher. Meanwhile the material capital is invested where labor force is cheaper. The analysis of the impact of trade, labor migration and the movement of capital on labor markets and industrial sectors also is fruitful.

Perfect world of Neoclassical migration is a situation, when the convergence increases between the wages of both – origin and destination – countries. It is reflected in the process of “wages tend to become equal”, which is known as Heckscher-Ohlin theorem. Swedish economists Heckscher (1949) and Ohlin (1933) developed a theory of migration (Kjeldsen-Kragh, 2002), where attempted to show, that migration does not add value neither origin nor destination country (Trefler, 1997; de Haas, 2010). Todaro (1980) contributed significantly to development of rural-urban migration theory. He tried to clarify the situation, when urban unemployment level is rising but the process of migration from rural to urban areas

is ongoing. This theory has been developed and by other scientists from presentation in 1967. The first changes were done personally by Todaro and his colleague Harris (1970) (Todaro, 1980). Migration process has been explained by domestic trade of two sectors – urban and rural. The original theory of Todaro (1969) and Harris-Todaro (1970) was modified by Johnson (1971), Bhagwati & Srinivasan (1974); Cordon & Findlay (1975); Fields (1975); Calvo (1978); Bauer & Zimmermann (1999), and others (Todaro, 1980; Bauer & Zimmermann, 1999; Wang, 2010). Developments of the theory gave more reality but did not change core of the original theory.

Sjaastad, (1962) presented Human capital theory, in which migration is defined as individual's investment decision (cited by Bauer and Zimmermann, 1999) because individual increases employment perspective or/and uses opportunities of foreign education. The need for highly skilled personnel with international experience is increasing. Also, it is said that foreign universities can give more knowledge and skills, which extend the career opportunities and increase future earnings (Wang, 2010).

Most scientists name the process of migration of highly skilled persons as brain drain or brain gain. Aspects of knowledge-based economy were analyzed by a lot of scientists. Analysis of different economic development in the European Union countries, evaluated knowledge-based economy and conditions migration of knowledge workers is also important. Sometimes brain drain is explained as a result of the factors of attraction and repulsion of migration of qualified specialists, scientists and students. Also, in their article it is written that the migration of highly educated specialists may have negative economic, social, cultural and political effects on the development of the country. Leak of skilled labor force may have a negative effect on economic development of the region. The decrease of this segment is a huge loss for the entire economy.

Various authors' decision-making theories can be found in the literature. Daugherty and Kammeyer (1995) refer Lee (1966) theory as one of the earliest theories of decision-making (Maslauskaitė & Stankuniene, 2007). Lee's (1966) Early decision-making theory identifies four factors, which determine the decision to migrate or not:

1. Positive and negative factors associated with place of origin (employment opportunities, living conditions, climate, culture, leisure accessibility, situation of discrimination, etc.);
2. Positive and negative factors associated with place of destination (the same examples can be mentioned as in the first point);

3. Intervention obstacles (oceans or deserts, migration laws);

4. Personal factors (personal or family characteristics and personal sensitivity, intelligence, knowledge about conditions in other countries) (Maslauskaite & Stankuniene, 2007).

Doeringer & Piore, (1971) described American economy as having two labor markets (Bulow and Summers, 1986). Piore (1979) formulated a theory of Dual labor market. According to this theory, the labor market has been divided into two sectors – the primary, which includes attractive jobs, and the secondary, which includes dirty, dangerous and difficult jobs (Jennissen, 2004). It is said that the native inhabitants take more attractive jobs, while the secondary jobs are performed by immigrants. Equilibration of the primary and secondary labor markets was analyzed by many authors.

