



Analysis of International Migration and Migration Theories: A Theoretical Perspective

Dr. Suman Kujur

Department of Political Science, B.S College Lohardaga, Ranchi University, Ranchi

Abstract: *The academic examination of international migration has attracted considerable scholarly attention in recent years. Reflecting this trend, the body of literature addressing migration continues to expand steadily. However, compared to other domains of global exchange, migration theory remains relatively underdeveloped. The intricate nature and extensive scope of international migration may account for this theoretical gap. This article focuses primarily on the theoretical dimensions of international migration. Accordingly, the introduction provides a broad overview of global migration patterns. Subsequent sections discuss various categories of international migration and examine major theoretical frameworks. Particular emphasis is placed on classification systems for migration and theoretical perspectives on cross-border population movements. The limitations inherent in existing migration theories are also critically examined.*

Keywords:- *Types of Migration, Migration Theories, International Migration, Classification of Migration Theories*

Introduction

International migration possesses an extensive historical background marked by several transformative periods. The dissolution of medieval societies, coupled with subsequent developments including the Renaissance, commercial expansion, colonial enterprises, agricultural transformation, industrial revolution, emergence of market-based economies, modern educational systems, and technological progress, have all contributed to increased cross-border movement. Contemporary globalization has substantially accelerated migration patterns, largely attributable to revolutionary advances in information technology. Migration flows increasingly target member states of economic blocs such as the European Union. The financial burden on migrants has diminished considerably due to accessible public transportation, affordable accommodation options, online travel reservations, and the availability of secure destinations with reasonably priced insurance coverage. Similarly, modern 低成本 communication infrastructure, international agreements protecting migrant rights, peaceful conditions in numerous global regions, and encouragement of skilled and professional labour mobility have emerged as significant drivers of international migration. Migration persists due to both natural phenomena and human-generated crises, including warfare, conflicts, and deteriorating political circumstances. The ratification of bilateral and multilateral accords has facilitated relatively unrestricted worker movement between nations in certain world regions (Rosen 2007). Partly owing to these factors, international migration has become a commonplace phenomenon globally. Research interest in international migration continues to grow among scholars (Chan 2012; De Haas 2010b; Faist & Fauser 2011; Skeldon 2010; Sutherland 2013). Furthermore, considerable contemporary debate surrounds the economic implications of global population movements (Barrell, FitzGerald & Riley 2010; Kerr & Kerr 2011). Researchers including Beine, Chowdhury, Rabbi, and Arrehag, Sjöberg, and Bredl (2011); Dustmann, Mestres, and Mamun & Nath (2010); Plaza, Navarrete, and Ratha (2011); and Quisumbing & McNiven (2010) have examined adverse economic consequences such as Dutch disease. Labour market impacts of international migration have also received scholarly attention (Brücker & Jahn 2011; Castles 2011; Docquier, Fleischmann & Dronkers 2010). From developing nation perspectives, the brain drain dimension of international migration has been emphasized (Agrawal, Kapur, McHale & Oettl 2011; Dustmann, Fadlon & Weiss 2011).

Nevertheless, no single theoretical framework comprehensively explains all facets of global migration. Theorizing about international migration presents considerable challenges given that multiple disciplines—including Economics, Sociology, Geography, Business, Management, Law, Political Science, Demography, and Psychology—influence understandings of cross-border population movements. According to Massey et al. (1993), no coherent theory of international migration exists; instead, the field is characterized by disparate and fragmented perspectives. However, these partial theories remain essential for guiding analysis of relationships among various factors associated with international migration.



Objectives of the Study

The primary objectives of this investigation involve examining international migration and surveying diverse migration theories. The paper addresses four principal aims:

1. To develop comprehensive understanding and overview of international migration phenomena
2. To discuss various typologies of international migration
3. To develop theoretical comprehension of international migration frameworks, including classification and analysis of existing theories
4. To identify major challenges and limitations characterizing migration theories

Methodology

This research study utilized secondary sources for data collection. Numerous source materials including articles, book chapters, textbooks, dictionaries, annual reports, and research journals were consulted. Descriptive and analytical methods were employed to examine research issues. Migration literature typically addresses two primary domains: internal and external migration. The former concentrates on intra-national movement, while the latter discusses cross-border migration. This paper emphasizes the inter-migration dimension of existing literature.

