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Executive Summary

More people than ever before live in a country other than their own; more people are on the move more than ever before; and, more people than ever before have families, social and cultural relations, economic and political activities and engagements in more than one country.

It has been increasingly recognised by scholars and policy-makers that people may be physically mobile and anchored to particular (and often in more than one) places at the same time. The simultaneity of mobility and fixity, or the transition from fixity/ immobility to mobility and vice-versa is influenced by migrants’ integration. Destination and origin countries are pressed to better understand the interconnections between integration and transnational mobility as these may have implications for migration, integration, diaspora engagement and return policies and may lead to a variety of transfers between and within the migration corridors. More specifically, it is necessary to better understand:

- The drivers and determinants of migrants’ transnational engagement and mobility;
- The dimensions of integration that matter the most for migrants to engage in transnational mobility;
- The conditions in the country of origin or of destination, or of the migration corridor, that are relevant in encouraging or hindering transnational mobility, as well as in influencing the kind of transnational mobility one engages in.

In the ITHACA project we have aimed to gain insight into the factors that affect the capacity and desire of a migrant to be transnationally active and mobile, and the ways in which integration and transnational mobility intersect. We have explored migrant’s individual characteristics; their situation in and attachment to both their country of origin and the wider socio-economic and political conditions in both these countries and the migration corridor that links these countries. Our empirical research in Italy has provided us with the following insights:

- Immigrants’ attachments to their country of origin and their country of destination is dynamic and fluctuates according to life-cycle phase and duration of their migration project;
- The nature and intensity of migrants’ transnational engagements also fluctuates according to their life-cycle and migration-trajectory. Transnational investments develop incrementally. They take place through cumulative transfers, and evolve along with the individual’s or household’s needs and prospective migration plans.
- Transnational mobility fluctuates throughout the life-cycle and the migration-cycle of the individual. Thus, in the first years after migration, travelling back to the country of origin tends to be rare due to
lack of adequate resources to pay the travel costs but more importantly due to the lack of regular status that would permit travel and re-entry. Across all groups interviewed in Italy, the overwhelming majority had had an irregular status during their first years in the country. They were only able to travel back to their country of origin once they had regularized through benefitting from one of the various amnesty schemes that have been adopted since the 1990s. Once the status is regularized and long-term residence is secured then the frequency of travel back to origin tends to increase.

- Regularisation and acquisition of long-term status determines migrants’ transnational mobility (frequency, duration of stay) and the ease with which they can invest in transnational engagements either at origin or at destination.

- High levels of integration in the destination society facilitate transnational engagement in at least three ways:
  - they enable the accumulation of resources that can then be invested in the country of origin;
  - they provide a background of security that maximises the chances for success/accomplishment of the transnational investment as they enable the migrant to gradually prepare and develop this investment; and,
  - they permit return to the country of destination in case the transnational investment fails.

- Transnational mobility may or may not be associated with transnational engagement. In other words, individuals who are highly mobile between two (or more) locations may be intensely economically engaged in either or both of these locations, or, they may have minimal economic engagement. Similarly, individuals who are largely immobile may on the contrary be intensely transnationally active within the migration corridor for instance via their engagement in NGOs, or via representatives (family members).

- Patterns of transnational mobility, transnational engagement and integration vary between migration corridors thereby underlining the extent to which conditions in the country of origin matter.

- Socio-economic and political conditions at destination matter in different ways to different groups. The economic crisis in Italy has led to a deterioration of the migrants’ actual situation and future prospects (income, job security) and has encouraged the pursuit of alternative or complementary investment of resources (financial, time, efforts) in the country of origin for certain population groups (Moroccans), but less for others (Indians or Filipinos).

- Transnational engagement is practiced individually and for the most part outside state bilateral agreements or international programmes. The Filipino community in Italy stands apart from this finding as it has formed a tightly knit network of own initiatives and associations from both ends of the migration corridor that encourage Filipino investment back in the Philippines, provide assistance
and trainings to Filipino migrants to support their investment and business development plans, and encourage regular philanthropic initiatives targeting local development projects in the Philippines.

- Family motives are the most powerful driver of transnational mobility. Plans to return, and particularly retirement plans, constitute the most dynamic catalysts for transnational economic engagement. The principle motives for transnational mobility:
  - To see and care for family - parents or children who have been left at origin;
  - To take care of property and for home-building – mainly for private use and only rarely for income generation;
  - To fulfil personal/ emotional needs – bonding with their home-town for themselves or to nurture a sense of attachment for their offspring;
  - To provide assistance to their home communities – disbursement of funds raised for emergency humanitarian projects or development projects.

- Engaging in transnational mobility in order to explore alternative or complementary work alternatives has been less frequent within our sample. It seems to occur in one of the two following situations:
  - Deterioration of the economic conditions in the country of destination (in consequence of the financial crisis) negatively affect the migrant’s actual situation and future prospects in Italy thereby ‘pushing’ the individual to seek complementary or longer-term alternatives back in the country of origin; or,
  - As preparation for the retirement return migration plan.

Integration is a socio-cultural process of becoming part of and identifying with the receiving society. Integration also consists of structural dimensions that denote the position of migrants in education, on the labour and housing markets and their legal and factual position with regard to residence, nationality and access to the labour market and social and political rights. Assessing the extent or degree of a migrant’s integration in the receiving society is challenging, as is comparison across time and across countries. The challenge is substantial because of the diverse normative Understandings of what integration actually entails, what it presupposes, and how or when it is ‘achieved’. The ways in which integration affects transnational engagement is thus interesting to consider: Is transnational engagement a strategy for migrants to cope with low levels of integration in the receiving societies? Or is transnational engagement actually facilitated when the migrant is highly integrated in the destination labour market and society?

Analysing the Italian dataset suggests that in order for a migrant to become transnationally engaged s/he must be sufficiently well integrated in socio-economic terms in the society of residence. By sufficiently well integrated we mean having a long-term and secure legal status (and potentially access to citizenship) and stable employment which allows for an accumulation of financial resources and human capital that
can serve as the platform from which to pursue transnational activities. It also means having a sufficiently wide and dependable social network consisting of contacts among the migrant and native populations in the destination country that offers the individual the confidence to launch into a transnational initiative and a ‘cushion’ to fall back on in the event that the transnational activity fails or is challenged.

Finally, it also means having meaningful attachments and identifications with both ends of the migration corridor; these may be expressed through nostalgia, appreciation of the advantages that each location offers, and active engagement at both locations that may range from collective fund-raising and development cooperation to individual business initiatives.

The Italian case study reinforces our understanding of the dynamic nature of migration and of the fact that transnational mobility and economic engagement are intricately connected with migrants’ integration and with a sense of attachment with both their country of origin and their country of destination. The motives and drivers of transnational mobility change and take on varied dimensions and levels of intensity in different stages of the nexus between the individual’s life-cycle and their migration trajectory.

Migrants’ integration in the society of settlement is affected by the country of origin through various formal or informal ways. When state and non-state institutions from the origin country offer support and opportunities for association and networking to their migrants, (for instance through developing banking and financial services that facilitate remittances and access to funding, offering trainings and seminars on business development plans, financial management and investment opportunities ‘back home’, or encouraging philanthropic initiatives), then transnational mobility and engagement is substantially facilitated – as the Filipino case in Italy suggests.

There exists much room for future research to explore the intersections between integration, mobility and transnational engagements. For instance, are there differences in the transnational mobility and engagement of the second generation within or outside their migration corridor in comparison to their migrant parents? In what ways does technology facilitate transnational engagement and investment regardless of actual physical mobility? And, to what extent may there be ‘spill-over’ effects between migrant communities in the destination countries through sharing experiences on transnational investments?
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1. Introduction and Scope of the Report

More people than ever before live in a country other than their own; more people are on the move more than ever before; and, more people than ever before have families, social and cultural relations, economic and political activities and engagements in more than one country.

The multi-dimensional and dynamic relations that exist between transnational engagements and integration have been increasingly recognised by scholars and policy-makers suggesting that a range of factors affect the capacity and desire of a migrant to be transnationally active and mobile. These factors may include the migrant’s individual characteristics (i.e. their human and social capital); their situation in and attachment to both their country of origin and destination (i.e. the extent of her/his integration at both ends of the migration corridor); and the wider socio-economic and political conditions in both these countries and the migration corridor that links these countries.

The nexus between migrant integration and transnational engagement has triggered fascinating, thought-provoking research and significant policy interest\(^1\). Migrants’ transnational engagement has become intensified and multi-dimensional, while transnational lifestyles have been emerging quite distinctively. In this context of increasingly frequent inter-connections and exchanges, it is pertinent for both destination and origin countries to better understand the nexus between the two phenomena as this may have implications for migration policies, for integration policies, for diaspora policies, as well as for return policies.

Beyond the normative elements inherent to the public policy discourses related to both integration and transnational engagement, we consider them as two social processes through which migrants negotiate their attachments and their sense of belongings to (at least) their country of origin and of destination. Their multidimensional nature means that disaggregating these two concepts in measurable activities and indicators in order to grasp the complexity of the domains inherent to each of them constitutes quite a challenge.

There exists still very limited insight into what is needed to empower people to be transnationally mobile or transnationally active. It is thus important to gain better insight into the sort of resources, skills or competences that may initiate or facilitate transnational engagement and to understand how these may

\(^1\) For a detailed literature review, see ITHACA’s conceptual papers: Gropas, Ruby, and Anna Triandafyllidou (2014) Integration, Transnational Mobility and Human, Social and Economic Capital - Concept Paper for the ITHACA Project 1/2014; and Gropas, Ruby, Bartolini, Laura and Anna Triandafyllidou (2014) Conceptualising the Integration-Transnationalism nexus - Concept Paper for the ITHACA Project 2/2014.
change throughout the life-cycle or migration-cycle of the individual or their household. It is equally important to understand which conditions, instruments or policy measures – be they from the country of origin or of destination - may in fact be relevant.

In the ITHACA project we have focused on exploring the nexus between integration and transnational activities (principally socio-economic activities), and in particular, we have explored the role and relevance of mobility in this nexus. We have approached this from a variety of perspectives. We have examined the available micro-level and statistical data, and secondary data from official institutions (national surveys or census data); we have interviewed stakeholders; and, we have conducted a survey among transnationally active migrants.

Given the diversity in scope and in intensity that characterises transnational mobility, we suggest that there is a need to revisit the various facets of the interconnections between integration and transnationalism and take into account new variables to explain:

- For what reasons and under what circumstances do migrants engage in transnational mobility?
- In what ways does their integration in the society of settlement influence their transnational engagement and mobility (mainly between place of origin and place of settlement)? Which dimensions of integration matter most for the migrant to engage in transnational mobility, and vice versa?
- What kind of capital is transferred by the migrant, in what directions, and for what purposes?
- To what extent is mobility relevant for migrants’ transnational engagement?
- In what ways are the particular characteristics of each migration corridor relevant for the link between integration and transnational mobility?
- Which conditions in the country of origin, country of destination, or the migration corridor are relevant in encouraging or hindering transnational mobility and integration?

We address these questions through our empirical research on Italy. During 2014-2015, we conducted fieldwork focusing specifically on Filipino, Indian, Moroccan and Ukrainian migrants in Italy. We have sought to draw some insights with regards to the conditions of their situation both in their countries of origin and of destination, the motivations and the sort of resources they have that may facilitate, enable, encourage or even determine their transnational (economic) activities.

In the next section we present a brief background on Italy’s migration history while focusing specifically on the aforementioned four migrant communities. Through a short overview of the way in which migration between the Philippines, Morocco, India and Ukraine and Italy has developed, we present some
statistical data with regards to their characteristics and their integration paying particular attention to data concerning legal status, employment and inclusion in the labour markets. In Section 3, we present our research methods and describe the methodology we applied in conducting our fieldwork, presenting the general characteristics of our sample of interviewees. In Section 4 we draw some insights about the phenomenon of transnational mobility based on a qualitative analysis of the collected material, exploring the links between transnational engagement and mobility, and the extent to which one matters for the other. In the final section, we put forward some concluding remarks and thoughts for further research.

2. Italy’s migration history and ITHACA’s four migration corridors

ITHACA’s populations of interest

Over the past three decades, Italy has become one of the most important destination countries for international migration in Europe. Italy was transformed into a host country against a wider backdrop of globalisation and transnationalism, with international migration and mobility becoming more intense and also more securitised.