Borjas (1987) analyzed a process of Self-selection. He used a model developed by Roy (1951) that analyzed the distribution of employees according to skills of the country from which the migration was (Liebig, 2003). In the Roy (1951) model, immigrants were classified in to two groups: positive and negative selection. In Borjas (1987) theory, positive self-selection occurs “when the correlation between skills in the two countries is sufficiently high and when the host country has more dispersion in its earnings distribution” (Liebig, 2003). This suggests that high skilled people migrate from the country where taxes are higher for them and less qualified have better social conditions than in the host country. It can be said that countries with low wage dispersion will face with a negative selection immigrants because mentioned situation would attract low-skilled people (Liebig, 2003).

Family migration theory reflects well by simplified model of “husband and wife”. The main idea of this model is that the family decides to migrate if the total return from their migration will be positive. The optimal decision for the family is not necessarily optimal for each of the family members (person can be tied stayer or tied mover) (Kubursi, 2006; Borjas, 2008). Described model reflected migration decision as a family unit (both migrate or both stay). Also, the decision can be taken, when not all family migrates but one or few of family members. Labor power distribution of family between the countries is affected by element of risk-sharing and purpose to secure economic stability of the family budget (Maslauskaite & Stankuniene, 2007).

Stark (1984), one of the most known theoretic of the Relative deprivation, refers Runciman’s (1966) theory (Bhandari 2004). According to the basis of Runciman (1966) theory, Stark (1984) says that

relative deprivation develops of social inequality (Bhandari, 2004). It is said that people, who live in the poverty, have incentives to migrate. Decision to migrate is accepted not just for increasing income of household but more for improvement of economic position in the community and feelings to be more honorable. Stark and Yitzhaki (1988) state that the poorest people have greater incentive to migrate than rich people (Bhandari, 2004).

John (1962) identified the differences of economic advantages as essential motivators for labor migration. Sell and de Jong (1978) formulated Motivation decisions theory (Maslauskaite & Stankuniene, 2007). This theory consists of four parts:

1. Possibility (whether migration is possible of physical and psychological purport);

2. Motive (an important role is for that, what individual values in life, for example, motive could be wellbeing, which could be expressed as economic success);

3. Expectation (belief that migration will provide the opportunity to achieve purposes, for example, to make money);

4. Incentive (assessment of pluses and minuses of the origin and destination countries, for example, migrants with children evaluation of level of education system and better school system can be one of positive factors that promote the decision to migrate) (Maslauskaite & Stankuniene, 2007).

According to de Jong and Gardner (1981) Rational expectation theory (Haug, 2008), individuals decide to migrate where sum of factors benefit is the largest. De Jong & Fawcett (1981), (Haug, 2008), define the evaluation of expected benefit such factors categories as health, status, comfort, suggestions, independence, acceptance in the new environment and morality. Also, the decision is influenced by factors as household characteristics, social and cultural norms, personality factors and opportunities (Haug, 2008).

Consumption theory was proposed by Wallace (1997) (Liebig, 2003). This theory is as a contrast for traditional theories of migration because the focus of migration cause is not income but value maximization. Wallace (1997) says that mainly the benefits are gotten not only with usual products but also with material and immaterial values. This may include proximity to relatives, locality convenience, climate, security, quality of life and so on (Liebig, 2003). Highly skilled migrants react to some specific aspects as comfort and pleasure in the locality differently from low skilled migrants. As examples can be mentioned opera houses, theatres and museums (Liebig, 2003).

Development of Network theory allows understanding migrants' benefits of interpersonal connection between origin and host countries better. Migrants' communication with relatives, friends and others facilitates the process of migration. Migration networks reduce migration costs and risks, which increase the expected return from migration (Massey 1993). Migrants' networks help for potential migrants to choose way of travel, find a job and living place, providing information about studies opportunities, social security. This reduces the migration costs, increases employment opportunities and reduces the probability of failure (Jennissen, 2004).

Increasing extent of migration were influenced not just of Network theory but Myrdal (1957) Cumulative causation theory (Massey 1993) as well. This theory identifies migration stimulating factors as distribution of income and land, organization of agrarian production, culture of migration, regional distribution of human capital and social labeling (Massey, 1993).

