

La perpétuation de la migration internationale : une analyse théorique

The Perpetuation of International Migration: A Theoretical Analysis.

Auteur 1 : OUTOUGANE El Hossain

Auteur 2 : ABDELKHALIK Hicham.

OUTOUGANE El Hossain 1, (<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7835-0264>), Docteur en Sciences Economiques et de Gestion. Université Mohamed V / Faculté des Sciences Juridiques, Economiques et Sociales Souissi – Rabat, Maroc.

ABDELKHALIK Hicham 2, (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9949-9387>), Docteur en Sciences Economiques et de Gestion. Université Ibn Tofail / Faculté de l'Economie et de Gestion – Kénitra, Maroc.

Déclaration de divulgation : L'auteur n'a pas connaissance de quelconque financement qui pourrait affecter l'objectivité de cette étude.

Conflit d'intérêts : L'auteur ne signale aucun conflit d'intérêts.

Pour citer cet article : OUTOUGANE .EL H & ABDELKHALIK .H (2024) « La perpétuation de la migration internationale : une analyse théorique / The Perpetuation of International Migration: A Theoretical Analysis », African Scientific Journal « Volume 03, Numéro 22 » pp: 0796 – 0815.

Date de soumission : Janvier 2024

Date de publication : Février 2024



DOI : 10.5281/zenodo.10803917
Copyright © 2024 – ASJ



Résumé

Dans un monde en plein mutation, caractérisé par une évolution permanente des conditions des migrations et par l'émergence de nouvelles exigences, les sciences sociales ont adopté des logiques, parfois, contradictoires pour mieux comprendre les facteurs de la migration internationale. Notre méthodologie s'est appuyée sur une analyse critique de la littérature existante concernant les facteurs influençant la migration internationale. Cette revue analytique a permis de dégager une compréhension approfondie des différents facteurs et de leur impact sur les décisions d'émigration, en fonction du cadre socioéconomique spécifique à chaque individu ou groupe envisageant la migration. Le résultat montre que les causes de maintien du phénomène migratoire sont complexes et multidimensionnelle et sont organisées généralement autour d'une série de théories, à vocation économique et/ou sociologique, appelées *théories de perpétuation de la migration internationale*.

Mots clés : Migration internationale, Théorie de réseaux, Théorie des causes cumulatives, Théorie institutionnelle, Théorie des systèmes migratoires.

Abstract

In a rapidly changing world, characterized by constantly evolving migration conditions and the emergence of new needs, the social sciences have adopted sometimes contradictory logics to better understand the factors behind international migration. Our methodology was based on a critical analysis of the existing literature on the factors influencing international migration. This analytical review provided a comprehensive understanding of the various factors and their impact on emigration decisions, depending on the specific socioeconomic framework of each individual or group considering migration. The results show that the causes of sustained migration are complex and multidimensional, and are generally organized around a set of economic and/or sociological theories, known as *the sustained theories of international migration*.

Keywords : International migration, Network theory, Cumulative causation theory, Institutional theory, Migration systems theory.

.

Introduction

International migration is a complex and constantly evolving phenomenon that has been extensively researched. It is important to maintain objectivity in the evaluation of this topic and to use clear and concise language with a logical structure. Technical terms should be explained when first used, and the language should be formal and free from bias. It can be triggered by various factors, such as the desire to earn additional income, the need to diversify household risks, or the demand for labor in host countries. The text should also adhere to style guides and be free from grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, and punctuation errors.

Researchers have made numerous attempts to come to a convincing conclusion that maintenance theories alone cannot explain the continuation of the phenomenon once the initiating causes have disappeared. This is because the conditions that provoke international movements may be different from the conditions that maintain these movements over time and space.

Several theories have been developed to explain the continuity of individual or collective human movement over the last two centuries. However, the literature review does not allow for a clear classification of these theories based on a logical approach. Academic work is often influenced by various factors, including economic, political, and cultural ones. Most of the conclusions drawn from the studies have been influenced by various doctrines (such as liberalism, socialism, third-worldism, etc.) or by the organizations funding the research (such as research centers, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, etc.). In other words, the studies have been subject to external influences.

This paper aims to simplify the classification of the main explanatory approaches to the persistence of international migration in scholarship by identifying four main distinct theories. In other words, it proposes an analysis of the theoretical framework behind the factors that perpetuate international migration. This analysis is based on economic and social theories developed over the last two centuries.

The article is structured around four main theories that explain the factors perpetuating the migratory phenomenon. The first title discusses network theory, followed by cumulative causes in the second. The third title explores factors related to institutional theory, and the final one is dedicated to migration systems theory.

1. Network theory

Although neoclassical theory has faced criticism from the New Economics of Labor Migration, Stark and Bloom's work introduces the concept of family strategy, which highlights the interdependence between the migrant and their family, while emphasizing risk-sharing

(Stark & Bloom, 1985). This approach analyzes migration at the household level and takes on a social security character. In addition to human capital, which is favored by neoclassical theory, social capital in the form of networks and kinship also plays a role.