At present, Italy’s foreign-born population stands at around 8% of the total resident population, with a total of more than 5 million individuals (ISTAT 2015). Although Italy has for long been criticised as lacking a coherent and proactive migration policy, there have been strong pull factors and labour-driven demand for immigrants. Two dimensions are particularly noteworthy. First, the shortcomings of the Italian welfare system in being able to cope with the effects of the populations’ massive ageing process led to a growing demand for carers and domestic workers. Second, the considerable size of the informal economy enabled irregular migrants to easily find work in agriculture, construction and the service sectors. Regularisations and amnesties have been Italy’s main instrument of migration policy regularising more than two million immigrants in the past three decades (1986, 1990, 1995, 1998 and 2002, 2007, 2009 and 2012) (Ambrosini 2014b).

|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| MOR     | 294945 | 319537 | 343228 | 365908 | 403592 | 431529 | 452424 | 408667 | 426791 | 454773 | 9.2 R 3
| UKR     | 93441 | 107118 | 120070 | 132718 | 153998 | 174129 | 200730 | 180121 | 191725 | 219050 | 4.5 5
| PHI     | 82625 | 89668 | 101337 | 105675 | 113686 | 123584 | 134154 | 129188 | 139835 | 162655 | 3.3 6
| IND     | 54288 | 61847 | 69504 | 77432 | 91855 | 105863 | 121036 | 118409 | 128903 | 142453 | 2.9 8
| Tot.    | 2402157 | 2670514 | 2938922 | 3432651 | 3891295 | 4235059 | 4570317 | 4052081 | 4387721 | 4922085 | 100

* Break in series, recalculation after 2011 Census. - Source: ISTAT.
The population groups studied in the ITHACA project are among the most represented nationalities in Italy and have been consistently growing in size, in fact doubling or tripling their populations over the last 10 years. Moroccans represent 13.5% of all non-EU residents in Italy, followed by Ukrainians, Filipinos and Indians.

Data on the type of residence permits issued to third country nationals suggests considerable differences with regard to their length of stay and participation in the labour market. Moroccans show a large share of long-term residence permits (65% of all permits issued to Moroccans and 16% of all long-term permits in 2014). At the same time, ISTAT data show that there is still a significant number of Moroccans with seasonal work permits (21%), meaning that along with a stable population with a long migration history there is also a non-negligible portion of Moroccans who come alone only for short-term, definite periods of time (either because they are actual circular, transnational migrants or because they use seasonal permits as the entry way towards a more stable regularization of their presence). As for the ‘newer’ migrant communities such as the Ukrainians, the Filipinos and the Indians, they show shares of long-term residence permits in line with their overall presence in Italy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Total foreign resident population by type of permit, ITHACA’s CoO and total.</th>
<th>1st Jan 2013</th>
<th>1st Jan 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Of which:</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a.v.</td>
<td>% col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>513374</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>224588</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>158308</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>150462</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3764236</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ISTAT.

Figure 1 and 2 show gender differences in the composition of migrant communities and in their prevalent motivations for their residence in Italy. The most unbalanced communities in terms of gender are the Ukrainian and the Filipino ones, where women constitute the striking majority (79 and 57% respectively) and work permits are issued more often to females than to males. Among the Morroccan and Indian populations men constitute the majority, while almost three quarters of women enter with a permit for family reasons (79% of Moroccan women, 73% of Indian women in 2013 respectively).
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**Figure 1:** Share of foreign resident population by gender, ITHACA’s CoO and total - 2014.

Source: ISTAT.

**Figure 2:** Type of permits issued in 2013, ITHACA’s CoO and total.

Source: ISTAT.

---

**On integration of third country nationals in Italy**

Italy’s Ministry of Interior is responsible for the country’s immigration policy and for the general framework of integration policies, but regions, provinces and municipalities shape programmes and projects and implementing policies on the ground.
The regular migration system within which migrants should enter Italy for economic purposes is that of quotas.\(^2\) However, Italy’s immigrant population has been largely constituted through irregular channels of entry and a series of general amnesties offering migrants a number of opportunities to shift from unauthorized to fully legal status. We mention this detail about the importance of Italy’s regularisation programmes because this was a dominant phase in the migration trajectory of almost all the migrants that we interviewed in the Italian study. In effect, almost all of our respondents had started off with an irregular status but they had all been able to regularise their status within few years. As soon as they had acquired legal work and residence status, they were then able to return home, in more or less regular frequency, and to engage in their transnational activities.

After at least three decades of a continuously growing presence, Italy’s immigrant population is neither ‘new’ nor ‘unexpected.’ However, comprehensive integration policies are still not on the official government agenda. Until the 2000s, integration policies concentrated mainly on the economic dimensions of integration. A shift towards a more cultural concept of integration first occurred in 2006, with the drafting of the Charter of the Values and Citizenship and Integration, and then in 2010, with the “Patto per l’integrazione” and the “Piano per l’integrazione nella sicurezza” (in effect since 2012) (Campomori and Caponio 2013). The Plan was proposed by the Minister of Interior Maroni (in accordance with the Ministry of Labour). Maroni, a politician of the Northern League party, emphasised the need to combine immigrant integration with the preservation of public security thereby emphasizing mainly immigrants’ duties and responsibilities, for example, in terms of public order rather than comprising fully-fledged integration policies. Migrant integration has been receiving increased attention in the public sphere and policy debates, and this was particularly the case during the short-lived government of Enrico Letta (2013-2014) that had also assigned a Minister for Integration (Cecile Kyenge).

The need to measure and monitor migrant integration has become increasingly relevant in recent years, not just for reasons of social cohesion and social justice but also for economic considerations. Integration has been studied from both qualitative and quantitative perspectives and there has also been a growing tendency towards the use of indicators in order to obtain a more complete understanding of the situation in a particular country, its development over time on a specific issue or policy area, or also to be able to draw some comparative conclusions across countries, regions or sectors. The EU’s Stockholm Programme called for the development of core indicators in a set of relevant policy areas in order to monitor the

\(^2\) Quotas are settled on a non-regular basis, they are distinguished according to type of employment or occupation and often a certain number of permits is reserved to citizens from specific countries (notably, Latin American citizens of Italian origin and citizens from countries with whom Italy has signed bilateral readmissions agreements). See http://www.integrazionemigranti.gov.it/en/latest-news/news/Pages/Flow-decree0130-2529.aspx (accessed 22/09/2015)
results of integration policies and increase the comparability of national experiences. It is therefore interesting and useful to include in this section an overview of studies focussing on measuring and monitoring migrant integration in Italy and to briefly highlight here some of their findings.

The general picture is probably best offered by MIPEX as it allows to see how the countries have evolved over time and also to permit a comparative overview across EU countries. Italy overall performs quite well at the international level with regards to the fundamental policies and institutions which affect the level of social, economic and political integration of migrants (see Figure 3). Nevertheless, between 2010 and 2014, Italy’s ranking is slightly decreased and it is now assessed as “Half-way favourable country” for the integration of migrants. Most importantly for the integration of second and third generations of migrant origin now and in the future, education constantly emerges as the major area of weakness in Italy.

Figure 3: Map of MIPEX total score in Europe, with disaggregated scores for Italy in 2014.

The ISMU Foundation also developed in 2012 an instrument for the measurement of integration of immigrants in Italy. This index is based on data collected from a structured questionnaire administered in 2008 to approximately 12,000 non-Italian residents across the country. The ISMU Integration Index is based on 37 variables, aggregated in 4 broad dimensions of integration - cultural, social, political and economic - and highlights the following variations: ³

³ See Caselli (2012) for a discussion on the choice of data, the definitions of single indicators, of weighting and aggregation formulas etc. As recognized by their authors, the ISMU Integration Index offers an interesting picture of migrants’ performance in various domains of public and private life, but as all indexes it should be treated as a measurement which may be very useful but which also has its limitations and scholars and policy makers should not draw far-reaching conclusions. See also (Cesareo and Blangiardo 2011).
The length of stay and the level of education are positively associated with more integration in all dimensions;

- Migrants from different countries perform differently in different dimensions: being well integrated in economic terms (employment rate, average salary, housing situation) does not necessarily mean good levels of cultural or social integration (knowledge and use of Italian, agreement with values and habits of the country, use of public health services etc.);

- Average integration levels vary according to different religious backgrounds, with the Catholic Christian migrants appearing as the most integrated - relevant for the Filipino and possibly also Ukrainian communities studied in ITHACA - and, on the opposite side, the Muslim migrants the least integrated in all dimensions.

**Restrictive citizenship legislation**

Italy’s Citizenship Law is grounded on the *jus sanguinis* principle (Law 91, 1992). Non-EU nationals must reside for at least 10 years before they can apply for citizenship and children born in Italy to foreign parents can only apply at the age of eighteen, if they can prove their uninterrupted legal residence in the country – a condition often difficult to formally prove. Although the trend in acquisitions through marriage or by means of residence is increasing, the total number of naturalised migrants (17%) is well below the EU-15 average 34% (Bauböck et al. 2013).

**Figure 4: Acquisitions of citizenship, ITHACA’s CoO and total (2003-2013).**

The political debate on changing Italy’s citizenship legislation to facilitate naturalisation of the second generation has been gaining dynamism in recent years and a new citizenship law is under discussion in the
Parliament at the time we are writing the report. Indeed, in our fieldwork, access to long-term residence status or even citizenship was frequently flagged out as an important factor that mattered for our interviewees as it determined the extent to which they or their offspring were able to travel between Italy and the country of origin, live between the two countries and have the possibility to move to one or the other (and back again) depending on the evolving socio-economic and political conditions on either end of the migration corridor.

Labour market integration and the gender dimension of migration

The majority of migrants have entered the country without a residence authorisation or they have overstayed a temporary visa and can therefore be categorised as ‘employed without a job’ (Cangiano 2012), or in other words, as being informally employed. This has a number of unavoidable implications. For one, it limits the ability to register and monitor the real labour market integration of the migrant population as a significant portion is in informal and unregistered conditions. It also significantly restricts the employment and professional development opportunities of migrants in the labour market in terms of access to employment, quality of employment, and the potential of upward professional mobility. This correlates with data collected through the Labour Force Survey (LFS) that confirms high levels of immigrant de-skilling in Italy. This under-utilisation of skills can be explained by the high share of the domestic workforce employed at occupational levels above their educational qualifications – resulting in an ‘up-skilling’ of the domestic labour force that is not experienced by the migrant workforce. The loss of skill potential is high among male, older cohorts, while the employment of migrant women at occupational levels below their educational skills is considerably more frequent amongst recent arrivals than for older female immigrant cohorts. This appears to be related to the significant expansion over the last decade of the female migrant workforce in the domestic and care sector (Cangiano 2012; Salis and Bartolini 2015).

Migrant employment is specifically concentrated in the Northern part of the country, while gender specialisations across sectors of employment are evident: men are mostly employed in industry, construction, trade and agriculture, while women are concentrated in services, both in the public and private sector, especially in the care and health sector (Del Boca and Venturini 2014).

Italy is one of the European countries where the private market of care and domestic services provided by migrant women has been established for the longest time, since the end of the 1970s, and where it has grown extensively. This need has largely been provoked by the shortcomings of the country’s welfare
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4 See http://www.ilpost.it/2015/09/29/nuova-legge-cittadinanza-ius-soli-ius-culturale/
state and the growing needs within society for care for the elderly. This has led to a very large development of the domestic work sector, a sector that is also of course notorious for its informal working conditions. Today, 88.6 per cent of the Italian care and domestic sector is composed of women and 81 per cent are third country nationals (Marchetti and Venturini 2014; Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali 2015). Two of the population groups we are studying in ITHACA, namely the Filipinos and the Ukrainians, have in fact a dominant position in this sector and a significant portion of our interviewees were employed in these sectors.

In the following sections we take a closer look into the characteristics of migration from the Philippines, India, Morocco and Ukraine to Italy.

**Filipino migration to Italy**

Migration flows to Italy began in the 1970s and it was mainly women working in domestic work and care. Their husbands and children were generally able to follow later on based on Italy’s family reunification schemes. According to IOM data (2010) there are an estimated 85,594 temporary migrants, 24,598 permanent residents and an estimated 13,000 undocumented Filipinos in Italy. Between 80 and 90% are domestic workers or caregivers (IOM 2010). The statistics provided by the Philippine Overseas Employment Administration records Italy among the top ten destinations for (land-based) overseas Filipino workers for rehires and the first European destination for Filipinos workers overall (between 20 and 40 thousands each year over the last 5 years) (POEA 2015).

One of the characteristics of the Filipino migrant population in Italy is that, although the majority has a higher education level, they are employed in the domestic work. Research on this population group has suggested high levels of pressure to take on multiple jobs in order to obtain higher earnings to be able to remit to their families in the Philippines (where children are often left with the grandparents during most of their school years) or to provide for their families in Italy (in fact, high numbers of Filipinos have applied for family reunification schemes and there are growing numbers of now long-settled Filipinos who work, study and raise their families in Italy) (IOM 2010; Basa, De Guzman, and Marchetti 2012).