Mabogunje (1970) was the first, who defined the Systems theory of migration. It was described as a set of geographic locations interface, including people, products and services and information flows sharing (de Haas, 2007). Identified processes facilitated exchange between the countries, including migration. Mabogunje (1970) theory has been focused on the rural-urban migration. Portes with Borocz (1987) and Kritz et al. (1992) developed this theory to the theory of international migration (Haas, 2007).

Geographer Zelinsky (1971) proposed a spatio-temporal model, which integrates demographic transition theory with the theory of the spatial diffusion of innovation. Zelinsky (1971) sets out five phases of the vital transition (Haas, 2010):

1. Pre-modern traditional society (mobility mainly limited to circular migration);
2. Early transitional society (all forms of mobility increase);
3. Late transitional society (international migration decreases);
4. Advanced society (transformation from emigration to immigration);
5. A future „superadvanced“ society (immigration continues) (de Haas, 2010).

Geographer Skeldon (1990, 1997), further developed Zelinsky's (1971) original work by strengthening the spatial dimension of transition theory and applying it to actual world migration (de Haas, 2010). Skeldon (1990, 1997) divided the regions of the world by migration and presented five development tiers:

1. Resource niche countries, which changes and often characterized by weaker forms of migration;
2. Labor frontier countries, which dominate by emigration to core country;
3. Expanding core countries, which characterized by both - immigration and emigration – processes;
4. Old and new core countries, which are characterized by immigration processes;
5. Future – Old/Declining core countries (Haas, 2010).

Discussed Zelinsky (1971) and Skeldon's (1990, 1997) migration theories of transitional periods were focused on explanation of long-term structural changes, which were linked with social and economic processes (Haas, 2010). Meanwhile Martin (1993) and Martin with Taylor (1996) formulated the theory of Migration hump, which was focused on the short-term migration changes, which were linked with trade reforms (Haas, 2010). Martin (1993) and Martin with Taylor (1996) proposed convincing arguments in their works, why trade and migration can complement one another during short and medium period. Adaptability to the new market conditions takes time. Effect of migration hump is seen because investments do not create new job places immediately (Haas, 2010).

As we can see, many studies are done to determine the causes of migration. Quite popular and prevalent was the Push and pull theory, developed by various researches: Ravenstein (1889), Lee (1966), Altbach (1998), Mazarol & Soutar (2002), and many others (Wang 2010). These theories were supplemented with new push or/and pull elements.

Description of the integrated model of migration theories

It is understandable that it would be difficult to propose overall migration theory of causes, which could fit in all cases. Furthermore, such theory would be useless because, as de Haas (2010) said, we need to stay at very universal statement “most people migrate to improve their wellbeing”. However, the purpose of this article was not to propose such single theory. Various consistent patterns and correlations can be seen in the migration's movements. After classifying and summarizing these aspects, it is possible to understand the causes of migration “deeper”. All analyzed theories according to their features, similarities and period were grouped into 4 groups of theories with interrelationships. Also, all this information is summarized into one integrated Push and pull model and given in Figure 1.




Figure 1. The integrated model of migration theories

Despite the fact that there are a lot of migration theories created up to this day, the main are so called Neoclassical and New theories of migration. Smith (1776), Ravenstein (1889), represented one of the first Neoclassical theories – Economic equilibrium theory (Bauer & Zimmermann 1999). It also includes Heckscher-Ohlin theory and Todaro/Harris-Todaro theory. The original Todaro (1969) model was developed by other scientists as well: Johnson (1971), Bhagwati & Srinivasan (1974), Cordon & Findlay (1975), Fields (1975), Calvo (1978), Bauer & Zimmermann (1999) and others (Todaro 1980; Bauer & Zimmermann, 1999; Wang, 2010).