This approach has gained popularity in research on migration in developing countries, especially in relation to survival strategies and the potential for migrants to effect change (De Haas, 2010). By shifting away from an individualistic and atomistic perspective, it is possible to view any migratory process as a result of collective and familial actions that connect both migrants and non-migrants through a network of relationships (Piché, 2013).

This concept has been explored in recent studies, which often refer to it as 'chain migration'. Networks refer to the interpersonal ties that connect migrants, former migrants, and non-migrants in both areas of departure and destination. These ties can be based on kinship, friendship, or shared community connections (Massey et al., 1993).

The analysis of the social ties approach, which is fueled by a sense of belonging to a transnational community, explains why migrants pay substantial amounts to benefit non-migrants. In contrast, the neo-classical approach adopts an egoistic vision that neglects the role of remittances between migrants and non-migrants (Djajic, 1986 ; Taylor, 1999). The transnational nature of migrants' identities explains the strength of their ties with their communities of origin over generations and the durability of remittances to family members back home (De Haas, 2010).

Monica Boyd's text is a significant contribution to the literature on networks and gender, particularly in including networks as links between places of departure and arrival (Boyd, 1989). For the author, networks mediate between structural factors (macro), individual actors (micro), and the international level (meso). Sociologist Thomas Faist (1997, 2000) analyzed the meso levels of migration, linking rational individual migration decision models to macro structural models of the migration phenomenon. He notes that social relations and social capital within households, neighborhoods, communities, and formal organizations play a dual role. On one hand, organizations assist migrants in their decision-making processes regarding migration. On the other hand, they serve as a resource and mechanism for integrating migrants into host societies (Hagen-Zanker, 2008).

Moreover, in societies experiencing continuous cultural change, diverse social relations strongly influence various obligations and social capital. For instance, exchange relationships that connect multiple actors, such as migrants and brokers, are based on weak social ties and typically lack any form of solidarity or reciprocity between the parties involved. Social capital is the result of various relationships between individuals, which can be transformed into other

forms of capital for material purposes, such as borrowing money from neighbors to finance migration trips. Bourdieu and Wacquant, Massey and Arango have discussed this concept (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Massey & Arango, 1998).

The choice of a host country during the migration process is often made by chance, without sufficient knowledge of living and working conditions. Migration takes on a definite direction as a result of established contacts with migrants already on the spot, particularly family members, friends, or others from the same community of origin living abroad. These ties serve as an incentive to emigrate, giving migration an institutional character (Buga, 2011).

Therefore, understanding the motives and volume of migration once it has begun is crucially dependent on the role of micro-level social ties. Access to destination countries by prospective emigrants became easier after the period of pioneer domination, when migrants faced many difficulties. Pioneer migrants informed potential migrants and established new communication channels, leading to the formation of migrant communities in host countries (Goss & Lindquist, 1995). Late migrants benefit from the assistance of pioneering migrants, who help with organizing the journey and finding employment, making migration less risky and costly. Empirical network practices are a prominent aspect of migration theory worldwide.

When the number of network connections in an area of origin reaches a critical level, migration becomes self-sustaining, as the phenomenon creates the necessary social structures to sustain itself. Each additional migrant reduces the cost of further migration for a group of family and friends, including psychological costs (Böcker, 1994), which subsequently enables some candidates to take the migration plunge (Massey, 2012). This cycle ensures a minimum of favorable conditions, the physical presence of a connected community abroad, and reduced travel costs for a new wave of potential emigrants. Recent empirical studies conducted in Mexico strongly support this scenario, demonstrating that access to network connections significantly increases the likelihood of migration to the USA (Massey & García España, 1987; Munshi, 2003). The patterns seem to be quite similar in other parts of Latin America as well (Massey & Aysa, 2005).

Regarding the limitations of network theory, Piché and Krissman have criticized the approach for its focus on social capital as a positive factor (Piché, 2013; Krissman, 2005). Piché specifically argues that Massey's concept of migratory networks is too narrow, as it centers on social and family networks that primarily originate from the same geographical regions, rather than networks formed by migrants from different regions. Krissman states that migration networks involve intermediaries, such as employers seeking migrant labor or traffickers conducting cross-border business. These actors are not only facilitators but can also be

exploitative beneficiaries of migration. It is important to note that all players involved in migration networks are not necessarily facilitators. Numerous reports on human trafficking indicate the existence of vast networks of smugglers, often with direct links to criminal organizations (Skeldon, 2000). It is important to note that subjective evaluations have been excluded from this analysis.

However, some academic research presents limitations and reveals a reluctance to accept the largely debatable arguments of network theory. De Haas argues that this theory lacks sufficient detail to understand the mechanisms that lead to the weakening and unravelling of migration networks. Additionally, it fails to accurately present the external structural factors and internal processes that lead to increased migration through networks (De Haas, 2010).