Overview of International Migration

Migration refers to the process through which individuals relocate from one place to another for residential or employment purposes. The United Nations notes that the complexity and repercussions of international migration are experienced globally. When examined from national development perspectives, international migration yields both beneficial and detrimental consequences. Migration is widely regarded as a significant development factor, as it enables receiving nations to acquire needed knowledge, skills, and labour services from both skilled and unskilled workers, thereby facilitating their development. However, receiving countries may also suffer from unwanted refugee inflows. Conversely, sending nations may experience brain drain through substantial skilled worker emigration, despite receiving remittance flows.

Migration may be triggered by natural disasters, family reunification aspirations, political instability, and economic difficulties. Current global circumstances clearly demonstrate that internal and external conflicts compel people to flee sovereign states. Notable examples include emigration from Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and Syria resulting from civil warfare. Economic migration, meanwhile, represents an outcome of individuals leaving their countries due to poverty and inadequate employment opportunities. This pattern commonly characterizes international migration, particularly from developing to industrialized nations. Individuals from developing countries frequently immigrate to industrialized nations seeking improved quality of life. Accelerated information exchange and enhanced travel accessibility have further facilitated worldwide migration. Consequently, migration has emerged as a significant demographic force globally in recent decades, particularly accentuated by globalization processes.

Types of International Migration

Various categories of international migration emerge based on factors influencing population movement. This section briefly explains migration types identified by different authors in the literature. Jennissen's study (2004) identifies four primary migration categories: labour migration, return migration, chain migration, and asylum migration. Labour migration refers to cross-border movement for employment purposes, involving high-skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled migrants. Return migrants are individuals who, after working internationally, intend to return to their country of citizenship and remain there for at least one year. Chain migrants are persons migrating for family formation or reunification between nations. Asylum migrants seek refugee status consideration in another country.

Bell, Alves, de Oliveira, and Zuin (2010) distinguish three basic international migration categories: forced migration, employment migration, and retirement migration. Labour migration encompasses high-skilled, unskilled, low-wage, and temporary workers. Forced migration includes both displaced persons leaving homes due to natural disasters and development projects, as well as refugees and asylum seekers crossing borders due to conflict and political instability (Bell et al., 2010; Castles, 2003). International retirement migration occurs when retired individuals purchase overseas residential property (Bell et al., 2010).



Forced and voluntary migration represents another frequently employed classification (Hugo, 2008; Koppenberg, 2012). Forced migrants seek asylum, refugee status, or become internally displaced persons, while voluntary migrants move for reasons such as labour sale. The former group has no choice but to migrate due to homeland difficulties, whereas the latter migrates intentionally seeking personal advantage. Numerous additional terms describe various migration types. "Economic migration" constitutes perhaps the most significant concept, characterized as the decision to move between countries to enhance living standards through better-paid employment and improved facility access. This concept closely resembles traditional labor migration, prioritizing economic benefits. "Political migrants" describes individuals migrating due to civil conflicts or political discord in their homelands. "Environmental migration" currently gains prominence in migration research (Laczko & Aghazarm, 2009), referring to those leaving their countries due to environmental conditions including desertification, rising waters, and droughts.

Given the foregoing, different types of international migration continue evolving. Researchers increasingly identify new migration categories based on distinctive push and pull factors. Migration thus appears as a continuously evolving phenomenon, paralleling ongoing transformations in socioeconomic and geopolitical conditions.

Theories of International Migration

Numerous international migration theories appear in research literature. Scholars frequently categorize migration theories according to historical development, migration patterns, disciplinary applicability, and contemporary relevance. This section examines these classifications and identifies specific theories applicable to understanding international migration.

Classification of Migration Theories

As noted previously, multiple perspectives inform migration theory categorization. Research literature contains several attempts to classify theories under different rubrics, briefly examined in this section.

i. Level-Based Analysis of Migration Theories

- a) **Micro-level:** Push and Pull factors, neoclassical micro migration theory, Behavioural Models, Theory of Social Systems
- b) **Meso-level:** Social Capital Theory, Institutional Theory, Network Theory, Cumulative Causation Theory, New Economics of Labour Migration
- c) **Macro-level:** Dual Labor Market Theory, Neoclassical Macro Migration Theory, World System Theory, Mobility Transitional