Above mentioned Economic equilibrium, Heckscher-Ohlin and Todaro/Harris-Todaro theories are the main components of Neoclassical theories. However, Sjaastad (1962) Human capital theory, Lee (1966), Early decision-making theory, Doeringer & Piore, (1971). Dual labor market theory and Borjas (1987) Self-selection theory were significant too because they brought on the development of migration theories.

It should be noted that all above mentioned theories cannot be directly attributed to the Neoclassical theories because some of them can be attributed to both Neoclassical and New theories of migration. Early decision-making theory was attributed to the Neoclassical theories because of personal factors included into the theory. However, to take count of all

aspects included in the personal factors, one of them can be family characteristics. Thus, it can be said that this theory has strong links with the New theories of migration (Maslauskaite & Stankuniene, 2007).

The individual was emphasized in the Neoclassical theories of migration while focus was put on family and community in the New theories of migration. As basis of New theories, Family migration theory, which includes Model as family unit and Risk-sharing model, can be mentioned.

Other theories are important for New theories of migration too, which supplement understanding of migration process. It includes Runciman (1966) Relative deprivation theory, Sell and de Jong (1978), Motivation decisions theory, de Jong & Gardner (1981), Rational expectation theory and Wallace (1997), Consumption theory. As shown in Figure 1, the relevance of migration processes had an impact to come into existence for Theories of international movement solvents. It includes Network, Cumulative causation and Systems theories. These new factors facilitate the process of migration more. Neoclassical, New and International movement solvents theories determined the origin of Spatio-temporal transition theories, which includes Zelinsky theory, Skeldon theory and Migration hump. Spatio-temporal transition theories summed up consistent pattern of migration processes.

One of the earliest migration theorist Ravenstein (1889) in his „Laws of Migration“ concluded that

migration was governed by a push and pull process (Wang 2010). He described that push factors are unfavorable conditions (heavy taxation, etc.) which force to move and pull factors are favorable conditions (better economic opportunities, etc.) which encourage a person to move. Lee (1966) reformulated Ravenstein's theory to give more emphasis to push factors (Wang, 2010). One of determinant was listed as "plus" and "minus" factors in areas of origin and destination (as equivalent for push and pull factors). Push and pull model has been developed by a lot of scientists continuously. Many theorists have followed footsteps of migration push and pull model. These theories have been improved and supplemented with new push or/and pull factors.

Thus, all theories of migration, which were analyzed in this article, were summarized in the Push and pull model because the idea of analyzed theories was based on migration analysis of push or/and pull factors. This is one of the proposals, in order to summarize all discussed theories in to one integrated model, which could reveal reasons for migration wider and deeper.

Conclusions

In order to show synergy of migration theories, it was necessary to characterize various migration theories. Thus, Economic equilibrium, Heckscher-Ohlin, Todaro and Harris-Todaro, Human capital, Early decision-making, Dual labor market, Self-selection, Family migration, Relative deprivation, Motivation decisions, Rational expectation, Consumption, Network, Cumulative causation, Migration systems, Zelinsky, Skeldon, Migration hump and Push and pull theories were analyzed.

All above mentioned migration theories were classified into Neoclassical and New theories of migration, Theories of international movement solvents and Spatio-temporal transition theories groups. Theories groups were associated with interrelationships and summarized into one integrated Push and pull model.

Thus, it could be said that most migration theories can be combined together. Push and pull model of discussed migration theories could be one of suggestions how to integrate theories into one model. This integrated model of theories could reveal the reasons for migration wider and deeper. Proposed model can be used as integrated and complex model seeking to understand migration theories and the main migration reasons based push and pull motives deeper.