As with push-pull models, empirical illustrations of the important role of migrant networks often lack specificity regarding their relative weight compared to other factors that facilitate or constrain migration. To clarify the diffusionist role of these networks in perpetuating the migratory process, De Haas has shown that most empirical research on migratory networks tends to use potentially biased dependency variables in its case studies. De Haas argues that migratory movements of workers often have a long-term downward trend or even come to a halt in the absence of the fundamental causes of human displacement. He supports this idea with three observations. Secondly, although migration may be difficult to control due to network effects, physical and legal obstacles can significantly influence the scale and nature of migration without affecting the target direction (De Haas, 2010).

Finally, it is important to consider the impact of internal forces that may weaken networks in the medium and long term. Migrants, as human beings, are not simply 'bridges' who sacrifice their personal and professional lives to facilitate the subsequent migration of non-migrants remaining in the country of origin. On the contrary, they can become restrictive 'gatekeepers' who are reluctant to help potential migrants (Böcker, 1994; De Haas, 2003). In addition, connections with non-migrant family members and friends may weaken over time.

Furthermore, restrictive immigration policies raise doubts about the effectiveness of networks in spreading migratory culture. It is evident that these networks often influence the presence of direct family relationships, such as kinship between descendants and ascendants. As a result, the scope of the networks excludes other types of blood-based family ties, such as brothers, uncles, and cousins, as well as social ties, notably between friends and neighbors. Portes and Landolt analyzed this situation to resolve the social capital dilemma discussed above (Portes & Landolt, 1996). Moreover, they question the durability and effectiveness of each

structure, which is often influenced not only by the political considerations of host countries but also by the will and initiatives of the members of the structures.

Thus, the authors emphasize that relevant migration inevitably leads to a decline in social capital, which in turn leads to a fall in the numbers of migrants. This is because “*the same strong ties that help members of a group can also exclude outsiders*” (Portes & Landolt, 1996). The key finding of network theory is that selectivity tends to decrease shortly after the arrival of the first pioneers, resulting in a diffusion of personal migration experience within the original community.

1. 2. Cumulative Causation Theory

As recognized by network theory, an increase in the number of migrants from the same source community strengthens the network and guarantees the sustainability of migratory flows. International migration is further sustained over time by other processes that Myrdal refers to as “*cumulative causalities*” (Myrdal, 1957). The theory behind cumulative causality is that each migration initiative contributes to the modification of the social context in which individuals make future migration decisions (Massey, 1990).

This theory belongs to the theories of intermediary factor analysis, balancing between the macro and micro levels, similar to network theory. This text discusses the conditions and circumstances that have contributed to the collective and self-sustaining nature of migration since its emergence. Previous migration experiences can disrupt households' macroeconomic conditions and significantly affect their macro-environmental situation, which in turn can impact the decisions of future applicants (Hagen-Zanker J., 2008). As networks expand, migration can become an integral part of local culture within migrant-sending communities. This allows new immigrants to overcome psychological barriers, primarily related to changes in the social environment, and to establish accessible channels for all members of the population.

The dualist theory of the labor market confirms the labor demand factor as an important determinant of inter-regional movements. The abundant supply of unskilled or low-skilled labor in areas of origin is one of the negative consequences of the use of new production methods. The use of advanced techniques, such as high-performance machinery, in traditional sectors like agriculture has negatively influenced the equilibrium level of job supply and demand in less developed regions. In the post-mechanization era, technology is used throughout various stages of production, leading to the replacement of unskilled workers by machines. Surplus labor is then channeled into the markets of developed countries.

To account for the sustained increase in the number of migrants worldwide, proponents of the cumulative causality approach simplify the theory's operating system as follows: the departure of educated individuals deprives sending societies of the human capital necessary for development, resulting in stagnation and an increased return on migration. In most cases, remittances contribute to income redistribution among local populations and can increase socio-economic disparities among households. To address this imbalance, populations in sending countries may increase the number of candidates for emigration (Hagen-Zanker, 2008). In the case of cumulative causality, the current volume of migration at time t conditions the flow of individuals in the future at time $t+1$. This means that the more intensive the migration, the more intensive it will be in the future.

However, the steady pace of migration to wealthy countries is forcing specialists and decision-makers to consider the negative repercussions of the impoverishment of human resources in the sending societies. Fortunately, some countries and regions have shown a more optimistic reality, proving that migration cannot continue indefinitely. After a long history of emigration, the number of migrants is now declining due to the saturation of networks and the failure of their mechanisms, as well as the scarcity of labor resulting from increased demand in sending markets. At this point, migration rates begin to decline in an inverted U-shape, with only children and the elderly comprising the largest portion of the local population.