Hammar, Brochmann, Tamas, and Faist (1997) utilized migration levels for theoretical categorization. According to Hammar et al. (1997) and Faist and Faist (2000), migration theories divide into three primary types: micro-level, macro-level, and meso-level frameworks. Micro-level theories consider individual desires and expectations to understand migration decisions. Macro-level theories examine migration decisions holistically within national economic system contexts. Meso-level factors—including family ties, social networks, peer groups, and isolated minority populations—represent intermediate levels where migration decisions occur between the two previous theoretical levels.

ii. Discipline-Based Analysis of Migration Theories

Scholars have conducted research across various disciplines including economics, sociology, geography, and demography to explain migration causes and effects (Prakash, 2009). Consequently, migration theories emphasizing economic, sociological, cultural, and geographic aspects have been developed. The following section organizes and references migration theories found in literature.

a) **Sociological:** Intervening opportunities (Stouffer, 1940), Push-Pull factors (Lee, 1966), Migrant Network (Taylor, 1986), Transnational Social Spaces (Pries, 1999)

b) Economic:

- **Macro:** Classical (Lewis, 1940), Neo-classical (Harris and Todaro, 1970), Keynesian (Hart, 1975), Dual Labour Market Theory (Piore, 1979)
- **Micro:** Neo-classical (Sjaastad, 1962; Todaro 1970), Value-expectancy (Dejong and Fawcett, 1981), New Economics of Migration (Stark and Bloom, 1984)

c) **Geographical:** Gravity Theory (Stewart, 1941), Entropy (Wilson, 1967), Catastrophe Theory and Bifurcations (Wilson, 1981), Mobility Transition (Zelinsky, 1971)



d) Unifying: Migration System Theory (Kritz et al., 1992), Multidisciplinary Approach plus Mobility Transition (Massey, 2002)

iii. Initiation and Perpetuation Theories of Migration

a) Initiation of Migration: Neo-classical Macro-Migration Theory, Neo-classical Micro-Migration Theory, Migration as System, World System Theory, Dual Labour Market Theory, Lee's Push/Pull factors, Behavioural Models, Theory of Social Systems, New Economics of Labour Migration

b) Perpetuation of Migration: Migration as System, World System Theory, Social Capital Theory, Institutional Theory, Network Theory, Cumulative Causation Theory

Drawing on theories examined by Massey et al. (1993), Hagen-Zanker (2008) divided migration theories into two subdivisions: "initiation of migration" and "perpetuation of migration." The first type focuses on migration causes, while the second addresses migration continuity or universality. Kurekova (2011) adopts an equivalent approach, dividing migration theories into "determinants of migration" and "perpetuation of migration" categories by examining earlier migration studies by eminent scholars including Massey et al. (1993) and Arango (2000). This classification essentially reflects analytical focus. Neo-classical Theory, Human Capital Theory, New Economics Theory, World System Theory, and Dual Labour Market Theory are organized under determinants of migration. "Network theory, migration system theory, and transnational migration" address perpetuation of migration.

iv. Explaining 21st Century Migration Theories

- a) Behaviorists and Equilibrium Models: Repulsion and attraction Theory, Neo-classical Theories, Migration Equilibrium Model, New Economics of Migration
- b) Historical Structural Approach
- c) Theory of Segmented Labour Market
- d) Migration systems: World System Theory, Network Theory, Institutional Theory, Cumulative Causation Theory

Huzdik (2014) specifically focuses on theories attempting to explain migration processes in the twenty-first century, classifying these frameworks into four groups: the behaviorist and equilibrium tradition; the historical structural approach; the theory of the segmented labour market; and Migration Systems. These are influenced by various factors including wage disparities, labour market imbalances, geographical variations in labour demand and supply, economic culture, historical trends, institution formation supporting migration, economic globalization, and individual considerations.

Based on analytical level, disciplinary orientation, and related factors (economic, sociological, cultural, geographical, and unifying dimensions), as well as initiation, perpetuation, and application considerations, authors have categorized the same theoretical sets differently. It bears emphasis that diverse models developed by contributing authors reflect varying research objectives, themes, interests, assumptions, and theoretical orientations. The outcome typically represents a collection of disparate theories, models, or frameworks developed substantially independently (De Haas, 2010b; Massey et al., 1993). Developing a single comprehensive, overarching migration theory requires advanced theoretical integration accommodating these diverse perspectives. Arango (2000) contends that no general theory based on robust conceptual framework and supported by empirical evidence has yet been developed. The following section discusses theories frequently employed in migration literature.