Data from the Italian Central Bank has reported that Filipinos in Italy were the fourth largest remitters in 2014 with 324 million Euro remitted back home, which is a decreasing total in comparison with the peak of almost 1 billion Euro reached in 2009 (Banca d’Italia 2015). World Bank data ranks the Philippines as
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5 This section includes information provided by the ITHACA country expert for the Philippines, Dr Jean Encinas Franco who undertook research in the Philippines for returnee transnationally mobile migrants between 2014 and 2015.
the third top recipient of formal financial remittances for 2013 at 26 billion USD (Ratha et al. 2015). Remittances are facilitated by the rather well-developed banking sector that the Philippines have developed with Filipino banks and other financial entities involved in remittances and remittance related operations. In Italy, there are six Filipino banks that provide services to the Filipino community and indeed dominate the remittance market in the Italian-Filipino corridor along with Western Union as dedicated money transfer operator. In our fieldwork the interviewed Filipino migrants confirmed a regular and steady remittance behaviour and the use of the Filipino Banks and of Western Union for their remittances back home. Research conducted by Basa et al (2012) reported that on average, each Filipino sent home 5,300 euro in 2010. Though this is a notable amount it constitutes a decrease from previous years. So, while remittances to the Philippines have been growing this is more the result of an increase in Filipino migration and not an increase in wealth accrued and remitted by the Filipinos abroad. Basa et al (2012) have also reported on gender differences in remittance behaviours with women remitting regularly and higher amounts than males in addition to ‘random remittances’ in the form of gifts and cash for anniversaries and special occasions.

The Philippines have established a sophisticated migration system where government agencies, private sector and civil society organisations are actively involved in managing the outflow of Filipino migrants, in assisting them in their work and settlement abroad, and in engaging them in development initiatives ‘back home’. There are legal means through which Filipinos may enter Italy – mainly through the quota system or through family reunification. Nonetheless, our fieldwork in ITHACA has suggested that Filipinos migrating to Italy have overall done so on tourist visas or through irregular channels though they have quickly regularised shortly after arrival by taking advantage of the regular amnesty programmes. In fact, Filipino civil society and their organisation within strongly networked migrant NGOs with the solid support of the Filipino embassy and consulate in Rome, as well as the Honorary Consulate in Florence has been a significant source of support to facilitate access to information, networks and procedures in order to regularise the status of irregular/ undocumented Filipino migrants.

The Filipino system for migration includes the Migration Management and Reintegration Process which implements programmes and services aimed at empowering Filipinos abroad, both temporary and settled migrants and at providing to a variety of migrants’ needs. These range from information and orientation services in the reception countries, to information initiatives aimed at encouraging savings and investments, financial management and investment of remittances back home, as well as government coordinated programmes and initiatives aimed at tapping into migrant capital and resources for the development of specific areas and sectors back in the Philippines (see IOM 2010). Illustrative of this is the fact that The Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (BSP) won the Global Forum on Remittances and Development
(GFRD\textsuperscript{6}) Public Sector Award for 2015 held in Milan in June 2015 in recognition of its outstanding commitment, innovation and impact in promoting remittances for social and economic development through its Economic and Financial Learning Program (BSP-EFLP).

According to the Italian Ministry of Interior, the Filipinos comprise the fifth largest group that hold residence permits. After legal residence in Italy for at least five years, it is possible to apply for residence permits of indefinite period and in fact the sample we interviewed all had acquired indefinite residence permits and some had also naturalised.

\textbf{Indian migration to Italy}

Italy has the highest number of Indian emigrants in mainland Europe\textsuperscript{7}. The last two decades has seen an enormous increase in the number of Indian migrants in Italy. Employment and family re-unification are the prime drivers of this mobility though we can trace the beginnings of an Indian Diaspora in Italy from the nineteen sixties (Singh 2012). While official figures report 121,036 Indians living in Italy (2011 data), the actual figures that include a sizable number of undocumented Indians vary between at least 170,000 (Lum 2012) to about 250,000 (Italian High Commission: Personal Communication). According to data from the Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs, 99,127 Indians were residents in Italy in 2012. This constitutes 19.7\% of the total number of Indian residents in the EU (2011, Data provided by the Delegation of the EU to India). A majority of these migrants are engaged in farming, agriculture, dairy and animal husbandry as well as horticulture and are concentrated in Northern and Central-Northern Italy. In terms of their social profile, they usually come from rural areas (mainly Punjab) and rarely possess more than a secondary education. The number of professionals and high skilled experts in sectors such as Information Technology and Medicine are extremely low and the bulk of migrants employed in low and semi-skilled employment in the farming and agricultural sector are the standard (Lum 2012; Fargues and Lum 2014).\textsuperscript{8}

The framework for emigration management in India is provided by the Emigration Act of 1983 that replaced the Emigration Act of 1922, part of the colonial emigration management system (CDS 2009; Society for Labour and Development 2013). The Act serves as a regulatory instrument that intends to


\textsuperscript{7} This section includes information provided by the ITHACA country expert for India, Dr Geetika Bapna who undertook research in India for returnee transnationally mobile migrants between 2014 and 2015.

\textsuperscript{8} For a range of in-depth reports on India-EU migration consult: http://www.india-eu-migration.eu/publications/
Country Report - ITALY

protect and safeguard the interest of Indian workers going to work overseas. Within this framework, the decision to emigrate is that of the individual, and the government’s job in principle is only to regulate the flow of people in order to protect the best interests of the emigrants. It seeks to uphold the interests of the worker going overseas through a principle of ‘protection by exception’ making it obligatory for the ECR (Emigration Check Required) passport holders to receive ‘emigration clearance’ from the POE (Protector of Emigrants) offices before proceeding to emigrate to certain specified countries (CDS 2009). The rest of the emigrants with ECNR (Emigration Check Not Required) passports, who fall within that category by virtue of their higher educational attainment (Matriculate pass) are allowed free mobility without an emigration clearance. Thus emigrants with low educational accomplishments and who are hence more vulnerable undergo a compulsory document’s verification while those who possess an educational qualification of secondary school education are entitled to an unfettered mobility corridor (ibid: 2009). In recent years, the Indian government has attempted to evolve a more progressive migration policy given the burgeoning importance of peoples and labour mobility in the current economic environment as well as the ‘demographic dividend’ that India enjoys. The policy impetus has been to encourage international migration and remove barriers to the extent possible. In recognition of this ‘The Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs’ was set up in 2004 to look into all aspects of overseas Indians (non-resident Indians and people of Indian origin), through its three divisions: Diaspora Services, Financial Services and Emigration Services.

Other institutions that have been set up recently include the ‘Overseas Indian Facilitation Centre’ for economic engagement, ‘India Development Foundation’ of Overseas Indians to facilitate philanthropy, ‘Global Indian Network of Knowledge’ (Global-INK) for knowledge sharing, ‘Prime Minister’s Global Advisory Council’ of Overseas Indians as a high-level think tank and the India Centre for Migration (ICM), as a strategic ‘think-tank’ (SLD 2013). There have also been new legislative and institutional initiatives to take advantage of the opportunities in global labour markets (ibid: 2013). Among these, it is worth pointing to the Foreign Exchange Management Act (FEMA) in 2000, which facilitates the foreign currency flows, with respect to setting up business in India or by Indians abroad; the Overseas Indian Facilitation Centre (OIFC), launched in 2007 as a non-profit trust in partnership with the Confederation of Indian Industry (CII), envisaged to function as a ‘single stop shop' for potential overseas Indian investors in respect of any business related services; and the Overseas Citizenship of India (OCI) card scheme (2006) which comes close to dual citizenship offering OCI card holders multiple-entry, life-long visa for any length of stay in India, economic, financial and educational rights but no political rights.

Despite the slew of measures that appear both substantive and progressive, recent research suggests that only a small proportion of returnees set up business or invest in development projects in their country of
origin. More often than not returning migrants use their savings on a large scale for personal and household consumption, i.e., they may buy or construct houses, spend money on a higher standard of living and finance the education or lavish weddings of their children. The share of Indian migrants in foreign direct investments is significantly low while the non-investor friendly regulatory environment with highly bureaucratic procedures was underlined by the stakeholder interviews we conducted in India.

**Moroccan migration to Italy**

Morocco has a long history of emigration but still a rather limited emigration and diaspora policy. Morocco developed a very active policy of stimulating placement of Moroccan workers in the EU labour markets in particular although back in the 1960s there was an understanding of migrants as agents who would be able to foster national industrial development through their migration experience and eventually through their return. As migrants prolonged their stay and settled in the European countries of destination the bulk of the attention on the part of the Moroccan state focused on sustaining the strongest possible links with their migrants in order to sustain remittances and investment flows (Gabrielli 2015). In comparison to other European destinations such as France or Belgium, Italy constitutes a more ‘recent’ destination but it largely coincided with a time during which the Moroccan authorities were investing in their diaspora policies. Thus, there exists significant collaboration between Moroccan and Italian institutions (with the overall support of the EU Fund for Integration of Third Country Nationals) in the elaboration of pre-departure programmes, training programmes particularly aimed at seasonal workers in the tourist and agricultural sectors (Di Bartolomeo, Gabrielli, and Strozza 2015).

The main state actors involved are the Ministry of Employment and Vocational Training, the ANAPEC (the National Agency for Promoting Employment and Capabilities), the Fondation Hassan II for les MRE, the Mohammed V Foundation, the Ministry for Moroccans Living Abroad and for Migration Matters, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Interior. Along with the UNDP is has sought to mobilise the skills of its emigrant population for the benefit of Morocco’s economic development through initiatives such as the TOKTEN programme already from the 1990s.

As for the Moroccan emigrant population, it is estimated that 10% of Moroccan nationals live and work outside the country. From the 4.5 million Moroccans living abroad, 524,775 hold residence permits in Italy (2014). The Moroccan population in Italy is predominantly male and young, while ISTAT data has
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9 This section includes information provided by the ITHACA country expert for Morocco, Professor Mehdi Lalou who undertook research in Morocco for returnee transnationally mobile migrants between 2014 and 2015.
been recording an increase in new arrivals of women through family reunification schemes and particularly of minors, leading to the current gender balancing out of the Moroccan population. Two out of three regular Moroccans hold a permanent residence permit (Di Bartolomeo, Gabrielli, and Strozza 2015) and as this population with a long presence has been settling down it has become territorially concentrated in the north of Italy where employment opportunities are wider. Moroccan males are present across the Italian labour market, include a substantial portion of self-employed and have employment and activity rates comparable to that of natives.

Remittances as recorded by the Moroccans Living Abroad (MLA) represent nearly 8% of the country’s GDP. Although these remittances have been on a decreasing trend since the outbreak of the global financial crisis, they are extremely important for the country’s finances. The effects of enduring economic crisis in Italy have been rather notable in this respect, with a strong decrease of remittances from Italy to Morocco in the last years.

**Figure 5: Remittance inflows to Morocco from Italy and total, 2004-2013 (millions of dihram).**

![Remittance inflows to Morocco from Italy and total, 2004-2013 (millions of dihram).](source)

Indeed, the Moroccan population in Italy seems to have been particularly affected by the crisis and its consequences in terms of higher levels of unemployment, (Marchetti, Piazzalunga, and Venturini 2013) while their potential for mobility has been increasingly restricted both directly and indirectly due to the increased levels of insecurity resulting from the political and violent conflicts in north Africa and the wider Middle East. Security concerns have impacted on the ability of young Moroccans to move as easily as before the 9/11 attacks and the recent surge in securitisation following the Arab Spring and massive refugee waves from across the Middle East. Given that Moroccan migration in Italy was substantially
characterised by circularity and seasonal migration (Devitt 2011) this is having quite an impact on Moroccans’ transnational mobility, their integration in Italy, and their possibility to remit and invest back in Morocco.

**Ukrainian migration to Italy**

Since the 1990s there has been massive emigration from Ukraine to the EU with over 10% of the Ukrainian population (equivalent to one fifth of the country’s working age) working abroad\(^\text{10}\). Ukrainian migration has typically been circular, characterised by an overwhelming majority of women undertaking autonomous migration projects, and with strong family links resulting in regular returns of migrants back to Ukraine (Montefusco 2008). Remittances to Ukraine have also been steadily rising, reaching 4% of the country’s GDP in 2012 according to World Bank official data but these are much more significant in reality given the substantial amounts of remittances transferred via informal channels.