References

- Bauer, Th. K., & Zimmermann, K. F. (1999). Assessment of possible migration pressure and its labour market impact following EU enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe. *IZA Research Report*, No. 3.
- Bhandari, P. (2004). Relative Deprivation and Migration in an Agricultural Setting of Nepal. *Population and Environment*, 25(5).
- Borjas, G. J. (2008). *Labor Mobility. Labor Economics*. (4-th ed.). Irwin: McGraw-Hill, (Chapter 9).
- Bulow, J. I., & Summers, L. H. (1986). A Theory of Dual Labor Markets with Application to Industrial Policy, Discrimination, and Keynesian Unemployment. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 4(3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/298116>
- Chiariene, R., & Kumpikaite, V. (2008). The impact of Globalization on Migration Processes. *Social Research*. Siauliai, 13(3), 42-48.
- Chiquiar, D., & Hanson, G. (2002). International Migration, Self-Selection, and the Distribution of Wages: Evidence from Mexico and the United States. *The National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER)*, Working Paper No. 9242.
- De Haas, H. (2007). North African Migration Systems: Evolution, Transformations and Development Linkages. *International Migration Institute*, 6, 5-6.
- De Haas, H. (2010). Migration Transitions: a Theoretical and Empirical Inquiry into the Developmental Drivers of International Migration. *International Migration Institute*, No. 24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2009.00804.x>
- Grundey, D., & Sarvutyte, M. (2007). The Implications of Financing Higher Education in the Context of Labour Force Migration: The Case of Lithuania. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 13(3), 208-213.
- Haug, S. (2008). Migration Networks and Migration Decision-Making. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(4), 585-605. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13691830801961605>
- Jennissen, R. P. W. (2004). *Macro-Economic Determinants of International Migration in Europe*. Amsterdam: Dutch University Press.
- Kaminska, M. E., & Kahancova, M. (2011). Emigration and Labour Shortages: An Opportunity for Trade Unions in the New Member States? *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 17(2), 189-203. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959680111400916>
- Kjeldsen-Kragh, S. (2002). *International Economics. Trade and Investment*. Copenhagen: Business School Press.
- Kryk, B. (2009). Evaluation of Environmental Policy Pursued by Poland during the Transformation and Globalization of the Economy. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 8(3), 110-128.

- Kubursi, A. (2006). The Economics of Migration and Remittances Under Globalization. *Full and Productive Employment and Decent Work – Dialogues at the Economics and Social Council*. New York, pp. 159-174.
- Kumpikaite, V. (2009). Adaptation of Immigrants from Lithuania in Ireland's Companies: Practical case. *Changes In Social and Business Environment*, 229-234.
- Liebig, Th. (2003). Migration theory from a supply-side perspective. *Research Institute for Labour Economics and Labour Law*, July, Discussion Paper No. 92.
- Maslauskaitė, A., & Stankūnienė, V. (2007). *Seima abipus sienu*. Vilnius: Tarptautinė migracijos organizacija, Socialiniu tyrimu institutas.
- Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, J. E. (1993). Theories of International Migration: a Review and Appraisal. *Population and Development review* 19(3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2938462>
- Sarvutytė, M., & Streimikiene, D. (2010). New Concepts and Approaches of Migration, *Ekonomika ir vadyba. Tarptautinės mokslinės konferencijos pranešimų medžiaga*, 226-233.
- Todaro, M. P. (1980). Internal Migration in Developing Countries: a Survey. *Population and Economic Change in Developing Countries*, pp. 361-402.
- Trefler, D. (1997). Immigrants and Natives in General Equilibrium Trade Models. In *National Bureau of Economic Research*. Available from Internet: <http://www.nber.org/papers/w6209>.
- Tvaronavičienė, M., & Kalasinskaitė, K. (2010). Whether Globalization in Form of Fdi Enhances National Wealth: Empirical Evidence from Lithuania. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 11(1), 5-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3846/jbem.2010.01>
- Wang, Z. (2010). Self-Globalization – a New Concept in the Push-and-Pull Theory. *Sustainability, development and Global Citizenship: for Education and Citizenship 2010 Conference*. London, 15-17.