In conclusion, Massey's work has confirmed the existence of reciprocal effects between migration and cumulative causality through socio-economic factors such as income distribution, land distribution, organization of agriculture, culture, regional distribution of human capital, and the social significance of work (Massey *et al.*, 1993). Finally, it is important to note that although other variables may influence the migration phenomenon, the scientific community has not systematically addressed them (Stark *et al.*, 1986; Taylor, 1992).

3. Institutional theory

During the post-World War II economic boom, commonly referred to as the Glorious Thirties, Western countries experienced a surge in economic growth and mass production. This led to a high demand for labor, which in turn prompted industrialized nations to establish mass immigration programs aimed at recruiting foreign workers from underdeveloped countries. Theories on the initiation of emigration have explored the various factors and circumstances that influence the start and continuation of these migratory movements. The decision to migrate can be made individually or orchestrated by government or affiliated bodies linked to the sending and/or receiving societies (Outougane, 2016). In the case of individual decisions, the

force of inertia is paramount. It is of particular importance since potential emigrants tend to choose the same destinations, regardless of changes in these countries.

Future migrants move for various reasons, including social advantages like having a network of relations between their home country and emigrant communities in the destination country, or economic advantages such as access to information about job opportunities in the host country. Additionally, different motivations can affect the choice of destination, such as geographical proximity, climate similarity, and cultural affinity (including language and customs). In brief, the choice to migrate is not always motivated by economic factors. Ideological, political, or sociological considerations may also be involved (Federici, 1989).

In general, institutional theory enriches the debate on migration and the mechanisms for maintaining human flows. The theory focuses on the political aspect and the impact of various institutions to explain the continuation of migration, even in the absence of traditional factors such as wages, demand for labor, culture, and geographical location. Federici argues that political factors, rather than economic ones, play a greater role in determining the destination of population transfers (Federici, 1989). Despite the abundance of demographic and economic data, political and ideological motivations remain significant in migration decisions.

Institutional theory, also known as the political science contribution, supports this view, with several studies highlighting the political factor as a major determinant of migration decisions. The energy and economic crisis of the early 1970s had a significant impact on international migration policy. Host countries responded to the crisis by implementing restrictive immigration measures to avoid political and economic problems and limit the entry of new arrivals. However, such prohibitive government action often leads to an increase in illegal entries or a deviation in the direction of migratory flows.

Moreover, the institutionalist approach suggests examining the degree to which the intensity and regularity of migratory exchanges influence the formation of a specific institution. Guilmoto reminds us that migration, like any other exchange, generates transaction costs that gradually lead to the formation of an institution regulating the flow of individuals. The institutionalization of migration enables us to understand the establishment of a standard system of tacit contracts between migrants and sedentary people in a given context (Guilmoto, 1998).

Due to the imbalance between the number of potential emigrants and the limited number of permits granted by capital-rich countries, there is a steadily increasing demand for visas. To fulfill this need, markets in the respective countries are promoting the establishment of private institutions and non-profit organizations. These institutions are based on legal contracts and national programs and are intended to provide technical and legal support to the governments

of Western countries. This support enables them to manage the flow of individuals and attract qualified members of the sending societies (Outougane, 2016). Since the early 1970s, the world has been witnessing a harmful result of international migration known as the « *Brain Drain* » (Bhagwati and Hamada, 1974).

In the past, international migratory flows were determined by factors such as structural factors linked to countries of origin or destination, the strategic behavior of migrants based on individual motivations, and the emergence of transnational structures, in the absence of government measures. However, today, the effects of globalization, particularly technical and technological advances, have made travel easier. This new situation requires destination countries to implement migration policies, either to manage the flow of arrivals or to shape and adjust the personal and professional qualities of future emigrants to meet the demands of their job markets.

Additionally, these policies act as a filter that allows states to practically influence the way micro and macro forces perceive and determine the motivations of migrants with specific characteristics. In addition, creating a theoretical model that can explain state behavior, which typically changes in response to national and international conditions, necessitates a thorough statistical analysis of international migration (Massey et al., 1993).

The migration policies of host countries are the result of a political process in which national interests interact within the bureaucratic, legislative, judicial, and public arenas. Massey notes that recent theoretical and empirical research has yielded important conclusions about the main determinants of immigration policies in host societies (Massey, 1999).

A country's economic conditions determine the circumstances in which immigration policies are drawn up. During periods of economic difficulty, destination countries tend to tighten their immigration policies. On the other hand, policies to lower barriers to entry for prospective immigrants are associated with periods of euphoria and economic take-off (Lowell et al., 1986; Shughart et al., 1986; Foreman-Peck, 1992; Goldin, 1994; Timmer & Williamson, 1998).

Additionally, immigration policy is highly sensitive to the volume of international migrant flows. In most cases, an explosion in the number of arrivals leads to the development of more repressive policies (Timmer & Williamson, 1998). In addition, policy implementation may be influenced by prevailing ideological currents, which can mobilize their supporters into significant electoral blocs to influence future decision-makers during host country elections (Meyers, 2004).