In spite its high numbers of nationals abroad, there is still a very limited engagement on the part of the state agencies to manage Ukraine’s labour emigration, engage in the protection of Ukrainian migrants’ employment and social protection rights abroad, or in return migration programmes. The 2011 Action plan on the Integration of Migrants and the Reintegration of Ukrainian Migrants is the core document that refers to the country’s core challenges of reintegrating return migrants and addressing the educational, political and administrative needs of its emigrants. A piece of legislation on ‘External Labour Migration’ which was drafted in 2012 has still not been discussed in Parliament (at the time of writing of this report). Overall, Ukraine has not yet developed an organised approach to reach out to its emigrant communities abroad in order to tap into their investment potential and channel these into the country’s economic development objectives. In fact, its diaspora policies have to date mainly concentrated on encouraging the preservation of ethnic identity, cultural legacies and nation-building (MPC 2013).

Ukrainian migration to Italy underwent several stages: it began with the migration of women who were included into global care chains, to mass migration waves in the early 2000s. This migration was driven by economic reasons, but social conditions in the country of origin also played an important role, in particular, personal crisis, family issues, alcoholism of a migrant’s husband, impossibility of professional self-fulfilment, and pressure from social environment with traditional values (Vianello 2009; Näre 2007).

\(^{10}\) This section includes information provided by the ITHACA country expert for Ukraine, Dr Svitlana Odynets who undertook research in Ukraine for returnee transnationally mobile migrants between 2014 and 2015.
The numbers of Ukrainians in Italy were over 220,000 in 2014, with a prevalence of women working in the care and domestic sectors (Ambrosetti, Cela, and Strielkowski 2013).

Research on the professional and migratory patterns of Ukrainian women who work in Italy suggest a rather elaborate trajectory. Ukrainian migrant women – who are generally in their forties and fifties – come to Italy with an education and a long working experience. In their majority they have undertaken international migration to survive the economic crisis of the 1990s, and while in the earlier years of their migration project they were engaged in circular trans-border mobility (mainly between Poland and Ukraine), they later shifted to longer-distance circular migrations (Montefusco 2008; Vianello 2013). Ukrainian migrants are overall over-represented in low-skilled jobs where they easily end up being overqualified (Reyneri and Fullin 2011) and who cannot easily upgrade their position due to the scarcity of labour mobility dynamics that characterize their jobs and the undeclared nature of the work (Marchetti and Venturini 2014; Di Bartolomeo, Gabrielli, and Strozza 2015).

It is worth noting that the 2007 labour agreement between Ukraine and Italy introduced the possibility of job sharing which encouraged circular migratory practices. Workers are allowed to share their job with another person, and to manage independently the organization of the work schedule. This has contributed to the development of the phenomenon of intermittent migration (Vianello 2013) which involves Ukrainian migrant women living and working in Italy as care-givers or domestic workers, and returning to Ukraine once or twice a year, for periods that range from two weeks in the summer to two or three months. Their attachment to their country of origin tends to be very strong given the presence of their offspring, but at the same time, their return to Italy for work purposes has become necessary as remittances have become an essential source of income for their children who remained at home (Vianello 2013). Data on Ukrainian migrants in Italy suggests high levels of integration in the labour market but less positive as regards housing. Ukrainians are found to be in a difficult position with respect to social and political integration due to two conditions: first because of working conditions at destination (caregivers who cohabit with their employers are often deprived of their autonomy and independence), and second because massive migration from Ukraine is a quite recent phenomenon.

3. Methodology: fieldwork and data

For the Italian study, we examined three different sets of data. First, we conducted a review of the literature and recent research on migrant integration in Italy. In addition to the general background understanding on the Italian migration history and state of affairs as regards the characteristics of its immigrant population, we concentrated on the material that was most relevant for the population groups
that we are studying in Ithaca. We reviewed reports and data that examine the challenges that migrants face during their migration experience in Italy – from arrival, to settlement and also to departure (or return to the country of origin). We also sought material that focuses on the transnational engagement of migrants in Italy. Second, we looked into the statistical datasets that have been collected at the national and EU levels (Population Datasets, LFSs, etc.) in order to obtain a quantitative understanding of migrant integration and dimensions of migrant’s transnational activities that are virtually the only measurable or at least for which comparable estimates exist at the international level, such as remittances. Third, we conducted a survey where we interviewed Filipino, Indian, Moroccan and Ukrainian migrants. These fell within two categories: those who are currently in Italy and are engaged in a range of transnational activities with their country of origin, or individuals who returned to their country of origin but who have maintained or wish to maintain some transnational engagement with Italy. For these latter return migrants, we concentrated particularly on Morocco and Ukraine and to a smaller extent on the Philippines.

Before further proceeding with the description of our methodology and our qualitative and quantitative analysis of our material we wish to emphasise that the survey we conducted across the nine countries is fundamentally of an exploratory nature. The material we analyse in this report aims at exploring the links and dynamics of transnational mobility and integration and at examining which conditions obstruct or facilitate these relations. We also wish to shed some light as regards the transfers of human capital that are made within these migration corridors. This survey does not aim at representativeness; rather, it serves as an exploratory platform through which to stimulate further empirical research and inform academic and policy debates on the links between migrants’ transnational mobility and their manifold patterns of integration.

In the sections that follow we refer to the ITHACA Quantitative Report (Bartolini 2015) for the overall methodology of the project, while we provide a more detailed account for what concerns the Italian part of the fieldwork, in order to give new insights and understandings on the nexus between integration and transnational engagement and the particular role that mobility plays in this relationship.

**The fieldwork in Italy**

The fieldwork in Italy began in July 2014, but the vast majority of the interviews were done in the period between October 2014 and January 2015. Respondents were interviewed in Milan, Turin, Bologna and north-western Italy overall (Bolzano, Trento, Rovereto, Vicenza and Bassano del Grappa) as well as in Rome (see the map in Figure 6).
In line with the requirements of ‘ethical ethnography’ (O’Reilly 2012: 62), we received access to the field through specific gatekeepers of the immigrant community. Informants were often recruited through the reference of other informants – that is, through the method of snow-balling, which is common in narrative interviews. We gained access into the communities principally through the following entry points:

- local NGOs; (such as Associazione Donne Nissa, Bolzano; Associazione Città Aperta, Rovereto; Associazione Bizzefte, Turin; Associazione Nosotras, Florence; Associazione Circolo Hillal, Treviso; Associazione delle Donne Lavoratrici Ucraine, Rome; Association of Filipino migrants, Florence)
- national NGOs; (such as Associazione Mediterranea, Milan; Associazione Caritas, Milan; IOM, Rome/Italy; Associazione nazionale stampa interculturale)
- Chamber of Commerce in Florence;
- (Honorary) Consulates in Florence (Filipino, Moroccan);
- contacts from previous research projects that the EUI team had been involved in as well as personal contacts that the team members had due to previous relevant collaborations and research;
- personal contacts in other academic and research institutions such as the University of Florence, Cattolica University Milan, European Academy Bolzano, Centro Studi Politica Internazionale Rome;
- ‘cold’ drop-ins in specific locations where we expected to find migrants from these population groups (such as grocery shops, restaurants and cafes);
- and through recommendations and further introductions to other migrants through the individuals we interviewed who passed on the contact details of other members of their communities (snowballing).

For the Ukrainian and Filipino communities in particular we were able to make a ‘break-through’ thanks to the assistance of a couple of extremely well connected individuals and NGOs that were able to introduce us to a chain of informants. The Moroccan and Indian communities were the hardest to connect with. We tried a number of strategies, using both personal contacts and institutions (such as the Moroccan Consulate in Bologna, smaller NGOs) but with limited results. In the last phase of the fieldwork there was a breakthrough in the Moroccan population but this was much less the case in the Indian community where regular physical mobility between India and Italy seems to be overall limited.

Interviews on average lasted around 60 minutes, with some peaking up to over an hour and half or two. The majority of interviews were conducted in public places (cafes and ethnic shops) or in the shop/activity of the interviewee (restaurant, hairdresser, shipping company, etc.). Interviews were also conducted within
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11 For more detail on ‘ethical ethnography’, see O’Reilly 2012.
the premises of the Filipino Consulate, in migrant’s private workplace, or in the offices of intercultural or migrant associations.

**Figure 6**: Map of interviews in Italy.
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Source: ITHACA’s team.

**The fieldwork in the countries of origin**

In addition to the interviews conducted in Italy, country experts were recruited by the ITHACA team in the countries of origin in order to conduct interviews with migrants who have returned to their origin country and who maintain or try to maintain active transnational links with their previous country of settlement. For the Italian case, the most relevant origins in our sample are Morocco, Ukraine and the Philippines. Thus, three experts with wide research and policy experience on migration and extensive networks both within the local societies and with the relevant stakeholders were responsible for conducting the respective fieldwork in the countries of origin. Their research was also conducted between October 2014 and May 2015 following the same questionnaire structure (with adjusted sentences on country of origin/destination) as the one followed by interviewers in Italy.

**Insights from stakeholders**

In all countries of origin as well as in Italy, we conducted interviews with experts, academics and researchers working on different aspects of migrant integration and mobility, as well as with civil society representatives and policy makers. These discussions with the relevant stakeholders were insightful as regards understanding a wide range of issues that have to do with the difficulties and challenges that
individuals face when preparing their migration project; (due to Europe’s restrictive immigration policies) with regard to their integration in the receiving society (acquisition of legal status, access to citizenship and identity issues, labour market insertion, etc.); and with regard to their return to their country of origin (investment; engagement). However, as regards the concept of transnational mobility and engagement that we are exploring through ITHACA, this was much less evident in these discussions. Most informants either focused on straightforward return migration and (re)settlement, or on circular/seasonal migration, while there was significantly less (if any) awareness of the concept of transnational mobility and the extent to which integration matters in encouraging or hindering it.

The sample structure

The composition of the Italian sub-sample is presented in Error! Reference source not found.. It is composed of 77 interviews, consisting either of migrants prevalently residing in Italy or of returnees in their country of origin. Interviews collected in Italy were mainly conducted in Italian, while interviews in the country of origin were originally conducted in the local mother tongue. All interviews have been then translated into English for comparison purposes with the rest of the ITHACA sample.

Our sample is not intended to be representative of the migrant population that is transnationally active and, specifically, that is transnationally mobile and economically active. The descriptive statistics we analyse in this section do not intend to convey generalisations on transnationally mobile migrants in Italy. We present traits that we observed within the groups that we studied, and the diverse experiences and biographies that shed light to the dynamics of transnational mobility and particularly the links between integration and transnational mobility, while of course having in mind the limitations of our data. The descriptive evidence that we present below is aimed at exploring the mechanisms and links between integration and transnational engagement and provides support for the more in-depth analysis in the next section that follows.

Table 3: Sample structure – Italy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Morocco</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>Ukraine</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ITHACA’s survey.
Demographic and socio-economic characteristics of our respondents

Table 4 below presents some general statistics on gender, age, education and marital status of the interviewees. Interestingly, across all nationality groups and in spite of the various strategies and entry points that we sought both in the countries of origin and in Italy, there is a strong representation of transnationally mobile female migrants (62%). This is the case both in the more female-dominated nationality groups such as the Ukrainian population where this would largely be expected, but also among the Moroccan community.

As regards age, we categorized our sample into three broad groups. The majority fall within adult active working age (in the early 40s), with Filipinos older than the average (67% of them is 50 years old or more). Thus, across all groups, mature adult working age is the norm.

Table 4: Basic demographics of the Italian sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>MOR</th>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>UKR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-34y</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49y</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+y</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean (years)</strong></td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/cohab.</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div/Sep/Widow</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children (Yes)</strong></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ITHACA’s survey. N=77

On average, 52% of interviewed migrants were married at the time of the interview, while the share of migrants with at least one child, ranges from 33% among Indians to 70% among Ukrainians. Our sample of transnationally mobile migrants has overwhelming urban roots (80%), while only 28% of our respondents declared to have a bad financial condition before migration and almost just as many where unemployed when they first migrated from their country of origin.
Our informants declared to speak on average more than three languages at the time of the interview, consisting of their native language (and in many cases also local dialects), Italian and an additional European language (English, French, Russian) which they knew already before migrating. Thus they set off on their migration project with a substantial linguistic capital that they further enriched while in Italy through the acquisition of an additional language. It is worth noting that in many of the cases, these individuals came from a rather multi-lingual environment: Moroccans, Indians and Filipinos often studied and used their past colonial mother tongue (English or French) before leaving and in addition had more than one official language (Arabic, Berber, Hindi, Bengali etc.), while older Ukrainians grew up in a Russian speaking environment.

Over 40% of our respondents came to Italy with no definite plan while the remaining had set off with a specific duration connected with a course of study or a specific job offer (Figure 7).

