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Abstract

There is weak conceptualization of the differentiation between migration and tourism, which has contributed to relative neglect of the relationships between these. This paper examines some of the major influences on these relationships, dividing them into two general but inter-linked categories: broad economic and social trajectories, and tourism factors. A number of specific forms of tourism-related migration are then examined in the context of these social and economic trajectories. The paper explores labour migration, return migration, entrepreneurial migration, retirement migration, and the special feature of second homes. It concludes by emphasizing the need to place studies of the links between tourism and migration more firmly into wider social science debates, and by setting out some fruitful lines of future research.
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Introduction

Mobility, which is one of the central preoccupations of contemporary geography, takes many different forms including tourism and migration. This paper has two principal concerns – the overlaps between tourism
and migration, and the relationships between them. There are also definitional overlaps between these two social phenomena, not least as both have been subject to chaotic conceptualization (Boyer 1997); definitions provide the starting point for this paper.

Migration is ‘usually defined spatially as movement across the boundary of an areal unit’ (Boyle et al. 1998: 34), and ‘it is generally agreed that there will be some permanence to a move described as a migration’ (Boyle et al. 1998: 35). The first of these is an arbitrary criterion given the diversity of processes which have produced boundaries. International boundaries have some meaning given their territorial delimitation of spheres of national government but, even if we dismiss some of the problems raised by contested theories of globalization (see Hudson and Williams 1998), there are still vast differences between migration within, for example, the United States or Australia and the many micro- and intermediate-scale states that constitute Europe. The second criterion is equally problematic, for there is no theoretically grounded definition of ‘permanence’. Consequently, the migration literature resorts to such terms as temporary migrants, seasonal workers and nomads for particular forms of non-permanent migration (e.g. Skeldon 1997; Boyle et al. 1998), while some of the early academic tourism literature equated tourism to migration (e.g. Wolfe 1967, 1982).

The definition of tourism presents another set of difficulties. Burkart and Medlik (1981) provide a useful starting point for the discussion of how to conceptualize tourism, and this is further explored in Hall and Page (1999: 58–9). We can take three main features of tourism from this: it occurs outside the normal place of residence, is of a ‘temporary short term character, with the intention of returning home within a few days, weeks or months’, and ‘destinations are visited for purposes other than taking up permanent residence or employment remunerated from within the places visited’. In short, this gives us a definition of tourism as an activity which involves a stay of at least one night but of no more than a ‘few months’ (see also World Tourism Organization 1991, 1996; United Nations 1994). Perhaps of greater value is the emphasis on the intention of returning home, and the purpose of not taking up permanent residence. However, this still raises problems of arbitrary time limits, as well as of defining ‘permanence’: this can be set out in terms of motivation, legalistic residential requirements, or ad hoc time limits, all of which provide different data sets and analyses of tourism. Another aspect of the definition causes further difficulties: the exclusion of ‘taking up employment remunerated from within the places visited’ serves to differentiate tourism from non-permanent labour migration, but leaves a chaotic collection of other motivations related to the overnight stay. It also does not address the phenomenon of ‘migrant worker’, who combine leisure, discovery and labour market participation, as epitomized by young backpacker tourists.
This brief review underlines one of the starting points for this paper: the largely discrete literatures on tourism and migration have, at best, marked out the core areas of their research concerns. The failure to conceptualize adequately and define their fields of enquiry has left a significant area of overlap where there are blurred motivations, types of mobility and duration of stay. It is a zone which is epitomized by the semi-retired, consumption-orientated migrant who leads a peripatetic life style, shifting between two or more homes. This form of mobility constitutes ‘circulation’ as opposed to migration. To date, there has been relatively little research on these groups, with the exception of the burgeoning literatures on counter-urbanization (e.g. Champion 1989; Halseth 1993; Sant and Simons 1993; Buller and Hoggart 1994; Halseth and Rosenberg 1995) and retirement migration (e.g. Murphy 1981; Mullins 1984, 1990; Hall 1990; Rogers et al. 1992; King et al. 1998; Williams et al. 1997). However, there has been a singular lack of attention paid to the role of tourism in these new forms of migration, with some exceptions (e.g., Monk and Alexander 1986; Myklebost 1989; Williams and Patterson 1998; Williams et al. 2000) and very few attempts to disentangle the changing relationships between tourism and migration which are inherent in the life courses of such individuals. Not only is this a potentially fruitful interface between different research traditions, but it also represents an increasingly important component of the new forms of mobility.