Political parties in destination countries often find themselves compelled to design and implement measures that respond to the country's economic situation, geopolitical balances, or even current or future ideological conflicts in exchange for voter support (Meyers, 2004). This is particularly evident in the case of policy-makers in capitalist countries during the Cold War period. They were accustomed to accepting large numbers of refugees from communist countries, even on generous terms, under the guise of defending the principles of liberalism. It is important to note that this was often done to maintain a balance of power rather than out of genuine concern for the refugees' well-being. However, even though immigration barriers were eased, the disappearance of the communist threat led to a shift towards more rigid policies. For instance, the United States of America (USA) implemented stricter migration practices during the period of 1986 – 1996. The United States of America utilized the federal constitution and legislation to restrict immigration and permanent residency for Latin American workers.

Meyers categorizes the immigration policies of receiving countries into three main categories : policies affecting migrant workers, policies aimed at specific cases such as refugees, and policies targeting permanent residents, including former migrant workers and refugees. It is important to note this distinction. Labor migration policies are typically formulated based on the bureaucratic regulations of economic interest groups representing employers and native workers (Outougane, 2016).

Finally, like other national laws, immigration policies can only be successful and implemented through the interaction and support of public officials in the countries concerned. This gives rise to a client policy of policy formulation (Calavita, 1992 ; Freeman, 1995 ; Joppke, 1998).

Asylum policy, on the other hand, is developed away from the scrutiny of the general public. This balance is often negotiated with social groups that have political or humanitarian interests (Meyers 2004). Permanent immigration policies prioritize the interests of politicians, legislators, and citizens over those of bureaucrats and private individuals in public administrations in host countries. Although states can intervene to limit the flow of immigrants through various institutions, researchers continue to investigate the ability of states to achieve pre-set objectives.

Several conclusions have been drawn from various research studies regarding the difficulties encountered by host countries in the process of formulating regulations and implementing migration policies. However, restrictive measures can sometimes have unintended consequences. In these cases, policies meant to reduce migratory flows can actually accelerate the movement of would-be immigrants to target countries.

Joppke argues that there is a significant discrepancy between policy intentions and actual outcomes, particularly in the high numbers of migrants, including those deemed « undesirable », who have migrated to developed countries in recent decades (Joppke, 1998). Despite the fact that their political systems are based on democratic and liberal values, most countries have officially adopted restrictive immigration policies. This dichotomy may limit the effectiveness of any type of restriction (Cornelius et *al.*, 1994).

Factors that contribute to this include the global economy, which generates powerful economic and social forces beyond the reach of national governments, resulting in large-scale international population movements (Sassen, 1996). Secondly, the internal constitutional order of liberal democracies is often reinforced by the emergence of a universal human rights regime. The synergy between these two variables strengthens the negotiating position of migrants and protects their rights vis-à-vis political actors in destination countries (Cornelius et *al.*, 1994; Freeman, 1992 and Jacobson, 1997). Finally, the existence of an independent judiciary allows immigrants to seek legal recourse against political decisions made by the legislature and executed by the executive, even if they are tyrannical (Joppke, 1998).

To enhance the effectiveness of restrictive migration policies in destination countries, Massey identified five essential elements: *a)* the nature of political power and its degree of autonomy from the state's administrative bureaucracy ; *b)* the relative number of people applying to emigrate ; *c)* the ability of the constitution to guarantee the political rights of citizens and non-citizens alike ; *d)* the level of independence of the judicial system, and *e)* the existence of a strong immigration tradition within the host community. The ability of each country to implement its migration policy is determined by the interaction between these factors. The table below provides a detailed illustration of several countries' cases.

Table N°1: Conceptual classification of factors affecting a country's ability to successfully implement restrictive immigration policies.

	Strength of Bureaucracy	Demand for Entry	Strength of Constitutional Protections	Independence of Judiciary	Tradition of Immigration	Continuum of State Capacity
Relationship to State Capacity:	Positive	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	
Kuwait	High	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	High
Singapore	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	
Britain	High	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Low	
Switzerland	High	Moderate	High	High	Low	
Germany	High	High	High	High	Low	
France	High	High	High	High	Moderate	
Argentina	Low	High	Moderate	Moderate	High	
Spain	Low		High	High	Low	
Canada	High	High	High	High	High	
United States	Moderate	High	High	High	High	Low

Source: Massey, 1999

An analysis of Massey's work shows that centralized authoritarian countries, particularly the oil-rich Gulf States, are characterized by a lack of independent judicial systems, weak constitutional regimes, and a tradition of limited individual and immigration freedoms. These countries are ranked at the extreme end of the scale in terms of migration policies. One concrete example is the case of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. These homogeneous Islamic societies are significant examples of authoritarian states ruled by hereditary monarchs. As a result, migration laws in these countries remain stricter than those in Europe or North America.