![Figure 7: Initial planned length of stay abroad.](source)

The above mentioned initial uncertainty regarding the length of their migration project is well in line with the status of interviewed migrants at the time of arrival: 58% entered the country with a tourist visa or with no visa at all and only 18.5 entered with a visa for job-related reasons (Table 5). Nevertheless, looking at the effective time since first migration, the overall sample definitively shows some sort of maturity: for 80% of the total, more than 10 years have passed since they first left their origin country. As for the time spent in Italy as destination, Ukrainians are those with the shorter presence (4 individuals with 5 years or less of presence), while Filipinos and Moroccans are settled since more than 20 years in half and a third of the cases, respectively.
Table 5: Legal status, at arrival and during the migration experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status at arrival</th>
<th>Prevalent status</th>
<th>Irregular</th>
<th>Temp.</th>
<th>Renewable</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Citizen</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Tot. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourist/no</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ITHACA’s survey.

At the time of the survey, 12.9% of our respondents in Italy and 10.5% of our returnee transnationals stated to be not in employment, most of the time retirees or in a couple where the husband/wife is prevalently working. Among those employed, variations are evident both between migrants and returnees and across different nationalities. Overall, our respondents came to Italy in the early 1990s. Even the Ukrainian respondents who are more recent in comparison to the other population groups have been in the country for approximately a decade. In most cases our respondents have higher levels of formal education than would be required for their occupation confirming thereby an overall reality in the Italian migrant labour market of over-skill. However, there is a positive evolution in the course of their migration trajectory. While upon arrival in Italy, 60% of the overall sample had an unskilled occupation (either manual or in the domestic and care sectors), the situation eventually becomes more diversified as people shift into self-employment (16% of those in Italy) and more middle-level occupations like clerks, teachers and other technical jobs. Cultural mediation and social work appear to be a migrant occupation by definition (19% of those in Italy, zero of those returned). As regards our returnees, here too we noted a shift towards the skilled manual labour category. A last point regarding our sample’s characteristics is that we encountered different job specializations depending on our informants’ origin country. For example, we encountered Indians who are more likely to be entrepreneurs or in high-level professions; Moroccans who tend to be employed in skilled manual occupations or in socio-cultural work (mediator); Filipinos we mostly found in the domestic and care sector, in social and clerical work as well as entrepreneurs; Ukrainians seem the most diversified group in terms of occupational condition, with a predominant group of domestic and care workers.
Figure 8: Type of occupation upon migration, currently in Italy and currently in the CoO (%).

Source: ITHACA’s survey. N=77

Figure 9: Current type of occupation, by CoO (%).

Note: calculated on the informants who declared to be employed/occupied at the time of the survey only.
Source: ITHACA’s survey. N=77

4. The Dynamics between Transnational Mobility and Integration

The interview material that we collected through our purposeful sampling strategy of seeking out transnationally mobile and transnationally engaged individuals provided us with some fascinating insights as to: what motivates transnational engagement and transnational mobility; the extent to which these correlate; and the conditions of the individual, of the two countries and of the migration corridor that links
them that provide the wider environment within individuals chose to be more or less mobile, more or less attached, and more or less engaged at either or both ends of the migration corridor.

Following the rationale and definitions of transnational engagement and mobility presented in the ITHACA report (Gropas, Triandafyllidou, and Bartolini 2014), the questionnaire aimed at gaining insights into the transnational engagement of interviewees that involves economic activity. At both ends of the migration corridor, our notion of economic activity goes beyond employment and includes any economic participation through a wide range of activities and practices that produce added value or income in kind or in money (Gropas, Triandafyllidou, and Bartolini 2014, 14).

Our empirical material strongly highlighted the multiple ways in which transnational engagement, integration and mobility intersect and fluctuate at different stages of people’s life-cycle, at different stages of their migration trajectory and depending on the socio-economic and political conditions at either end of the migration corridor. The table below highlights some of the ways in which we found different forms of transnationalism to intersect with different ‘degrees’ of mobility. What is important to underline is that we often found the same individual transnationally engaged for different reasons throughout their lifecycle, and that throughout their migration project these reasons (family related and economic-driven) tend to be combined and often mutually reinforcing. The degree or intensity of his or her mobility fluctuated depending on their personal circumstances, or the conditions within the migration corridor as our examples illustrate in this section.

### Table 6: The Transnationalism-Mobility Matrix from the Italian sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transnationalism</th>
<th>Forms of mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intensive Transnational Mobility (3 times a year or more)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Transnational Mobility (1-2 times per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited Transnational Mobility (less than one a year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remitting for family needs (education, subsistence, home creation and improvement)</td>
<td>Mobile Family Transnationalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately Mobile Family Transnationalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immobile Family Transnationalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic investment in business or shop in the country of origin</td>
<td>Mobile Economic Transnationalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately Mobile Economic Transnationalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immobile Economic Transnationalist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transnational financial transfers and investments at origin**

There is no data or systematic information available on most aspects of transnational behaviours or even on transnational mobility. Remittance data is the only indication we have of transnational economic
transfers and the World Bank is the only source able to estimate bilateral data (2010-2014) of remittances from one country to another, comparable for all countries. There has been a growing policy interest in better understanding the various migration corridors that have developed between migration sending and receiving countries but in most cases long-term historical data is missing and official statistics from single National Banks do not cover remittances sent through informal channels (bringing money to the country of origin on occasion of a visit, or sending money through friends or go-betweens), which are consistent and substantial, particularly for the countries we are studying in this project. Moreover, this data represents only a unidirectional flow of financial transfers and does not incorporate the financial flows from the countries of origin to destination that accompany migrants throughout their migration projects.

Nonetheless, given the importance of these transfers, it is useful to consider the formal outflows of financial resources (i.e. remittances) from Italy to the ITHACA’s countries of origin. Figure 10 shows the relative importance of ITHACA’s countries as recipients of remittances produced by Italy, as estimated by the World Bank: the relatively low shares are coherent with the wide number of migrant communities residing in the country.

Figure 10: Share of remittance outflows from Italy to ITHACA’s CoO, 2014.

![Bar chart showing remittance shares from Italy to different countries]

Source: World Bank Bilateral Matrix 2014, original data in USD.

If we examine the importance that these remittances have for the countries of origin as percentage share of the total remittances received, then we gain a different perspective on the size of the monetary transfers
and their importance: remittances coming from Italy alone represent around 14% of all money received by Morocco in 2014\textsuperscript{12}.

**Figure 11: Share of remittance inflows to ITHACA’s CoO coming from Italy, 2014**

![Bar chart showing remittance inflows from Italy to ITHACA's CoO in 2014.](image)

Source: World Bank Bilateral Matrix 2014, original data in USD.

This financial perspective is useful in understanding the importance of remittances and regular financial transfers within the migration corridors that we are examining. At the individual level, remittance behaviours tend to be connected to the life cycle of migrants and to their plans in terms of settlement or return: those with temporary migration plans, who are not engaging in family reunification processes and who plan to return home after a definite period of time, tend generally to invest more in keeping economic and social relationships with their origin household and tend to remit more (Dustmann and Mestres 2010) than migrants who intend to permanently settle at destination. At the same time, in reality temporariness and permanence constantly inter-act during one’s migration trajectory and this is reflected quite strikingly in the response of one Moroccan respondent. She is a 50 year old woman who used to work as a teacher in Morocco and moved to Italy to join her husband for a three month period. Twenty years later, she is still living in one of Italy’s largest cities and is now strongly active in a NGO that works on migrant integration and also encourages her children to be civically active. She explained that:

\[
I \text{ go back for many reasons, the main one being personal contacts with people. It is important for me to keep in touch with family and friends. A second reason why I go back is because of my daughters. I want to show them the place where my – and their - roots are. So it is important for me}
\]

\textsuperscript{12} We choose to show remittance estimates as calculated by the World Bank because this is the only source which allows for comparisons for all countries of destination and origin examined in the ITHACA project.
Filipinos are the more regular remitters (60% sending money monthly or bi-monthly) in line with expectations and with previous works (Basa, De Guzman, and Marchetti 2012). Our Indian group is not engaged in remittance flows of almost any sort. Moreover, Ukrainians, who in 7% of the cases travelled between 3 and 6 times back and forth over the last 2 years, show a good level of regularity in sending money too, which might also be related with the recent conflict in the country and consequent economic turmoil. There may be an inverse relationship between the level and frequency of remittances and the feasibility of physical travel between destination and origin. If that is true, those who travel more thanks to geographic proximity and the availability of cheaper means of transportation (Ukrainians and Moroccans) send less or less frequently than those who travel less (Filipinos and Indians in our sample). Nevertheless, micro-motives should be combined with considerations on macro-economic ones and contingent socio-economic and political conditions at origin and at destination, as remittances overall tend to be counter-cyclical (The World Bank 2011).

In line with other micro-surveys conducted in Italy (Pastore et al. 2014, 22), parents are those who are most likely to receive the monetary flows (40%) followed by siblings (22%) and children (19%). The type of recipients – which might not correspond to the final beneficiaries in some cases – is connected with the reasons and purposes of remittances, which can be clustered looking at the actual use of money and to the type of relationship between sender and receivers (Rapoport and Docquier 2006). In our sample, the most frequent remittances are aimed at providing financial assistance to their family back home for core subsistence needs (food, health care, bills and housing expenditures) and for education purposes of their offspring and quite frequently also of their siblings.

Filipino households, families and communities have been described as being characterised by a ‘culture of relatedness’ (Aguilar 2013) meaning that they demonstrate a wider sense of belonging that is not limited to the nuclear family but reaches out to kinship and community ties between different generations and among siblings and ‘in the communities where migrants came from’. This facilitates, mobilises and provides the support (in terms of material resources, time and emotional support) that is needed during the migration process to cover living and residential needs, help in finding a job, care-giving and the broader fulfilment of parental and filial duties. This is characteristic of the Filipino communities based on past
research and also, to an extent, for the Ukrainian community, even though extended family here is more limited. Indeed, these attachments and relations figured quite prominently in the interviews we conducted and did seem to drive the desire and commitment to be as mobile as possible within the migration corridors and as engaged as they could on either end.

**Figure 12: Frequency of remittances, by country of origin and total (%)**.

![Frequency of remittances, by country of origin and total (%).](image)

Source: ITHACA’s survey. N=77

Nevertheless, almost a quarter of migrants declare to send money for investment purposes,

**Figure 13: To whom do you send money?**

![To whom do you send money?](image)

**Figure 14: For what purpose do you send money?**

![For what purpose do you send money?](image)

NB: more than one option allowed / multiple answers allowed. Source: ITHACA’s survey. N=77
In order to add insights as to the range and purposes of the financial transfers, through our interviews we explored whether and in what areas our respondents have invested and engaged in economic activities either at origin or at destination. Just over half (55%) of our transnational migrants declared to have invested in their origin country, while almost a quarter of these appear to have earned some money or income from this investment during these past two years. This fact – money earned in the country of destination is invested in the country of origin but does not generate new income – may be due to ‘unproductive’/long-term types of investments. Indeed, for the overwhelming majority of our informants investments were not intended to produce an income in the first place but were rather meant as safe-haven assets or as a preparatory strategy for the subsequent, future phases of their migratory trajectory. Investing in the construction and maintenance of a home is the most representative case.

Migrants actively investing at origin engage in a wide range of activities. Home repairs, home construction, acquisitions for the house, the purchase and cultivation of crops (for economic gains or for family-consumption), opening a new business or investing in the business of relatives and acquaintances, paying for formal education or training courses, saving money at origin (either buying durable goods or depositing money into savings bank accounts in banks in the country of origin) were the most common investments made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IND</th>
<th>MOR</th>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>UKR</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ITHACA’s survey.

Figure 15: Have you made any investment at origin? - migrants/returnees.

Source: ITHACA’s survey. N=77

A further set of reasons why financial resources invested in the country of origin did not produce income have to do with difficult or inopportune conditions in recent years (for instance the consequences of the
global financial crisis, the Euro-economic crisis, the war in Ukraine). Also, and consistently with what we expect in terms of different behaviours of migrants during their living at destination and of those that have come back to their country of origin, the share of those actively investing at origin is sensibly higher for those physically living there (68%).

Figure 16: Have you earned some income/money at origin?

![Figure 16: Have you earned some income/money at origin?](image)

Source: ITHACA’s survey. N=77

Our respondents have invested substantially in their countries of origin in different ways. In terms of ownership of assets, there is overwhelming investment in home ownership, bank savings and education, while family subsistence needs and social family events eat into very substantial portions of the income earned at destination. Although the building or the purchase of a house for themselves or for relatives is by far the most common investment (60%), it is frequently accompanied by one or another productive use. In case they employ someone in their activities at origin, a recurrent pattern seems to be the employment of members of their family. Where income was gained at origin, this tended to be from agricultural production. Moreover, and beyond the transfers connected with the willingness to keep an emotional connection with the family abroad (“family events”), there is also an interesting 9% of migrants who declares to send donations with collective, non-family purposes (associations, networks, municipal groups). As regards the philanthropic activities of our respondents, these range from a variety of church-run cases, to larger donations solicited by NGOs active in both countries towards disaster relief (from environmental or natural disasters), reconstruction (from war) as well as a variety of health and education projects aimed at improving conditions and quality of life back in their home towns, and often even at changing mentalities.