Tourism and migration: causal relationships

The second area of concern in this paper is the need to investigate broad symbiotic relationships between tourism and migration. Many forms of migration generate tourism flows, in particular through the geographical extension of friendship and kinship networks. Migrants may become poles of tourist flows, while they themselves become tourists in returning to visit friends and relations in their areas of origin. These ebbs and flows of tourism are structured by the life course of the migrants, with each temporary or permanent round of migration creating a new spatial arrangement of friendship and kinship networks, which potentially represent visiting friends’ and relations’ tourism flows (Jackson 1990; Dwyer et al. 1993; King 1994; Navarro and Turco 1994; Paci 1994; Braunlich and Nadkarni 1995; King and Gamage 1995; Meis et al. 1995; Morrison et al. 1995; Morrison and O’Leary 1995; Seaton 1994; Seaton and Tagg 1995; Yuan et al. 1995). The extent to which these are activated depends both on network characteristics (their intensity, reciprocity and utilization of different forms of sustaining contacts) and the particularities of place. There is in effect a motivational continuum with family/friend-centred goals and
activities at one extreme, and place-orientated activities (with the family/friends effectively acting as providers of accommodation services) at the other extreme.

Tourism may also generate migration flows. Most obviously this is through the demand generated for labour which, if it cannot be met locally, will stimulate labour migration (Monk and Alexander 1986). Such labour mobility may be differentiated by nationality, gender, ethnicity and skills, depending on the particular features of the tourism industry, and the local labour market (King 1995). In addition, tourism may contribute to defining the search spaces of migrants (Brown and Moore 1970), whether these are labour, life style or retirement migrants (Snepenger et al. 1995).

There is nothing new in the existence of these symbiotic links between tourism and migration. They can be traced back through time, on even the international scale, to at least the Grand Tour, when aristocratic visits from northern to southern Europe, provided the economic basis for attracting immigrants from the countries of origin to provide specialized services for these niche national markets (Hamilton 1982). Similarly, Gerald Brennan’s long sojourn in Andalusia in the 1920s was punctuated by a stream of visitors from England (see the account in Brennan 1987). However, a number of structural changes in consumption and production have led to intensification and extensification of these inter-relationships. Not only have the links between tourism and migration become more important in determining mobility, but they are increasingly expressed on the international as opposed to the intra-national scale (Dwyer et al. 1993). The constraints of space mean that we can do no more than provide a brief review of the determinants of these changes. Some of the more significant changes in production and consumption are outlined below.

**Broader economic and social trajectories**

**Increasingly volatile labour markets**

The increasing uncertainty of growth in the developed world from the 1970s, combined with shorter product cycles and more rapid technological change, has led to markedly greater labour market volatility. Careers have more discontinuities, and job changes have become more frequent. This has two important consequences. First, it contributes to the tendency towards early retirement, thereby changing the scope for retirement migration. Second, there has been increased labour mobility, both sectorally and spatially, that has contributed to the geographical dispersion of friendship and family networks.
Globalization of labour markets

Economic globalization involves not only capital (Dicken 1998) but also labour (Aislabie et al. 1994; Dawkins et al. 1995). This encompasses both unskilled and skilled workers (Castles and Miller 1993; Findlay and Garrick 1990) and has two main consequences. International labour migration, especially of skilled workers (for reasons related to the elasticity of demand), has internationalized the potential tourism networks of visiting friends and families. In addition, there are increasing numbers with experience of working and living abroad, which both increases their search spaces at retirement and removes the barrier of lack of familiarity with living abroad.

The ageing of developed societies

Increased life expectancy and declining birth rates have led to a ‘greying’ of the populations of the developed countries. For example, currently one in five Europeans is 60 years or older (United Nations, Division for Social Policy 1998). The significance of this is reinforced by changes in working lives and retirement practices, and in income streams, which are discussed below.

Changes in working lives and retirement

The combination of increasing life expectancy and shorter working careers have led to a marked increase in the numbers of people surviving to retirement, and the length of active retirement (Warnes 1993). This has increased the potential pool of retirement migrants as well as the size and spending power of the older age tourism market segment (Economist Intelligence Unit 1993).

Changing national and regional identities

Migration flows have also contributed to the continuous formation and reconstruction of national identities whether it be in terms of emigration (e.g. Ireland) or immigration (e.g. Argentina, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States). Given the interrelationship of identity, image and place promotion, it should therefore not be surprising to see the location of different ethnic and cultural groups in a particular place as the subject of tourism promotion, whether it be with respect to the availability of national and regional cuisines (e.g. Arce and Marsden 1993;
Cook and Crang 1996; Bessiére 1998; Hall and Mitchell 1998) or the commodification of entire locales, such as Chinatown. For example, Julesrosette (1994) argued with respect to Afro-Antillian Paris, that the transformation of the locales of everyday life into tourist sights connected with the identity of a particular foreign ethnic population is part of the process of postmodern simulation in tourism.