Officials in the Gulf States, which are considered « non-democratic », are in a strong position to enforce restrictive immigration policies (Halliday, 1984 ; Dib, 1988 and Abella, 1992).

In « *democratic countries* », particularly in Western Europe and East Asia, political elites may initially limit the number of immigrants, but they cannot completely stop the immigration process. However, new migrants' access to political and legal mechanisms allows them to prevent restrictive state decisions and neutralize actions that undermine the migration project.

In the middle of the ranking, however, are the intermediate countries of Southern Europe and South Asia, such as Spain, Italy, Greece, Thailand, and Malaysia. These countries have experienced a significant change in their migratory status, from sending to receiving countries. This change has been marked by a lack of immigration culture and the absence of a centralized bureaucracy, which is seen as the only mechanism capable of translating political decisions into real action. As a result, immigrants in transitional states can overcome various obstacles and benefit from the flexibility of migration policies regarding their conditions.

4. Migration Systems Theory

The above-mentioned theories demonstrate the complexity of international migration and cannot fully explain all its causes. To complete the analysis of international migration, migration systems theory was introduced in the 1970s as a way to integrate the findings of various approaches. However, it was not until 1992 that the first success was achieved, after the publication of the work of the IUSSP (International Union for the Scientific Study of Population) Commission on International Migration (Kritz *et al.*, 1992; Zlotnik, 2003).

Discussions on the migration phenomenon are now characterized by a broader openness and a focus on the synergies created between several theoretical visions from different disciplines, influenced by postmodernism. Existing models have been integrated into more general theoretical frameworks. For instance, the systems approach, which was one of the pioneers of this era (Buga, 2011), concluded with theories on the perpetuation of international migration. Therefore, it is considered the result of an interweaving of particular cases of certain other previous theories.

At the academic level, Mabogunje is considered the founding father of systems theory. In his book « *Systems Approach to a Theory of Rural-Urban Migration* », he defines a migration system as « *a set of spaces linked by flows and counterflows of people, goods, services, and information likely to facilitate any kind of exchange between different places* » (Mabogunje, 1970).

Based on the general systems theory, the author highlights the importance of information flows and the mechanisms for returning these flows between sending and receiving countries. This facilitates the exchange of useful information, further encouraging migration and enabling the systematic organization of migratory flows from disadvantaged rural villages to major metropolises.

To explain his model, Mabogunje focused his research on migration between rural and urban areas in African countries. However, the resonance of Mabogunje's model was extended to the dimensions of international migration by other researchers, particularly Portes and Böröcz and also Kritz et al.,. In summary, the authors suggest that dynamic countries or regions represent the core around which all migratory systems are formed (Portes & Böröcz, 1987). These regions are characterized by linking mechanisms that enable the easy movement of people, as well as the free flow of goods, capital (remittances), ideas, and information (Kritz et al.,1992).

Migration systems theory combines various models and theoretical approaches in the preceding pages. Kritz's work introduces the notion of Mabogunje and Zlotnik defines the migration system as « *a network of countries connected by migratory exchanges* ». The dynamics of this system are largely influenced by networks linking migration actors at different levels of aggregation (Zlotnik, 2003).

The phenomenon of migration unifies people, families, communities, and spaces between the country of origin and the host country, forming what Vertovec calls transnational communities (Vertovec, 1999). The two levels of analysis, *micro* and *macro*, combine in migration systems theory. These are new forms of societal organization that reinforce, maintain, and restructure migratory flows between countries and regions (De Haas, 2010).

Furthermore, according to Zlotnik, the systemic approach to migration involves five key elements (Zlotnik, 2003) :

- a) Migration creates a unified space that encompasses both the places of origin and departure ;
- b) Migration is a type of relationship that connects regions of origin and destination. As such, it is a process that occurs in conjunction with other historical, cultural, political, or economic processes, often with roots in history ;
- c) Migration can evolve over time, with consequences for all the regions involved ;
- d) The State plays a considerable role in the migration process, either through the migration policies it implements or through its economic, strategic, or political relations with other states, which may indirectly influence migration ;

- e) Identifying the instruments that influence macroeconomic forces to become microeconomic factors in individual decision-making is crucial.

When comparing theories, it is important to note that migration systems theory argues for the evolutionary nature of the systems that shape the realization of people flows. This is in contrast to the network and cumulative causality approaches, which suggest that migration flows are well-structured and acquire stability over time and space.

However, both theories have focused on the vital role of personal relationships between migrants and non-migrants, as well as the ways in which social capital facilitates and transforms migratory processes. Similarly, the systems theory of migration posits that the direct social environment of migrants affects not only their decisions but also the structures of both societies and spaces as a whole in host countries.