These dimensions are very well reflected in the case of a Filipino respondent who has been living in Italy for thirty years and who works as a cook and driver. She told us:

*I was able to support the needs of my family – the hospitalization costs of my brother, the education of my nephews and nieces, and after nine months, I was able to bring one of my siblings over, and*
after that each year I was able to bring one over [to Italy]. After four years I was able to buy a house for my mother.

As for her future plans, she intended to invest in a training programme aimed at targeting social behaviours and consumer patterns of those left home. As she put it:

...( ...) to educate the parents of migrant workers so that they are not extravagant in their lifestyle—they no longer wish to farm or be employed because they are dependent on them [the migrants who remit]. They have the latest technology gadgets (mobile phones, etc.). They must learn how to save so they can value their future.

And she felt she could contribute to changing this mind-set.

A similar motivation, of impacting on mentalities was a driver for a Moroccan interviewee from Casablanca who works as a cultural mediator in a secondary school in the north-east of Italy:

In 2012, I organized a trip to Morocco to show [my colleagues] some parts of the country you would not normally see as a tourist. It was my idea and I thought it was useful to share my knowledge about Morocco with the people I work with when I am in Italy. I also thought this was a way to do some good for my country. So I brought my colleagues into my family house and many other private places. The trip lasted 8 days and I was in charge of organizing it. ( ... ). All the participants paid for themselves to cover the expenses. Also, after the trip one of the participants prepared a collection of pictures that we sold. The revenue we collected was sent to a Moroccan charity that works to provide medical care to children. ( ...) I feel I can do something good for my country of origin even though I am not there. I am trying to use the resources I get in Italy to make some good in Morocco. At the same time, I try to value my knowledge of Morocco to spread it among my colleagues and co-workers in Italy and let them know something new about Moroccan culture and way of living.
Activities and investments in Italy and reasons for commitment

Almost half of all interviewees have invested in Italy, and even among returnees a non-negligible 32% is somewhat engaged in activities in their past country of residence.

Table 8: Have you made any investment at destination? – by CoD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>MOR</th>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>UKR</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ITHACA’s survey.

The most common sector of investment is housing (19.5% have either bought a flat or a house). Nevertheless, many state to have opened a new business or to have invested in an activity they were already engaged in.

The motivation to engage in transnational activities is driven by family-related incentives and by future life plans. Investments are usually made in the country of origin in order to prepare for the future return – either to create a family if they do not already have one (mainly in the case of the Moroccans) or as soon as conditions permit in order to reconnect with family members (offspring and grandchildren) and take care of ailing parents (mainly Filipinos and Ukrainians). On the other side, investments at destination put the grounds for more stability also for future generations and are generally taken to testify a deeper level of integration at destination. While integration can be very well defined in economic and labour market terms, the more subjective dimensions of attachment and belonging add different levels of complexity.
The example of a 40 year old Moroccan woman is insightful in this respect:

*I was part of an association working with migrants and we had a specific field of expertise in an area where we realized there was a strong demand for the kind of service we were offering: this was the support and simplification of legal and administrative procedures for immigrants looking for a visa or a permit to stay in Italy. So about ten years ago we turned the association into a cooperative and we started working on this job full time. Now I am one of the persons who are responsible for this service and I have more than 30 employees, some of them full-time, some of them part-time. Our service is private and we never received any public money for what we do.

When asked where she intended to settle, her response was definite and succinct: ‘I am settled in Italy’, she responded without any hesitation even though she had previously noted that she did not feel comfortable in Italy: ‘I still cannot find the right term to describe my feeling here’, she had concluded.

We could then summarise the motives for which a person engages in transnational mobility that involves an economic dimension as follows:

- **because I must** (principally transfers due to family obligations – i.e. repaying the debt that had been accrued in order to pay for migration; remittances sent for family subsistence needs, for educational needs of children left behind with the grandparents or of care costs for elderly parents);
- **because I can** (once conditions in the country of destination are rather settled and secure, this then allows for the individual to start saving and investing in family property and home construction which was often from the outset an objective of their migration plan);
- **because I want to** (principally due to personal sensitivities towards the social/ humanitarian conditions in their country of destination or because there is a clear intent / desire to return - either
as an active actor on the workforce or as a pensioner, thereby having to start preparing the return process.

Migrants engage in transnational activities in function of the resources that s/he may have been successful in accumulating through the migration project, or based on resources that may already exist at origin and to which the person is able to add value through the migration project. For example, a lot of land may already exist back at home; this is then enlarged and developed through resources accumulated abroad and transnational engagement. Transnational activities or the decision to return and remain transnationally engaged may also be triggered as a result of failed or unsuccessful experiences during migration, or simply a strong sense of dissatisfaction even though objective factors may be. As a 34 year old Moroccan man living in the country for a decade, who studied interpretation and cultural intermediation in Italy, and who has returned at least six times to Morocco over the past two years shared with us:

*I go back more often because now I know I want to try to get a job in Morocco. I have two jobs in Italy and they are relatively good job in terms of the salary and position, but I am not completely satisfied with them, I feel I can do something better. (...)at the moment I have two jobs I like (I work part-time as consultant for migrants who apply for visas and I also work part-time as receptionist in a hospital), but I am convinced I can try to find something better and more engaging. So in the last few years I started going back more often to try to find something in Morocco. If it doesn't work out, at least I will know I have tried. (...)Even though I am generally satisfied with my conditions in Italy, I think I would prefer to be living in Morocco. This is also because my parents are there and since I have no family in Italy it is very important for me to spend more time and be close to them.*

So where integration is (perceived as) incomplete (i.e. it may be high in economic terms and labour market insertion but low in the socio-cultural dimensions and perceptions of belonging), transnational engagement and mobility can be seen as a reactive or a protective decision, in a continued attempt to improve personal and family conditions and make the best of changing conditions or opportunities at either ends of the migration corridor (and beyond) (i.e. investing back home after peace-building and reconciliation; or invest in the country of origin in order to counter the negative effects of the economic crisis in the country of destination).

**Geographical and occupational mobility**

With regard to physical mobility, there is a great deal of variation in the number of times each migrant has visited his/her origin country over the last 2 years (from 0 to 10, on average around 2 times), in a way that is closely correlated to the geographical distance of the four countries from Italy.
These figures seem to confirm that the geographical distance, the existence and accessibility of various means of transportation (not only airplanes, but also cars, buses, ferry-boats, and trains) matters in determining how often migrants visit their origin households.

Moreover, transnational mobility may be more trans-local\textsuperscript{13} than transnational. Research on transnational migrant networks and economic exchanges has been increasingly asserting the importance of local-to-local connections (Zhou and Tseng 2001). Such translocal connections could in fact be traced between Lviv in Ukraine and their Italian city/province of for instance, or between specific regions in Morocco and Italy, or between Candelaria in the Philippines and Tuscany in our survey. What emerged quite evidently from our respondents is that when travelling to their country of origin they consistently returned to the place where their family and/or where their spouse’s family live, and when as returnees they returned to their previous country of residence they visited the areas where they had lived and work and where their friends and former colleagues live.

Our sample is mixed between individuals who had worked in other countries prior to moving to Italy (European or non-European), and individuals who had only lived and worked in Italy after leaving their country of origin. There is thus a dimension of ‘stepping-stone’ migration with migrants moving to different locations as part of their effort to take advantage of the better work opportunities at their

\textsuperscript{13}Translocality involves local-to-local connections across national boundaries that are created through everyday practices of transnational migrants. This involves the concept of life space: the locations with which the individual interacts, such as job, leisure, family, residence.
disposal. Overall, this mobility has been mainly geographic (i.e. between locations) but we did have the opportunity to interview transnationally active migrants who demonstrated cases of occupational mobility (i.e. working transferring to different sectors or kinds of job and involving a degree of upward professional mobility). As an example, a Filipino 50 year old woman we interviewed in Florence had worked as a domestic worker in Lebanon and then in the late 1980s had migrated to Italy. She worked for long as a domestic worker in Rome and various cities in the north of Italy but at present has set up an office with another Filipino to help Filipinos and other migrants in Florence regularise their status, renew their permits, register for social security and offer access to information and services both within the Filipino institutions in Florence and the local Italian authorities.

**Fig. 21: Average time spent on travel**
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**Fig. 22: Reasons for travelling (% , multiple ans.)**
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Source: ITHACA’s survey. N=77

**Transfers within the migration corridors**

The relationship between migrants and their homelands often encompasses a broad range of transfers and activities which are scarcely or not traced at all through official statistics.

As regards transfer of cultural and educational capital within the corridors, in their majority our respondents acquired their formal education in the country of origin so there is a substantial social capital that is transferred within the migration corridor from origin to the country of destination at the outset of the migration cycle. The education level of our interviewees was very high overall, with more than half (57%) declaring to have a tertiary degree and only 6% with no or very low education. Nevertheless, differences are wide between Moroccans – who declare a low formal education in 14% of the cases – and Ukrainians – who are highly educated in 83% of the cases. Moreover, many had finished their educational
career outside their country of origin, either at destination or in a third country. Investing in education while abroad and completing a degree or a vocational training (with a formal recognition) in the country of origin might have an impact in terms of recognition of skills, as we know from the literature that the recognition of formal qualification acquired in a third country is quite low, on average, all across Europe (Quintini 2011).

Indeed, only exceptionally, does this get tapped into at destination. One Filipino respondent who has been living in Italy for more than fifteen years but who had completed her studies in Manila in social engineering and had also pursued graduate studies in public administration expressed her strong frustration about this:

*I have studied so much, a university degree and two masters, and I am working as a cleaning lady. This is very difficult for me, as through studying, I had envisioned a better future for myself. (...) I have wasted my education.*

The same investments and actions may take different meaning depending on the extent to which, or the ways in which the individual is integrated in the receiving society or attached to the society of origin. For example, our interviewees expressed a wide range of transnational mobility patterns throughout the course of their life-cycle and their migration trajectory and the meaning this mobility had for them changed depending on the extent to which they wished to remain in the country of destination (for themselves or their offspring) while retaining a certain attachment with their country of origin; the extent to which they were in an exploratory phase for personal advancement on either or both ends of the migration corridor; or the extent to which – and the reasons for which - they were actively planning their return.
These fluctuate according to their real or perceived sense of attachment and achievement in the country of destination, and also according to the conditions in the country of origin and whether these may work as pull (attractive) or push (repulsive) factors (i.e. economic growth opportunities in the case of the former, corruption and administrative inflexibility in the case of the latter). As one of our Filipino respondents said laughingly, he intends to

*definitely retire in the Philippines, and [is] therefore already thinking in what to invest (...) I love it [the Philippines] very much, and miss it: I dream every day of going back to my home town.*

However, he acknowledged that after 23 years in Italy his family will probably not go with him, especially his daughter, 'who has grown up in Italy and does not want to leave’ so although he is sure he would like to go back to the Philippines to retire, he is unsure about what will eventually happen. The inter-mixing between the ‘definite’ desire to return to retire and other practical concerns about quality of life and opportunities at destination was a recurring theme in many of our interviews. As another Filipino stated:

*I want to move back to the Philippines to retire. I will die in the Philippines (...). However, now that my husband’s papers are in order [he is from Sri Lanka], we plan to bring our son over to Italy next year. [But] he is 15 years old, we have to see how he will adapt to Italy, whether he likes it or not. And depending on that [we] will make decisions as to where to settle.*

The various intersections between integration and transnational mobility that we discerned through our interviews are visualized in the matrix of Table 9, while the next section offers four more-in-depth descriptions of transnationally mobile individuals to show the overlap between categorisations that exists along a person’s life cycle and migration cycle.

**Table 9: The Transnational Mobility- Integration Matrix from the Italian sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transnational Mobility</th>
<th>High Social and Economic Integration</th>
<th>High Economic and Weak Social Integration OR Weak Social and High Economic Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Family Transnationalist (High or Moderate)</td>
<td>Homeland Investor</td>
<td>Preparing for Return (including Retirement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Economic Transnationalist (High or Moderate)</td>
<td>Global Investor</td>
<td>Resource Mobiliser/Explorer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Civic Transnationalist (High or Moderate)</td>
<td>Global Citizen</td>
<td>Resource Mobiliser/Explorer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strategy of one of our Ukrainian respondents who may be considered a *returnee transnationalist* reflects a core practical reason for remaining transnationally mobile between the county of origin and previous residence even if she has returned. After living and working in Italy for seven years, she married...
and chose to return to her hometown in Ukraine and invest the money gained in Italy to set up a business there. She explained that the family’s returns to Italy have a social and leisure dimension to visit friends, but equally a strong practical reasoning that is not only related with her business but also with the need to renew the work permits so they can have the chance to return to Italy if the family business fails.