Analysis of Migration Theories

Migration theories prove valuable by providing theoretical frameworks for understanding human movement from broader perspectives encompassing economic, social, legal, political, cultural, racial, and other phenomena. International migration theory offers scientific understanding of the subject, illuminating systematic migration patterns and underlying interconnections. Accordingly, reviewing popular global migration theories that incorporate aforementioned perspectives proves useful.

Neo-classical Theory

Neo-classical Theory represents the most established and widely recognized international migration framework. According to Arango (2000), Lewis (1954), Todaro (1976), and van Naerssen, Spaan, and Zoomers (2008), this theory explains how labour mobility affects economic development. This framework and its extensions contend that geographical disparities between labour supply and demand determine international migration. Workers typically immigrate to high-earning countries where labour supply remains flexible but wages and marginal productivity are low (Massey et al., 1993). This pattern establishes remittance generation as a powerful incentive for labour-exporting countries to promote out-migration. Moreover, migration benefits labour-receiving



economies by facilitating output, and remittance-receiving nations would ideally achieve reduced income inequality and wage gaps (Prakash, 2009). The theory's underlying premise holds that eliminating wage differentials would end labour movements, minimizing migration. Harris and Todaro (1970) cite evidence supporting this claim, emphasizing that employment options accessible to migrants initially and anticipated income differences significantly influence migration decisions.

Another essential Neo-classical feature holds that other markets play no significant role in international population movements (Massey et al., 1993). This assumption rests on the idea that international labour flow occurs primarily through labor markets. Considering these theoretical elements, the Neo-classical approach may appear overly optimistic about migration's effects on labour-sending countries, given its high expectations for declining poverty, unemployment, and overpopulation levels. Constant and Massey (2002) have also promoted the Neo-classical perspective, holding that immigrants remain in host countries as long as they derive benefits from salaries, education, and prestige there. Migration frequently leads to lower unskilled labour wages in host nations, increased unskilled over skilled labour employment by producers, and capital-intensive production. However, this depends on immigration volume and minimum wage regulations. Empirical evidence suggests minimal indication that migration causes noticeable local employment decline or significant earnings reduction. Friedberg and Hunt (1995) argue that migrant human capital determines migrant increase outcomes.

Neo-classical Theory further argues that labour market regulations and controls could limit international migration for both sending and receiving countries (Massey, Durand, & Malone, 2005). This assumption appears accurate given current circumstances, as various restrictions effectively regulate labour export. One notable example involves the Sri Lankan government prohibition on mothers with children under five accepting overseas housekeeping employment. Initial migrations from most developing countries are not always voluntarily undertaken; several factors including poverty, conflict, and restrictive governmental policies prove significant (UNESCAP, 2007). Thus, Neo-classical approach assumptions may be challenged, particularly in developing nation contexts. Non-migrants may occasionally remain at home for socio-cultural reasons such as gender norms, kinship systems, and hierarchical family power dynamics, despite unfavorable household conditions and superior external opportunities. Males may be compelled to stay for perceived household security functions, while females may remain because gender standards discourage family departure. Additionally, parents may decide against moving abroad considering children's education, safety, mental health, and similar factors.

The New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM)

Recent research on the New Economics of Labour Migration aims to challenge Neo-classical Theory premises and conclusions. NELM concerns individual movement from micro level to meso units such as families, households, or other culturally distinct entities. A key finding of this new approach holds that migration decisions are not merely individual choices but rather collective decisions made by households or families to manage risk during market failures beyond labour market difficulties (Stark, 1984, 1991; Stark & Levhari, 1982; Massey et al., 1993; Taylor, 1999). The theory recommends studying individual behavior within group contexts rather than isolation (Stark, 1991). Considering groups, households can diversify financial security risks through alternative labour resource utilization. According to Massey et al. (1993), family members may be allocated economic activities in both origin and host countries, thereby reducing employment insecurity and income uncertainty risks. Through this arrangement, local income decline could be offset by migrant remittances, and vice versa. Supporting this theory, Cassarino (2004) argues that migrants reasonably return to their place of origin upon meeting savings, insurance, household necessity, and capital acquisition requirements for investments and skills.

The New Economics of Labour Migration offers several advantages over Neo-classical Theory. NELM's collective household role outperforms the Neo-classical approach's wage difference concentration, challenging its assumptions. However, income disparities and household decision-making are not necessarily conflicting or mutually exclusive concepts. Families very likely consider income disparities significant, though certainly not the sole factor, when deciding where family members will work abroad. Thus, NELM may be said to challenge the Neo-classical approach only insofar as it considers individual structural circumstances rather than merely labour markets. Remittances form part of mutually beneficial agreements between migrants and their families according to the conceptual framework organized around family and household functions under NELM (Lucas & Stark, 1985). Unlike the individual migrant role in Neo-classical explanations, NELM's emphasis on labour as a household pooled resource has become an important factor.