**Changing income streams**

The post-war period of growth, combined with a once and for all redistribution of incomes in the 1950s in the ‘Golden Age of Welfare’ in Europe (Esping Andersen 1990), has greatly increased the disposable income available for leisure purposes. This has contributed to the growth of, and the internationalization of, mass tourism (discussed below), which in turn has created opportunities for labour migration. In addition, the spread of various forms of pension schemes (state, occupational and personal), together with capital accumulation through the property market (commonly house ownership or inherited property) has increased the wealth and income available in the retirement phase of the life course, facilitating various forms of tourism or tourism-related migration.

**The re-evaluation of valued living and working environments**

In most developed societies there has been a shift in fundamental values that is sometimes argued to be associated with postmodernism. Amongst others, there has been a reification of nature, a nostalgia for real or imagined past lifestyles and landscapes, and environmentalism. This has contributed to the growth of new forms of tourism, some of which have centred on particular types of rural destinations, such as the Dordogne and Tuscany. This, in turn, has influenced life style migration, of both the economically active and the retired, to these bucolic rural regions which has led to forms of ‘rural gentrification’ (Phillips 1993; Riebsame et al. 1996). The search for valued rural environments, was epitomized by Robert Graves who stated that he had come to live in Mallorca in the 1920s because here the ‘town was still town; and country, country; and where the horse plough was not yet an anachronism’ (Burns 1994). The flight from modernity was also identified by Buller and Hoggart (1994) as one of the key influences on the international migration from the United Kingdom to France. Hoggart and Buller (1995) also noted that many French owners who wished to sell their properties relied on France being seen as an extension of ‘British’ rural housing markets, whereby purchasers could acquire a rural ‘dream’ home that is not only unaffordable but also unattainable in Britain.
Transport and communications changes

The revolution in transport and communications in the second half of the twentieth century has greatly shrunk the spaces of both production and consumption. Even though we may not agree with Ohmae’s (1995) view of the borderless world, the barriers of space for mobility have been significantly lowered. This has consequences for tourism in terms of facilitating the globalization of business and pleasure trips, and the enacting of visiting friends and relatives networks. It also has implications for migration, particularly in enabling temporary migration and peripatetic life styles, and in the expansion of teleworking, with the latter tending to involve migration to regions of valued landscapes, which are also attractive to (and partly defined by) tourism.

Tourism-related trajectories

Mass tourism

The remarkable expansion of mass tourism in the twentieth century has two important implications for migration. First, the scale and speed of destination and resort growth has implications for the dependence on migrant as opposed to local labour. Second, it widened the search spaces of the first and subsequent generations of mass tourist as they progressed through the different stages of the life course. The subsequent shift to more individualized and flexible forms of tourism consumption has changed the nature of these search spaces, and led to the decline of particular tourist resorts, without as yet causing any marked change in what we may term large volume production of tourism services (i.e. large-scale production but not necessarily in the form of the traditional mass tourism resort).

Internationalization of tourism markets

The mass tourism boom has been internationalized; this process was contingent on place and time, but in Europe took place from the 1960s, at first supplementing but later challenging domestic mass tourism (Shaw and Williams 1994). This effectively internationalized the two mass tourism effects noted above. First the emergence of a series of new centres of mass tourism consumption, many of them rooted in areas of low population density but with the required attractions; these are epitomized by, but are not limited to, the Spanish costas. This generated not only generalized labour migration, but also segmented entrepreneurial and
labour flows destined to serve particular national market segments. Second, it extended across international boundaries the potential search spaces of large segments of the populations of the more developed countries.

**Internationalization of tourism capital**

The growth of transnational tourism capital, although highly uneven between sectors and across space (Williams 1995), has created greater need for skilled international migration, especially of senior management. This operates both in terms of intra-company transfers, and inter-company career moves. But the net effect in each case is similar in terms of generating tourism-led skilled labour migration. Most unskilled labour recruitment is influenced by the generalized growth of tourism labour demand, rather than by the recruitment/transfers effected by specific tourism capitals.

The above discussion only introduces some of the complex processes which have shaped tourism–migration relationships. The key to their evolution lies in the interfacing of these broader societal changes with those specific to the tourism sector. These are explored further in the following section, by focusing on a number of particular forms of the relationship. Our comments are, of necessity, generalized, and further analyses need to be sensitive to the contingencies of time and place.