As an illustration of our concept of Resource Mobiliser/Explorer, the approach of one of our Moroccan respondents is insightful. Although we would position her in the category of a Mobile Civic Transnationalist who is a Resource Mobiliser, due to the economic crisis in Italy she is considering alternatives that may lead her to become a Mobile Economic Transnationalist:

*There are new professional opportunities in Morocco, especially now that in Italy things are slowing down because of the crisis. This is one reason why it would make sense to enlarge my share of business in Morocco and make it more structured. At the moment I am working with some Moroccan associations, but I do this as a volunteering job - I am not be paid by them, my only sources of income come from my job in Italy [she is a lawyer] and my consulting services to Italian firms and individuals living in Italy [she has set up a NGO for Moroccan lawyers in Italy].*

Our definition of global citizens involves a high degree of mobile transnational civic activism and a high degree of integration and is best exemplified with the case of one of our Filipino respondents. A domestic care worker of 50 years old, she was actively involved in creating the Honorary Consulate for the Philippines in Florence, she served as President of the Confederation of the Filipino Communities in Tuscany, and was elected twice President for Foreign Nationals as City Councillor Adjunct of Florence-(Consigliere Aggiunto del Comune di Firenze) between 2004-2010. While she is extremely active among the migrant associations in Italy, she also maintains close relations with her past Italian employers and due to the political position she held feels connected with the local political scene. In addition, she is very engaged with national and local authorities back in the Philippines and specifically in Quezon (Candeleria) particularly in organising fund-raising campaigns for humanitarian and health-related needs in her country of origin, and has invested in economic activities (opening businesses both in Italy and in the Philippines) also at both ends of the migration corridor. For this exceptional profile of a migrant deeply integrated in and engaged with both ends of the migration corridor, mobility is core in bringing her projects to fruition but at the same time, it is worth to underline that the core driver for her travel between the two countries is family-related.

The notion of global investor developed from the intersection between high social and economic integration and high mobile economic transnationalism. The case of a 26 year old PhD researcher from India who had worked as a researcher in a university in Italy and had maintained the working relation and
social contacts even though she returned to India is suitable in this context. Her particular case is characterised by high levels of niche social and economic integration both in Delhi and in Florence. She was very well integrated in her social context in India where she also took advantage of her migration trajectory to invest in real-estate, as well as in the international high-skill research community of the university she was affiliated with. She was able to use her resources from both ends of the migration corridor in order to create economic value and in fact was obliged to be mobile between the two locations as she did not have a long-term work permit that would enable her to work in Florence rather than work remotely.

Finally, as regards the categories of second chance or nostalgic mobile transnationalist, the case of a Moroccan 41 year old woman that we interviewed illustrates the interplay between weak integration and transnational economic or civic mobility. She lives with her adolescent daughter and works as a care-giver to the elderly in Italy. She is involved in two NGOs - in one she teaches Arabic and translates texts from Arabic to Italian and vice-versa, and with the other she organizes guided tours to Morocco. She visits Morocco as regularly as she can:

_I go back to Morocco for several reasons. In the past I went back to stay with my family and work. But I can [no longer] stay in Morocco for a very long period because I have health issues and the health system is just much better in Italy - back in Morocco I cannot have proper healthcare. So I have to go back and forth, because I want to spend time with my family in Morocco, but I also have to follow health treatments in Italy (...)I am staying in Italy mainly because of the medical system, which provides me the kind of treatment I need for my health-related problems. I could imagine myself living in Morocco and I even found a job back home, as a secretary in a small commercial enterprise. But, again, I could not stay there for long because the health system was not good enough to take good care of my issues. In the end, the main advantage of this back and forth is that I can be taken care of as necessary and I can still occasionally enjoy Moroccan culture and life back home. But this is not the ideal position for me (...)I am not satisfied. I would like to live my life in Morocco (...) I miss my family and my friends. I miss living in the place where I was born. And because I am separated from my husband, sometimes I feel it is very hard to be alone in Italy. Back in Morocco it would be easier, because I have my relatives and parents who would be there for me._

In this section, we offered some snapshots into the intersections between transnational mobility, integration and the actual activities that take place in the transnational spaces that are created within these migration corridors. These snapshots are meant to highlight the dynamic nature of these intersections; as the personal circumstances of the migrant and the conditions within the migration corridor change, so do these. In the next section we take a closer look at four profiles of transnationally mobile individuals that we interviewed to show how the dimensions we identify in the matrix above may overlap or succeed one another during the course of a person’s migration trajectory and in different phases of their life-cycle.
5. In focus: profiles of transnationally mobile migrants

**Case 1: A transnationally economically active and mobile Filipino household**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOMELAND INVESTOR AND GLOBAL BUSINESSPERSONS, in earlier stages of their life-cycle and migration cycle could be characterised as IMMObILE FAMILY TRANSNATIONALISTS, NOSTALGIC MOBILE TRANSNATIONALISTS and also RESOURCE MOBILISERS/EXPLORERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amelia and her husband Ernesto (50 and 55 years old respectively), come from a rural area of the Philippines, Candelaria. Amelia finished secondary education and her husband studied business and worked in a law firm prior to migrating to Italy twenty years ago. They migrated together in 1994. They spoke Tagalog and English and learnt Italian though their work. Their families helped them gather the money needed for their migration and within a couple of years had obtained regular status due to the 1995 amnesty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Ernesto’s networks in the Filipino community in Italy, they both found employment as domestic workers. They have two children and even though they were registered in Italy they lived with the grandparents in the Philippines while Amelia and Ernesto worked in Italy and sent money home on a regular basis mainly for family subsistence needs but also for the education of their children. As Amelia underlined, they wanted their children to finish school in the Philippines because there it was sure they would learn English well (at that time, English was not very well taught in Italian public schools). However, being able to bring the children over to Italy was just as important. They also saved in order to purchase tickets to bring the children over to Italy as regularly as they could during the school holiday period, in order to ensure that they were registered in Italy too so as to be able to obtain long-term residence for them too. Once the children’s education costs had been covered, Ernesto and Amelia were able to diversify the way they spent the financial resources that they were accumulating in Italy. Their next project was to build their family house in Ernesto’s village. For years they visited once a year or once every two years. In more recent years Ernesto started thinking about forthcoming retirement and decided to start purchasing lots of land near their home in order to have a farm during retirement. Amelia supported this and in fact they bought four lots of land in Ernesto’s father’s village. Then, in 2012, they decided to end their employment in the city of northern Italy where they had been living and working in for almost two decades and use the severance payment that they would receive to purchase a bigger patch of land in their village and also purchase the necessary crops for cultivation to begin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernesto returned to Candelaria first, completed the land purchase and with his father and Amelia’s cousin selected the crops that were to be planted in the new plantation. Amelia followed shortly after while their two children remained in Italy, married with Filipinos and working in local Italian shops. Amelia and Ernesto stayed in Candelaria between 2013 and March 2015. During these two years they set up their farm and once the crops started taking their course they decided to return to the northern Italian city to continue working and accumulating more savings for their pension. When leaving they employed Ernesto’s father and Amelia’s cousin to cultivate and take care of their crops and pay them a monthly salary to take care of their farm. As Amelia noted, they (her father and cousin) were both farmers and knew what had to be done in the farm whereas neither she nor her husband had any farming experience. She also noted that they were paying her father in law and cousin their salary to take care of the farm, but that the income from the crops when they would be harvested would belong to her and Ernesto in its entirety. And this was something that she was particularly looking forward to. Since their return they call once a week via skype to speak with their family members in order to be informed of the progress of the crops. Ernesto and Amelia counted on their vast network of friends and acquaintances, on the Filipino civil society, and on the nodal role of the Honorary Filipino Consulate in serving as a point of encounter and a location rich with information and contacts for finding employment. Ernesto intended to work and accumulate more funds in order to send as much money as was needed back home to further develop the farm and the crops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case 2: An attempted and disrupted economic transnational activity between Italy and Morocco

In the past was a GLOBAL BUSINESSPERSON and a RESOURCE MOBILISER, she is currently more keen to become a GLOBAL CITIZEN.

Leyla, 48, now lives in the north-east of Italy. She grew up and worked as a teacher in one of Morocco’s most cosmopolitan city. She has a University degree in Physics earned in Morocco and when she moved to Italy she began to work as a cleaning lady. Eventually, she also obtained a post-graduate degree in inter-cultural mediation in Italy and also works part-time as a cultural mediator in schools. She spoke Arab, Berber, French and English and when she moved to Italy, she learnt Italian and German. She followed her partner and moved to Italy but always visited Morocco regularly, even a few times a year sometimes, and generally stayed for periods up to one month. She tried to trade, informally mainly between the two countries, by bringing Argan Oil or Berber kaftan tissues that she would then sell on the Italian market.

Lack of a substantial market did not allow this initiative to flourish. Now she only brings Argan oil back to her city of residence in the north east of Italy for her friends and the principle reason she returns to Morocco now is for family reasons and not for trade. She also returns less frequently than she used to because she has a child now in Italy and the infrastructure and opportunities for raising a child in Italy are better than in Morocco. She would like to return more frequently but does not have the resources at present and since her trading efforts were not fruitful she does not have employment opportunities in Morocco whereas she has a job in Italy. Although she recognises work and practical conditions as better in Italy, particularly for her child, she feels connected and nostalgic with the Berber culture and is seeking ways to maintain as regular links as she can. She feels that if she were able to obtain Italian citizenship she would be able to get a job more suited to her qualifications but wishes to continue working in promoting Moroccan and Berber culture in order to improve understanding of this culture in Italy and perhaps eventually create the conditions that would be conducive to trade and exchanges between the two countries.

Case 3: An economically transnationally active returnee between Ukraine and Italy

He was a HOMELAND INVESTOR clearly exhibiting linear transnationalism who was PREPARING FOR RETURN and a RESOURCE MOBILISER and is now a GLOBAL BUSINESSPERSON

Volodymyr is 53 years old and holds a university degree in the arts. He is married and has two children. He wanted to open a restaurant in his home town in western Ukraine. He decided to migrate to Italy alone in 2008 to gather enough money to be able to set up a family restaurant. He was supported in this migration project by family and friends that he had in Italy. They helped pay for his travel and then helped him find a job in domestic work and eventually in building. Once he was able to regularise his status he started returning more frequently. He always regularly remitted money earned back to his family in Ukraine, usually through the services of Western Union. Although he migrated alone, when speaking of Italy, he referred to the country as his second home and feels particularly attached to Italy. After five years in Italy, he returned home in 2013 and opened an Italian restaurant in his home city where he currently employs four people. He now travels up to 6 times a year back to Italy, staying a few weeks each time, in order to purchase foods and goods for his restaurant. He maintains a long term residence permit in Italy. His plans to open a second restaurant in Ukraine, and to remain permanently in Ukraine while being able to visit Italy for work and social purposes as often as he can. He has helped two friends return and find work in Ukraine.
Case 4: A global transnational, economically active migrant in India, Italy and elsewhere

He is a HOMELAND INVESTOR who was in the past a SECOND CHANCE MOBILE TRANSNATIONALISM and wants to be a GLOBAL CITIZEN

| Ajay is a 42 year old Indian man living in one of Italy’s largest cities. He has a degree in electric engineering and travels back to New Delhi twice a year principally to see his parents. However, every time he goes back he tries to keep his business networks alive, so he also visits people with whom he used to work when he was living in India. It is not work, he argues, but rather social and business networking. Sometimes he also uses his trips to train former employees and colleagues with new technologies which he takes over to India himself. Moreover, he sometimes outsources IT projects that he acquires in Italy to India. He argues that it is easier to find competent people in India for very competitive wages in this sector. When he does outsource a project, he likes to be present at the final stages, for quality control purposes and therefore coordinates his travel around this too. He does not earn an income in India, but neither is his main income earned in Italy. He has a company that manages his intellectual property and earns royalties in the USA from a number of projects he developed a couple of years ago. The economic crisis has not affected his travelling but it has affected his work collaborations in Italy. At present, he is starting an IT company with a friend in India, and though he argues that he has not had to travel for this matter, as his job allows him to do everything online, he is planning on going to New Delhi for a substantial amount of time to help his friend set up the project. For Ajay, the worst and best part of being transnationally mobile is that you are never at home and always at home. He enjoys travelling and feeling global, however he argues that this is mainly due to the work he engages in, always surrounded by people of different nationalities and cultures. He has recently bought a house in Italy, and ideally, he would like to spend his time equally between the capital cities of his two countries. |
6. Concluding remarks

Through our fieldwork we observed that mobility is overwhelmingly driven by personal and family motives. The core reason individuals seek to be mobile as regularly as possible between their two locations is to see and visit family which is in one location and work and earn an income in another. Intensity of mobility and of transfers fluctuates throughout the lifecycle and migration cycle of the individual. For instance during the first years of migration, travelling back is more scarce particularly when there is a substantial geographic distance and when there is no legal, secure status. Physical mobility is more restricted due to lack of resources accumulated to pay the travel cost but more importantly because of lack of regular status that permits travel and re-entry (i.e. the overwhelming majority of our sample was irregular during their first years). As the status is regularised, there tends to be an accumulation of resources and more frequent physical mobility between the two locations (in terms of regular trips and longer stays at origin).