Dual Labour Market Theory

Departing from micro-level models, Michael J. Piore presented the Dual Labour Market Theory in 1979. This theory avoids understanding migration as human choice outcomes, contending that modern industrialized nations' inherent labour demands



promote international migration (Massey et al., 1993). According to Michael (1979), international migration results from ongoing demand by industrialized and developed countries to support their development discourse. In other words, pull factors present in receiving nations, rather than push factors in sending countries, cause international migration. Michael considers low wages and high unemployment as push factors, while inevitable demands requiring foreign workers in receiving countries pull others. Additionally, this theory emphasizes four key characteristics of industrialized nations explaining worker attraction from other countries: structural inflation, motivational issues, economic dualism, and labour supply demography (Massey et al., 1993).

Although sharing many basic principles with Neo-classical Economics, Dual Labour Market Theory makes predictions diverging from macro-level models (Massey et al., 1993). One such implication holds that international labor mobility is demand-driven, contrasting with Neo-classical and NELM theories. According to this framework, economic structural needs—rather than income disparities or household or family preferences—drive migrant worker demand.

Network Theory

Various factors may cause labour migration, including individual income aspirations, household income risk diversification efforts, foreign migration with market penetration strategies, and employer recruitment programs for low-wage labour (Massey et al., 1993). Even if several explanations prove accurate, they cannot fully reflect actual migration trends. Therefore, attention should focus on additional elements such as geographic proximity to nation-states, social network accessibility, institutions, and cultural and historical aspects (De Haas, 2010b). A modern concept related to social capital theory involves migration networks. According to Arango (2000), migration networks constitute "a set of interpersonal ties that connects migrants with relatives, friends, or fellow countrymen at home who convey information, provide financial backups, and facilitate employment opportunities and housing in various supportive ways." These networks increase expected positive migration rewards while reducing human movement costs and risks (Massey et al. 1993). Such networks have positively influenced subsequent migrations by affecting later migrants' decision-making opportunities. Furthermore, diaspora and other networks can influence migrant destination decisions (Vertovec, 2002; Dustmann & Glitz, 2005). According to Massey et al. (1993), network ties represent social capital forms opening numerous overseas employment opportunities.

Consequently, while network migration mechanisms have produced favorable importing country development benefits, receiving countries have experienced substantial legal, political, and financial barriers regarding immigration-related issues. Van Naerssen et al. (2008) describe transnational communities as "mechanisms that reproduce their socio-cultural practices abroad, forming extended national markets, influencing migrant business development in both origin and destination countries." To build social, political, and cultural connections alongside economic ties, these multinational or transnational organizations have generated diverse goods, capital, ideas, and skills (Prakash, 2009).

Migration System Theory

This theory's fundamental idea holds that immigration influences economic, social, cultural, and institutional environments of both exporting and receiving countries. Network Theory and Migration System Theory are strongly related according to De Haas (2010a). Furthermore, the System approach (Kritz, Lim, & Zlotnik, 1992) focuses on macro and micro linkages of regions related to migration processes. While macro-level elements concentrate on economics, domination, political systems, national immigration policies, and cultural and social systems, micro-level factors include family and friendship systems. Migration System Theory, unlike other models, emphasizes migration-development relationships (De Haas, 2010a). The theory thus proves relevant for creating theoretical frameworks viewing migration from broader development perspectives. Migration promotes social growth alongside economic development. Remittances to family members, for instance, may change labour-sending countries' social and economic environments. Therefore, migration may affect origin country socio-economic growth and promote further movement at both macro and micro levels.

Institutional Theory

As international migration commenced, various institutions and organizations emerged to exploit disparities between labour-receiving country employers and potential migrants in labour-sending countries. The gap between individuals seeking employment opportunities in industrialized nations and available immigrant visas in these countries remains significant (Massey et al., 1993). Consequently, numerous for-profit and non-profit organizations have been established addressing migrant and employer concerns. While profit-seeking organizations and private entrepreneurs facilitate border crossings, falsify travel and legal documents, arrange marriages between migrants and destination country legitimate residents or citizens, and provide high-interest credit facilities for fees, most not-for-profit organizations focus on migrant humanitarian aspects (Massey et al., 1993). Non-profit organizations typically support affected migrants through counseling, social services, legal guidance, immigration



regulation awareness, and similar assistance, as profit-seeking organizations frequently engage in unlawful activities. Institutional Theory proves particularly important in contemporary contexts for developing effective and beneficial policy frameworks benefiting both labour-sending and labour-receiving countries.