Conclusion

Throughout human history, individuals have migrated to regions with better living conditions. Researchers have sought to explain this phenomenon by exploring its causes. Various theoretical models have been proposed by researchers from different cultural backgrounds to analyze the initiating causes of these movements. To convey the same ideas, researchers may use vastly different concepts, hypotheses, and frames of reference.

Academic work aims to enrich the analysis of phenomena and understand the causes of emigration. Regardless of the reasons for leaving home, migration triggers various impacts on cultural, political, social, and other aspects of migrant-sending countries.

Finally, the scientific community believes that an objective assessment of the impact of international migration on sending countries is currently not possible. To address this challenge, researchers have examined the effects of diaspora behavior on the economies of sending countries, especially those that are developing or least-developed. They analyze the impact of financial transfers and direct productive investments on the economic and social conditions of millions of recipient families.

Bibliography

- Abella M., (1992). *Contemporary Labour Migration from Asia: Policies and Perspectives of Sending Countries*. In, Kritz M., Lim, L., Zlotnik, H. (eds.), « International Systems: A Global Approach », Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 263 – 78.
- Bhagwati J., and Hamada K., (1974). *The brain drain, international integration of markets for professionals and unemployment: A theoretical analysis*. Journal of Development Economics. Vol., 1. Issue 1, pp. 19 – 42.
- Böcker A., (1994). *Chain Migration over Legally Closed Borders: Settled Migrants as Bridgeheads and Gatekeepers*. Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences 30, pp. 87 – 106.
- Bordieu P., and Wacquant, L., (1992). *Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., and Wacquant Loïc J. D., (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. University of Chicago Press. 332 pages.
- Boyd M., (1989). *Family and personal networks in international migration: Recent developments and new agendas*. International Migration Review, 23(3), p. 638 – 670.
- Buga N., (2011). *Les diasporas comme sources d'intégration dans l'économie mondiale*. This thesis was prepared at Centre de Recherche Economique sur les Politiques Publiques dans une Economie de Marché (C.R.E.P.P.E.M) and publicly defended on July 7th, 2011 at University of Grenoble - France.
- Calavita, K., (1992), *Inside the State: The Bracero Program, Immigration, and the I.N.S.*, Routledge. New York, 294 pages.
- Cornelius W., Martin, P. and Hollifield, J., (1994). *Introduction: The ambivalent quest for immigration control*. In, Cornelius, W., Martin, P., Hollifield, J. (eds.), « Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective », Stanford University Press, Stanford, pp. 3 – 41.
- De Haas H., (2003). *Migration and Development in Southern Morocco: The Disparate Socio - Economic Impacts of Out-Migration on the Todgha Oasis Valley*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Radboud University, Unpublished PhD Thesis. Nijmegen.
- De Haas H., (2010). *Migration and development : A theoretical perspective*. International Migration Review, 44(1), pp. 227 – 264.
- Dib G., (1988). *Laws governing migration in some Arab countries*. In, Appleyard, R. (ed.), « International Migration Today, Volume I: Trends and Prospects », Perth: University of Western Australia for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, pp. 168 – 179.

- Djajic S., (1986). *International Migration, Remittances and Welfare in a Dependent Economy*. Journal of Development Economics 21, pp. 229 – 234.
- Faist T., (1997). *The Crucial Meso-Level. International Migration, Immobility and Development*. In, T. Hammer, G. Brochmann, K. Tamas and T. Faist. Oxford, Berg Publishers.
- Faist T., (2000). *The Volumes and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*. Oxford University Press.
- Federici N., (1989). *Les causes des migrations internationales*. In, « L'incidence des migrations internationales sur les pays en développement » This Seminar was organized by the OECD Development Centre under the direction of Reginald Appleyard. OECD, Paris 1989, pp. 53 – 71.
- Foreman-Peck J., (1992.), *A political economy model of international migration, 1815-1914*. The Manchester School n°60, pp. 359 – 376.
- Freeman G. (1995). *Modes of immigration politics in liberal democratic states*. International Migration Review n°29, pp. 881 – 902.
- Freeman G., (1992). *Migration policy and politics in the receiving states*. International Migration Review n°26, pp. 1144 – 1167.
- Goldin C., (1994). *The political economy of immigration restriction in the U,S, 1890 to 1921*. In, Golden, C., Libecap, G. (eds.), « The Regulated Economy: A Historical Approach to Political Economy », University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 223 – 257.
- Goss J. and Lindquist B., (1995). *Conceptualizing International Labour Migration: A Structuration Perspective*. International Migration Review 29(2), pp. 317 – 351.
- Guilmoto C. Z., (1998). *Institutions and migration short-term versus long-term moves in rural West Africa*. Population Studies, 52 (1), pp. 85 – 103.
- Hagen-Zanker Jessica, (2008). *Why do people migrate ? A review of the theoretical literature*. Maastricht Graduate School of Governance. MPRA Paper n°28197, Janvier 2008.
- Halliday F., (1984). *Labour migration in the Arab world*. Middle East Research and Information Project Report n°123.
- Jacobson D., (1997). *Rights Across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Joppke C., (1998). *Why liberal states accept unwanted immigration*. World Politics n°50, pp. 266 – 293.