More importantly, the directions, intensity and frequency of economic remittances alter over time. In fact, at the very beginning, for the migration project to start off, financial resources are gathered together in the country of origin (by the person individually or through the assistance of the entire family), in order to pay for the travel and secure entry into the new destination. Whereas in the first years remittances are sent back for family subsistence needs, eventually these economic remittances are also diversified to include the construction or acquisition of a home. Investments in the country of origin in land acquisition (so not for housing purposes) and eventually in agriculture come next. This basically means that once family needs are overall catered for (i.e. the children have grown up and they have completed their education; the grandparents have perhaps passed away; migration-related debts have been largely paid back; and a home is built) then the individual starts diversifying further in certain cases. This occurs mainly when the aim is to return to the country of origin for retirement or for personal/ emotional needs (i.e. bonding with hometown for themselves or their offspring). Here, investment in setting up a farm or a small agricultural production or other small commercial business tends to be an option considered. In the case of the material collected through our fieldwork, we observed that this tends to happen after an average period of 10-15 year in the country of destination and when residence status has been secured. Retirement planning was certainly the most powerful motivator. Our respondents who had engaged in transnational mobility were doing so to secure housing during their retirement and in addition some sort of income autarchy. This encouraged them to invest in land, in farms and other small businesses back in their country of origin.
As noted above, we could summarise the motives as: *I must* (family obligations at destination need to be catered to), *I can* (resources have been accumulated so then it is possible to start ‘creating’ more), *I want to* (there is a desire to invest in order to fulfil personal aspirations which may be directed at oneself – i.e. retirement – or the offspring – i.e. to help children set up an independent business or to secure their livelihood). Finally, the desire to provide assistance and aid is quite significant, leading to a notable number of our interviewees to be engaged in charity, development aid or humanitarian assistance missions and projects (organised individually or through their NGOs). They range from what we have defined as global citizens to resource mobilisers, to nostalgic mobile transnationalists depending on their level of integration and degree of their mobility.

Transnational mobility may or may not be associated with transnational engagement. In other words, individuals who are highly mobile between the two (or more) locations may be intensely economically engaged in their country of origin or they may have minimal economic engagement. Engaging in transnational mobility in order to explore alternative or complementary work alternatives has been less frequent within our sample. It seems to occur either due to a deterioration of the economic conditions in the country of destination (for instance the consequences of the financial crisis) which negatively affect the migrant’s actual situation and future prospects in Italy thereby ‘pushing’ the individual to seek complementary or longer-term alternatives back in the country of origin; or, as preparation for the retirement return migration plan.

In terms of what is transferred through this transnational engagement and mobility, monetary transfers and remittances are the most explicitly and clearly identified transfers. As for cultural and educational capital, this is transferred within the migration corridor from origin to the country of destination at the outset of the migration cycle due to the overall high levels of formal education that our respondents have, but this was only exceptionally tapped into at destination. Interestingly, the skills and professional experience acquired in the country of destination are often not directly or formally transferred back to the country of origin even when the individual is transnationally mobile and active as the field of their investment in the country of origin is generally not related to the professional sector in which they work in the destination. – So for instance, a domestic worker in Italy who invests in building a farm in the Philippines is not transferring skills acquired in the home-care sector. Formally s/he may consider to just be transferring the income generated from this employment. In practice it is much more, and this may range from management and negotiation skills that she has acquired on the job and that improve her entrepreneurial nature, to much wider and more encompassing social remittances (see Isaakyan 2015).

An equally interesting finding that surfaced through our interviews is that migrants’ transnational engagement and mobility tends to be practiced individually, outside state bilateral agreements or
international programmes. In fact, state policies and initiatives aimed at encouraging transnational engagement were overall absent from the stories narrated by our interviewees with the exception of the insights shared by our Filipino interviewees. The Filipino state, non-state and civil society actors have formed a tightly knit network of initiatives and associations that encourage Filipino investment back in the country of origin, that provide assistance and training to Filipino migrants (including trainings on savings strategies, on business plan developments, etc.) and that encourage regular and consistent philanthropic support.

The conditions in the country of origin naturally, throughout all the case studies seem to provide the defining background against which transnational engagement takes place and the facility with which transnational physical mobility is practiced. In many interviews, frustration with conditions of corruption, bureaucratic inflexibility and lack of market opportunities in the country of origin were highlighted clearly as factors that inhibited their transnational activities. For the Moroccan case, the wider political instability and conflict in North Africa and the Middle East was repeatedly referred to as a matter of concern and a factor that had negatively influenced their transnational mobility. Similarly, the crisis in Ukraine was often raised as a factor that had decreased our respondents’ transnational mobility out of fear of not being able to return to Italy in case the situation deteriorated. The financial crisis in Italy and the Eurozone at the same time was also highlighted as a factor that restricted their employment opportunities and the income they were able to earn in Italy and unavoidably the extent to which they could remit or travel back to their country of origin. Thus, the interaction between conditions in the country of origin and the wider neighbourhood, as well as conditions in the country of destination certainly impacts transnational mobility and integration, and while it impacts transnational economic engagement in negative ways, it is may also trigger socio-cultural and political transnational engagement in dynamic and engaged terms.

To conclude, there exists much room for future research to explore the ways in which mobility, transnational engagement and integration interact. The material collected through this project opens up new questions for future studies. Among these, it would be useful to examine the differences in the transnational mobility and engagement of the second generation within or outside their migration corridor in comparison to their migrant parents; or the ways in which technology facilitates transnational engagement and investment regardless of actual physical mobility; or even the extent to which there may be ‘spill-over’ effects between migrant communities in the destination countries through sharing experiences on transnational investments. A regards the Italian case in particular, future research could examine the impact of rising unemployment and increasing risks of socio-economic exclusion magnified by the on-going economic recession on the transnational engagement and mobility of the newer arrivals and of the second generation.
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<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IT-UA-2-2</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Associations/consulate</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>IT-UA-2-3</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Associations/consulate</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>IT-UA-2-4</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Associations/consulate</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>IT-UA-2-5</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Associations/consulate</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IT-BIH-1-1</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>BIH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>IT-BIH-2-2</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>BIH</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>IT-UA-1-7</td>
<td>Svitlana</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>IT-UA-1-2</td>
<td>Svitlana</td>
<td>Lviv</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>IT-BIH-2-3</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Trento</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>BIH</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>IT-UA-1-3</td>
<td>Svitlana</td>
<td>Lviv</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-1</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Bolzano</td>
<td>Associations/consulate</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-2</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Bolzano</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-3</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Bolzano</td>
<td>Associations/consulate</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-4</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Bolzano</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-5</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Bolzano</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>IT-PHI-2-1</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PHI</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-6</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Rovereto</td>
<td>Associations/consulate</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>IT-MAR-1-7</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Trento</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>IT-BIH-2-4</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Bolzano</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>BIH</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-8</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>San Sebastian</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>IT-MAR-1-9</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Cafes/restaurant</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>MOR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>IT-PHI-2-2</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>QUEZON CITY, PHI</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PHI</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>IT-UA-2-4</td>
<td>Svitlana</td>
<td>Lviv</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>IT-UA-2-6</td>
<td>Svitlana</td>
<td>Sardinia</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>IT-UA-2-2</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Sardinia</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Language(s)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>UA-TT-2-8</td>
<td>Svitlana</td>
<td>Lviv</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Ukrainian, IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>UA-TT-2-9</td>
<td>Svitlana</td>
<td>Lviv</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Ukrainian, IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>UA-2-10</td>
<td>Svitlana</td>
<td>Lviv</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Ukrainian, IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-10</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Phone, Notes</td>
<td>Italian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>MAR-1-03</td>
<td>Mehdi</td>
<td>Rabat</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Arab, IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>MAR-1-04</td>
<td>Mehdi</td>
<td>Khouribga</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Arab, IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>MAR-1-05</td>
<td>Mehdi</td>
<td>Ben Yakhlef</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Arab, IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>IT-PHI-1-2</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Workplace, Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PHI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>IT-UA-2-12</td>
<td>Svitlana</td>
<td>Lviv</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Ukrainian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>MAR-1-11</td>
<td>Mehdi</td>
<td>Skhirat</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Arab, French, IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>IT-UA-2-13</td>
<td>Svitlana</td>
<td>Varese</td>
<td>Phone, Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Ukrainian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>MAR-1-12</td>
<td>Mehdi</td>
<td>Skhirat</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Arab, French, IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>MAR-1-13</td>
<td>Mehdi</td>
<td>Temara</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Arab, French, IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>MAR-1-15</td>
<td>Mehdi</td>
<td>Rabat</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Arab, IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>IT-PHI-1-3</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Workplace, Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PHI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>IT-PHI-1-4</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Associations/consulate, Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PHI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>IT-PHI-2-6</td>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Cafes/restaurant, Notes</td>
<td>Italian (with some words in English)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PHI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>IT-UA-2-14</td>
<td>Svitlana</td>
<td>Lviv</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Ukrainian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>IT-UA-1-15</td>
<td>Svitlana</td>
<td>Lviv</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Ukrainian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>IT-PHI-2-5</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Associations/consulate, Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian, English</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PHI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>IT-UA-2-6</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Associations/consulate, Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian, English</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-11</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Phone, Notes</td>
<td>Italian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>IT-MAR-1-12</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Phone, Notes</td>
<td>Italian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-13</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Phone, Notes</td>
<td>Italian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>IT-MAR-1-14</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Phone, Notes</td>
<td>Italian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-15</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Phone, Notes</td>
<td>Italian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>IT-MAR-1-16</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Phone, Notes</td>
<td>Italian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>IT-MAR-1-17</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>Phone, Notes</td>
<td>Italian, IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact Information:**

**Lorenzo, Lucrecia, Svitlana, Mehdi, Ruby, Gropas, Bartolini and Triandafyllidou**

**Notes:**
- **Italian:** The primary language used.
- **Ukrainian:** Language spoken when required.
- **Arab:** Additional language for specific contexts.
- **French:** Used for bilingual communication.
- **English:** Language for international communication.

**Notes:**
- **Phone:** Contact by telephone.
- **Notes:** Written notes or recordings.
- **Associations/consulate:** Interaction with consulates, associations, or similar organizations.
- **Other public places:** Meetings in public places.
- **Workplace:** Professional settings.
- **Cafes/restaurant:** Casual interactions.
- **Taped & notes:** Recorded conversations with notes.

**Duration:**
- **IT:** Italian (with some words in English).
- **UKR:** Ukrainian.
- **MOR:** Moldovan.
- **PHI:** Philippine.
- **F:** French.
- **30-49:** Duration in minutes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>IT/EN</th>
<th>MO/FR</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-18</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Associations/consulate</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>IT-IND-1-1</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>IT-IND-1-2</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>IT-MAR-1-19</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>IT-MAR-1-20</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>IT-MAR-1-21</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>IT-MAR-1-22</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-23</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Treviso</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-24</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-26</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>IT-MAR-1-27</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Senigallia</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>IT-IND-1-1</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Cafes/restaurant</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>IT-IND-2-2</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>English,</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>IT-IND-1-3</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Cafes/restaurant</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>English,</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>PHI 2-6</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>IT-MAR-2-28</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>IT-UA-2-9</td>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Lviv</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>IT-UA-2-11</td>
<td>Lucrecia</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Cafes/restaurant</td>
<td>Taped &amp; notes</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>IT-PHI-2-7</td>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Associations/consulate</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Mainly in</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>IT-PHI-1-8</td>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Associations/consulate</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>IT-IND-2-6</td>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>IT-PHI-2-9</td>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>English,</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>IT-PHI-2-10</td>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Other public places</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>English,</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ITHACA’s survey.
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