Vilmantė Kumpikaitė, Ineta Žičkutė

Migracijos teorijų sinergija: teorinės išvalgos

Santrauka

Pastaruoju metu migracijos procesai susilaukia didelio dėmesio. Migracija yra sudėtingas ir keblus reiškinys. Dauguma mokslininkų, susidūrę su sudėtinga migracijos procesų įvairove, drįstų teigti, jog visa apimanti ir paaiškinanti migracijos procesų priežastis teorija niekada nebus sukurta (Castles ir Miller, 2009).

Suprantama, jog sudėtinga būtų pateikti bendrą migracijos priežastis aiškinančią teoriją, kuri tiktų visais atvejais. Be to, tokia teorija būtų nevertinga, nes norint aprėpti visumą, tektų apsisotiti ties itin universaliu teiginiu, jog „dauguma žmonių migruoja, siekiant pagerinti gerovę“ (Haas, 2010).

Šio tyrimo tikslas ir nebuvo pateikti vienos bendros teorijos. Migracijos judėjime galima įžvelgti nemažai dėsningumų bei tarpusavio sąsajų, kurias tinkamai suklasifikavus ir apibendrinus, galima kuo aiškiau suvokti migracijos priežastis bei atskleisti migracijos proceso esmę.

Taigi šio straipsnio problema yra tai, kad trūksta išsamesnių migracijos teorijų, kurios labiau padėtų atskleisti ir suvokti migracijos priežastis. Tyrimo objektas yra migraciją aiškinančios teorijos. Pagrindinis straipsnio tikslas – išanalizuoti ir pateikti susistemintą migraciją aiškinančių teorijų vaizdą viename integruotame modelyje, kuris leistų atskleisti migracijos priežastis „plačiau“ ir „giliau“. Tyrimo naudoti metodai yra mokslinės literatūros analizė, grupavimas, sisteminimas, apibendrinimas ir grafinis informacijos vaizdavimas.

Migracijos procesus analizavo Altbach (1998), Bauer ir Zimmermann (1999), Borjas (2008), Calvo (1978), Cordon ir Findlay (1975), de Haas (2007, 2010), Doeringer ir Piore (1971), Fields (1975), Harris ir Todaro (1970), Haug (2008), Heckscher (1949), Jennissen (2004), Johnson (1971), Kubursi (2006), Lee (1966), Liebig (2003), Mabogunje (1970), Martin (1993), Maslauskaitė ir Stankūnienė (2007), Massey (1993), Myrdal (1957), Ohlin (1933), Piore (1979), Ravenstein (1889), Roy (1951), Runciman (1966), Sjaastad (1962), Smith (1776), Wang (2010), Zelinsky (1971) ir kiti.

Nepaisant to, jog iki šių dienų yra sukurta nemažai migraciją aiškinančių teorijų ir modelių, pagrindinėmis yra įvardijamos *Neoklasikinės* ir *Naujosios migracijos* teorijos. Vieną iš pirminių *Neoklasikinės migracijos* teorijų galima įvardinti Smith (1776) ir Ravenstein (1889) pristatoma *Ekonomikos pusiausvyros* teorija, kuri atskleidžia darbo ir kapitalo pasiskirstymo lygi ir pagrindine migracijos priežastimi įvardija darbo užmokesčio skirtumus (Bauer ir Zimmermann, 1999). Švedų ekonomistai Heckscher ir Ohlin pateikia teoriją, kurioje dėmesys skiriamas konvergencijos tarp darbo užmokesčių šalyse didėjimui bei bandoma įrodyti, jog migracija nesukuria pridėtinę vertę nei kilmės, nei tikslo šaliai (Trefler, 1997; de Haas, 2010). Todaro/Harris ir Todaro (1970) teorijoje migracijos procesas aiškinamas dviejų sektorių vidaus prekyba (miesto ir kaimo) ir bandoma įrodyti, jog migracija tęsiasi tol, kol nesulygina darbo užmokesčiai (Rapanos, 2005). Originalusis Todaro (1969) modelis buvo plėtojamas ir kitų mokslininkų: Johnson (1971), Bhagwati ir Srinivasan (1974), Cordon ir Findlay (1975), Fields (1975), Calvo (1978), Bauer ir Zimmermann (1999) bei daugelio kitų (Todaro, 1980; Bauer ir Zimmermann, 1999; Wang, 2010).