Cumulative Causation Theory

Gunnar Myrdal created the Cumulative Causation Theory in 1956, subsequently developed by Douglas Massey and associates (Massey, 1990; Massey, Goldring, & Durand, 1994). This theory explains why migration flows initiate and continue expanding (Fussell & Massey, 2004). Briefly, it explains how migrant numbers increase over time, as original immigrants contribute social capital to family members, friends, and others throughout their origin country, eventually motivating them to quickly secure employment with minimal destination country risk (Jennissen, 2004). These individuals are influenced and stimulated by circumstances to expand migration. Cumulative Causation Theory may be subsumed under either Network Theory or System Theory.

Major Limitations of Migration Theories

Literature contains several Neo-classical Theory criticisms. According to Van Naerssen et al. (2008), the theory's principles face challenges in developing nation contexts because social and cultural issues directly affecting migration receive insufficient consideration. Kurekova (2011) analyzes this theory's problems, claiming it ignores market inefficiencies, minimizes migration-causing factors, and standardizes migrants and migrant societies. He further notes that Neo-classical Theory generally minimizes politics and policy significance for migration processes and for sending and receiving country impacts. According to Massey, Arango, Hugo, Kouaouci, and Pellegrino (1999), new theoretical perspectives emerged from general dissatisfaction with the Neo-classical approach. Furthermore, immigrants are assumed adequately informed about employment prospects and income details. However, migrants actually possess only partial information about overseas work chances, as middlemen control the latter (Van Naerssen et al., 2008). The international migration sector experiences extensive influence from agents, recruiting agencies, rural agents, smuggling networks, and unstructured institutions due to absent appropriate regulatory frameworks. Thus, Neo-Classical Theory may be said to focus solely on economic issues, omitting migration's social, cultural, and political aspects. According to Prakash (2009), the theory remains primarily economic, neglecting other significant factors potentially affecting population movement. Neo-classical theory has also been refined considering nineteenth and twentieth century European events. Skeldon (2014) consequently criticizes Neo-classical Theory as relatively historical and Eurocentric.

According to Arango (2000), the New Economics of Labour Migration's main problem involves absence of other significant international migration categories, such as undocumented immigrants, refugees, asylum seekers, and families, raising questions about the model's underlying principles. Additionally, NELM remains mostly future-focused, neglecting domestic issues like gender impacts (Faist & Faist, 2000). Similarly, Kurekova (2011) highlights certain NELM shortcomings, including sending country preference bias and limited practical applicability due to challenges distinguishing problems related to market inefficiencies.

Discussing Dual Labour Market Theory limitations, Prakash (2009) notes the theory inadequately explains cross-border migration causes. It focuses mainly on importing countries' structural foreign labour needs, briefly mentioning difficult worker employment conditions. According to Arango (2000), the theory only records pull factors in labour-receiving nations, excluding push factors like low salaries and significant unemployment in labour-sending countries. This highlights how Dual Labour Market Theory ignores numerous migrants leaving home countries for personal reasons beyond employment seeking. According to Kurekova (2011), the approach promotes formal recruiting, excluding labour-exporting countries. She claims the theory ignores immigration rate variations among nations with comparable economic frameworks. This theory additionally represents industrialized nations as reliable, enthusiastic skilled labour recipients, whereas immigrant economic dominance becomes a significant destination country concern. Singapore provides an instructive example where unrestricted access provision eventually raised significant concerns about resident economic prospects and substantial demographic changes.

Beyond aforementioned critiques, Drbohlav (2011) highlights other broad migration theory problems summarized as follows. According to Drbohlav, certain migration theories represent mere ideas, frames, viewpoints, or attitudes, rendering them nonsensical. Drbohlav asserts that many migration theories concentrate on migrant countries, particularly labour migration. Political considerations or individual will receive limited emphasis in most perspectives. Furthermore, the migration knowledge corpus lacks female migration studies.