- Krissman F., (2005). *Why the « migrant network » fails to explain international migration*. International Migration Review. Vol. 39. Issue n°1. [Mars 2005], pp. 4 – 44.
- Kritz M. ; Lim LL., and Zlotnik H., (1992). *International Migration System: A Global Approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 354 pages.
- Lowell, L., Bean, F., and De la Garza, R. (1986). *The dilemmas of undocumented immigration: An analysis of the 1984 Simpson-Mazzoli vote*. Social Science Quarterly n°67, pp. 118 – 127.
- Mabogunje Akin L., (1970). *Systems Approach to a Theory of Rural – Urban Migration*. Geographical Analysis. Volume 2, Issue 1, pp. 1 – 92.
- Massey D. S. and Aysa, M., (2005). *Social Capital and International Migration from Latin America: A Comparative Analysis*. This paper was presented during the Congress of the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population. The event took place from July 18 to 23, 2005. Tours, France.
- Massey D. S. and Garcia España, F., (1987). *The Social Process of International Migration*. Science n°237, pp. 733 – 38.
- Massey D. S. and Arango J., (1998). *Worlds in Motion*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Massey D. S., (1990). *Social structure, household strategies, and the cumulative causation of migration*. Population Index n°56, pp. 3 – 26.
- Massey D. S., (1999). *International Migration at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century: The Role of the State*. Population and Development Review n°25, pp. 303 – 323.
- Massey D. S., (2012). *Towards an integrated model of international migration*. Eastern Journal of European Studies Vol. 3, Issue 2, Decembrer 2012.
- Massey D. S., Arango J., Hugo G., Kouaoucia A., Pellegrino A., and Taylo J.E., (1993). *Theories of International Migration : a review and appraisal*. Population & Development Review, [Vol. 19. n°3, Sep 1993], pp. 431 – 466.
- Meyers E., (2004). *International Immigration Policy: A Theoretical and Comparative Analysis*. Palgrave MacMillan, London.
- Munshi K., (2003). *Networks in the Modern Economy: Mexican Migrants in the U.S. Labor Market*. Quarterly Journal of Economics. Vol. 118. n°2, pp. 549 – 599.
- Myrdal G., (1957). *Rich Lands and Poor: The road to world prosperity*. Harper & Brothers Publishing, Volume 16 of World Perspectives edition.

- Outougane E., (2016). *L'émigration des profils qualifiés et son impact économique sur les pays de départ*. Journal of Economics and Finance. Volume 7, Issue 6 Ver. II (Nov. - Dec. 2016), pp. 48-61.
- Piché V., (2013). *Les théories migratoires contemporaines au prisme des textes fondateurs*. Population, 2013/1 Vol., 68, pp. 153 – 178.
- Portes A. and Böröcz J., (1987). *Contemporary immigration : Theoretical perspectives on its determinants and modes of incorporation*. International Migration Review n°23, pp. 606 – 630.
- Portes A. and Landolt P., (1996). *Unsolved Mysteries: The Tocqueville Files II*. The American Prospect n°7.
- Sassen S., (1996). *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press. ISBN 0-231-10608-4.
- Shughart W.; Tollison, R. and Kimenyi M., (1986). *The political economy of immigration restrictions*. Yale Journal on Regulation n°51, pp. 79 – 97.
- Skeldon R., (2000). *Trafficking: A perspective from Asia*. International Migration 38(3), pp. 7 – 30.
- Stark O., and Bloom D. E., (1985). *The new economics of labor migration*. The American Economic Review. [Vol. 75, n° 2], pp. 173 – 178.
- Stark O.; Taylor E. J. and Yitzhaki S., (1986). *Remittances and inequality*. The Economic Journal n°96, pp. 722 – 740.
- Taylor E. J., (1992). *Remittances and inequality reconsidered: Direct, indirect, and inter – temporal effects*. Journal of Policy Modeling n°14, pp. 187 – 208.
- Taylor E. J., (1999). *The new economics of labor migration and the role of remittances in the migration process*. International Migration 37 (1): pp. 63 – 88.
- Timmer A. and Williamson J., (1998). *Immigration policy prior to the 1930s: labor markets, policy interactions, and globalization backlash*. Population and Development Review n°24, pp. 739 – 772.
- Vertovec S., (1999). *Conceiving and researching transnationalism*. Ethnic and Racial Studies 22(2), pp. 447 – 462.
- Zlotnik H., (2003). *Théories sur les migrations internationales*. In, Graziella Caselli, Jacques Vallin and Guillaume Wunsch (Éds). « Les Déterminants de la migration », Paris, Institut National d'Études Démographiques, pp. 55- 78.