Minėtos ekonomikos pusiausvyros, Heckscher-Ohlin ir Todaro/Harris-Todaro teorijos yra pagrindinės *Neoklasikinių migracijos* teorijų sudedamosios dalys. Visgi, didelės reikšmės turi ir kitos teorijos, kurios prisidėjo prie migracijos teorijų atsiradimo. Ne visas teorijas galima tiesiogiai priskirti prie *Neoklasikinių migracijos* teorijų, nes kai kurias jų galima priskirti tiek *Neoklasikinėms*, tiek *Naujosioms migracijos* teorijoms.

Sjaastad (1962) *Žmogiškojo kapitalo* teorija aiškinama kaip priimtas investicijų sprendimas dėl užimtumo perspektyvų didinimo ar užsienio mokslo galimybių išnaudojimo. Sprendimas migruoti studijoms į užsienio šalį priimamas ne vien dėl to, jog būtų įgauta daugiau žinių ir įgūdžių, bet ir dėl to, jog baigus studijas ketinama pasilikti toje šalyje dirbti. Pasak Lee (1966), sprendimų priėmimas dėl migravimo apima teigiamus ir neigiamus kilmės ir tikslo šalių veiksnius, kurie gali būti įvertinti, remiantis įsidarbinimo galimybėmis, gyvenimo sąlygomis, klimatu, kultūros ir laisvalaikio paslaugų prieinamumu ar diskriminacijos situacija; intervencijos kliūtis, kurios sunkina migraciją (vandenynai, dykumos ar migracijos įstatymai) bei asmeninių veiksnius. Būtent dėl asmeninių veiksmių, ši teorija priskiriama *Neoklasikinėms migracijos* teorijoms. Tačiau atsizvelgus į tai, jog viena iš asmeninių veiksmių reikšmių gali būti įtraukta šeimos charakteristika, galima teigti, jog ši teorija turi stiprių ryšių su *Naujosiomis migracijos* teorijomis (Maslauskaitė ir Stankūnienė, 2007). Doeringer ir Piore (1971) aprašė Amerikos ekonomiką, kaip turinčią dvi darbo rinkas (Bulow ir Summers, 1986). Piore (1979) suformulavo *Dviejų darbo rinkų* teoriją, pagal kurią darbo rinka buvo suskirstyta į du sektorius. Pagal šią teoriją, gimtosios šalies gyventojai užima patrauklesnių profesijų darbo vietas, o antraeilūs darbus dirba imigrantai. Saviatrankos migracijai procesą analizavo Borjas (1987), pasinaudodamas Roy (1951) plėtotu modeliu, kuris analizavo darbuotojų pasiskirstymą pagal įgūdžius šalyje, iš kurios migruojama (cituoja Liebig, 2003: 10).

Neoklasikinėse migracijos teorijose buvo akcentuojamas individas, o *Naujosiose migracijos* teorijose dėmesys pradėtas skirti šeimoms nariams bei bendruomenei. Šeimos migracijos teorija vaizdžiai atspindi supaprastintą „vyro ir žmonos“ modelis, kurio pagrindinė mintis yra ta, jog šeima priims

sprendimą migruoti tik tada, kai bendra jų grąža iš migracijos bus teigiama. Taip pat analizuojamas ne tik šeimos kaip vieneto modelis, bet ir rizikos pasidalijimo modelis, kai emigruoja ne visa šeima (Kubursi, 2006).