This indicates that all global migration theories contain certain problems, possibly reflecting migration concept complexity. Migration constitutes a complex issue touching multiple disciplines including economics, sociology, geography, culture, religion,



law, political science, demography, and psychology. Scholars developing these theories concentrated on migration within their respective study contexts. A comprehensive approach enabling in-depth understanding of this global phenomenon may presently be necessary.

Conclusion

International migration encompasses diverse academic fields including economics, sociology, geography, culture, law, political science, international relations, demography, and psychology. Consequently, identifying a single, distinctive global migration theory has become impossible. This paper has focused primarily on international migration's theoretical dimensions. Following global migration overview, sections examined various international migration forms and migration theories. Critical analysis has also attempted to identify strengths and weaknesses of certain general international migration explanations.

The paper indicates that as migration processes have grown increasingly complicated, regular, and global in character, migration has emerged as a popular research topic among diverse experts. Numerous scholars have attempted explaining migration regarding its origin, development, and application. According to this article, this has generated diverse migration theories explaining specific phenomenon aspects in depth while lacking comprehensive perspectives enabling broader issue understanding.

References

1. Agrawal, A., D. Kapur, J. McHale, & A. Oettl. (2011): Brain drain or brain bank? The impact of skilled emigration on poor-country innovation, *Journal of Urban Economics*, 69(1), 43-55.
2. Arango, J. (2000): Explaining migration: a critical view, *International Social Science Journal*, 52(165), 283-296.
3. Barrell, R., FitzGerald, J., & Riley, R. (2010): EU enlargement and migration: Assessing the macroeconomic impacts, *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 48(2), 373-395.
4. Bell, S., Alves, S., de Oliveira, E. S., & Zuin, A. (2010): Migration and Land Use Change in Europe: A Review, *Living Reviews in Landscape Research*, 4.
5. Bijak, J. (2006): Forecasting international migration: Selected theories, models, and methods, retrieved from <http://www.ppge.ufrgs.br/GIACOMO/arquivos/eco02268/bijak-2006.pdf>.
6. Bredl, S. (2011): Migration, remittances, and educational outcomes: The case of Haiti, *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31(2), 162-168.
7. Brücker, H., & Jahn, E. J. (2011): Migration and Wage-setting: Reassessing the Labour Market Effects of Migration, *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 113(2), 286-317.
8. Cassarino, J.-P. (2004): Theorising return migration: The conceptual approach to return migrants revisited, *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 6(2), 253-279.
9. Castles, S. (2003): Towards sociology of forced migration and social transformation, *Sociology*, 37(1), 13-34.
10. Castles, S. (2011): Migration, crisis, and the global labour market, *Globalizations*, 8(3), 311-324.
11. Chan, K. W. (2012): Migration and development in China: Trends, geography and current issues, *Migration and Development*, 1(2), 187-205.
12. Constant, A., & Massey, D. S. (2002): Return migration by German guest workers: Neoclassical versus new economic theories, *International Migration*, 40(4), 5-38.
13. De Haas, H. (2010a): The internal dynamics of migration processes: a theoretical inquiry, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(10), 1587-1617.
14. De Haas, H. (2010b): Migration and development: a theoretical perspective, *International Migration Review*, 44(1), 227-264.
15. Docquier, F., Ozden, Ç. & Peri, G. (2014): The labour market effects of immigration and emigration in OECD countries, *The Economic Journal*, 124(579), 1106-1145.
16. Drbohlav, D. (2011): Migration Theories, Realities and Myths, *Migration Studies*, 36(10), 1565-1586.



17. Dustmann, C., & Mestres, J. (2010): Remittances and temporary migration, *Journal of Development Economics*, 92(1), 62-70.
18. Dustmann, C., Fadlon, I., & Weiss, Y. (2011): Return migration, human capital accumulation and the brain drain, *Journal of Development Economics*, 95(1), 58-67.
19. Edsel Jr, B. (2010): Do international remittances cause Dutch disease? Retrieved from Munich Personal RePEc Archive: https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/23022/1/MPRA_paper_23022.pdf.
20. Faist, T., & Faist, T. (2000): *The volume and dynamics of international migration and transnational social spaces*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
21. Faist, T., & Fauser, M. (2011): *The Migration--Development Nexus: A Transnational Perspective*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
22. Fawcett, J. T., & Arnold, F. (1987): Explaining Diversity: Asian and Pacific Immigration Systems, *Center for Migration Studies Special Issues*, 5(3), 453-473.