Šeimos migracijos teorija yra *Naujųjų migracijos* teorijų pagrindas. Nepaisant to, *Naujosioms migracijos* teorijoms yra svarbios ir kitos teorijos, kurios papildo migracijos proceso suvokimą. Runciman (1966) *Santykinio skurdo* teorijoje daroma prielaida, jog sprendimą emigruoti daugiausia priima labiau nepasiturintys namų ūkiai nei tie, kurie yra palankiau įsikūrę (Liebig, 2003). Sell ir de Jong (1978) *Motyvacinėje migracijos* sprendimų teorijoje išskiriamos galimybės (tiek fizinės, tiek psichologinės), motyvai (viena didžiausių – ekonominė sėkmė), lūkesčiai (tarkim, užsidirbimas) ir paskatos (kilmės ir tikslo vietovės privalumai ir trūkumai). Stark (1991) *Racionalių lūkesčių teorijoje* akcentuojama, jog racionalų sprendimą dėl naudingumo maksimizavimo galimybių priima šeimos ar namų ūkiai, o ne atskiras individas (Maslauskaitė ir Stankūnienė, 2007). Kaip tradicinės teorijos kontrastui, galima įvardinti Wallace (1997). Į vartojimą orientuotą teoriją (*plg. angl. consumption*), kurioje akcentuojami ne pajamų ir užimtumo skirtumai, o vartojimas, kuris apima ir ėjimą į operą, muziejus ir t.t. (Liebig, 2003).

Migracijos procesų aktualumas turėjo įtaką Tarptautinį judėjimą lengvinančių veiksnių teorijų atsiradimui (*Migracijos tinklo* teorija, *Kumuliacinio priežastingumo* teorija ir *Migracijos sistemų* teorija). Šie naujieji veiksniai dar labiau lengvino ir skatino migracijos procesą. Migracijos procesą aiškinančios *Neoklasikinės, Naujosios ir Judėjimą* lengvinančios teorijos lėmė *Laiko-erdvės kitimo* teorijų (apima Zelinsky ir Skeldon teorijas bei Migracijos „*Jump*“ (angl.) atsiradimą, kurios tarsi apibendrina vykusių migracijos procesų dėsningumą. Zelinsky (1971) sukūrė migracijos modelį, į kurį integravo demografinius pokyčius laike su esminiais plėtos etapais. Skeldon (1990, 1997) toliau plėtojo Zelinsky (1971) originalų darbą, sustiprindamas erdvės dimensiją (Haas, 2010).

Nustatant migracijos priežastis atlikta daug tyrimų. Gan populiarūs ir paplitusi buvo stūmos ir traukos (*plg. angl. Push and pull*) teorija, kurią plėtojo įvairūs mokslininkai: Ravenstein (1889), Lee (1966), Altbach (1998), Mazzarol ir Soutar (2003) ir daug kitų (Wang, 2010). Šios teorijos būdavo papildomos vis naujais stūmos ar/ir traukos elementais. Apibendrinant išanalizuotąsias migraciją aiškinančias teorijas, jos buvo sugrupuotos bei susistemintos.

Visos analizuotos teorijos apibendrintos integruotu Stūmos-traukos modeliu, nes visų analizuotųjų teorijų idėja remiasi migraciją lemiančių stūmos ar/ir traukos veiksnių analize. Tai galima pagrįsti tuo, jog Stūmos-traukos modelis buvo tobulinamas nepertraukiamai, tad tai būtų vienas iš pasiūlymų, siekiant apibendrinti daugumą aptartų teorijų į šį vieną modelį, kuris atskleistų vienas svarbiausių priežasčių, skatinančių migruoti.

Raktažodžiai: *migracija, migracijos teorijos, migracijos teorijų klasifikacija, Stūmos ir traukos modelis, Neoklasikinės migracijos teorijos, Naujosios migracijos teorijos.*

The article has been reviewed.

Received in February, 2012; accepted in October, 2012.