**Specific forms of tourism–migration relationships**

In this section we focus on particular forms of tourism–migration relationships, with two objectives in mind: first, to explore further some of the interdependencies that have been identified; and second, to demonstrate the limited research activity in this field. The relationships that are examined here are: tourism and labour migration, tourism and entrepreneurial migration, tourism and return migration, and tourism and retirement migration. Tourism and retirement migration is a special sub-set of permanent migration, where it involves long term migration with no intention of returning. It is, however, a particularly interesting form of consumption-led migration as it exhibits various forms of permanent and temporary migration, as well as dual residence (see Williams et al. 2000). A fuller account of some of the different forms of permanent migration, including those of working age, into tourism destinations can be found elsewhere (see Buller and Hoggart 1994; Champion 1989; Salvà Tomàs 1996). Their links with tourism are in many ways similar to those for retirement migrants: definition of search spaces by tourism experiences, amenity seeking, and reliance on tourism infrastructures. Such migration has been increasing
in recent years and has been grounded on changes in value systems, and facilitated by teleworking. In many cases the differences between permanent and labour migrants lies only in their initial goals: some labour migrants decide not to return ‘home’ and so become permanent migrants, while some ‘permanent’ migrants eventually do decide to return. There are also finer distinctions related to legal residence, citizenship, and the creation of new forms of identities, but these rarely follow any simple rules, and invariably differ between destinations as well as different nationalities. Some of the observations in the following discussion of labour migration therefore partly apply to permanent migrants.

Tourism and labour migration

Tourism employment has particular characteristics stemming from the spatial and temporal fixity of tourism consumption (Shaw and Williams 1994). Tourism services have to be experienced in situ, and (in most senses) they are not spatially transferable and cannot be deferred (Urry 1987). This implies that the tourism labour force has to be assembled in situ at the point of consumption and, moreover, is available at particular time periods. The nature of demand is such that a labour force is required with sufficient flexibility to meet daily, weekly and seasonal fluctuations. While visitor management strategies and technology can be used to reduce the variance in demand, labour forces have to be assembled at particular points in space and time.

The extent to which these production and consumption conditions generate migration flows, rather than reliance on local labour, is contingent on a number of factors, both intrinsic to the tourism development and to the locality. Two prime considerations are the scale of demand, and the speed of tourism development; the latter conditions the extent to which labour can be transferred from other sectors of the local economy/society. In addition, the degree of enclavism or spatial polarization is important, with dependency on migration likely to be positively correlated with this. For example, Barker (1982) demonstrates how ski facilities are more likely to be integrated into existing settlements in the eastern than the western Alps, with the consequence that there is greater reliance on indigenous labour. Over time the spatial form of tourism consumption and production is in constant flux. There is general agreement that there has been a shift in recent decades from mass to more individualized and flexible forms of consumption, related to changes in particular market segments and products (Williams and Montanari 1995). Even though this tendency is often exaggerated, it tends to produce a more dispersed spatial pattern of consumption, and the potential to rely more on local than on migrant labour (Williams and Gillmor 1995).
In addition, local demographic, social and economic structures condition the availability of local labour and the requirement for in-migration. Comparative wage differences, levels of education and training, working conditions and job status in tourism and other sectors all influence the availability of workers, as also does the overall level of unemployment. For example, the availability of better paid and higher status jobs in other sectors has conditioned the requirement for immigrant labour in the Swiss tourist industry (King 1995). Similarly, in Australia the rapid development of international visitor arrivals in the 1980s, combined with low levels of local trained and skilled staff, led to a labour shortage that was met through permanent immigration and temporary work-permits for appropriately skilled foreign staff. In the 1980s net immigration contributed some 30–40% of skilled chefs and cooks and some 20–25% of catering managers in hotels and clubs (Industries Assistance Commission 1989). The difficulty in securing the services of teachers of tourism and hospitality also led to many Australian educational institutions recruiting staff from overseas (Department of Sport, Recreation and Tourism 1985). However, the often heated immigration debate in Australia, union opposition to the import of overseas personnel, and the argument for a policy of self-sufficiency in tourism resources (Department of Employment, Education and Training 1988; Department of Tourism 1992), meant that government and industry attention increasingly focused on the development of tourism training and the creation of a domestic labour pool (Industry Commission 1995).

Finally, the degree of temporal polarization is also significant, for the demands for in-migration are likely to be greatest in large-scale, single-peak seasonal destinations. All else being equal, the lack of alternative jobs, outside the peak period, will either result in seasonal unemployment in the local labour market or reliance on seasonal labour migrants. Valenzuela’s (1998) work on Spain, for example, demonstrates sharp regional differences in the temporal polarization of demand, although there is a lack of empirical evidence on how this relates to migration. Over time, there has been a general increase in the relative importance of international tourism-led labour migration, at least within Europe (King 1995). In part this is due to the relative stagnation of labour demand in other sectors of the economy since the 1970s, but it also reflects the status of tourism as one of the few consistent growth sectors of the late twentieth century. Tourism labour migrants also tend to be found in the informal sector and to be female.

Thus far we have referred to tourism labour migration as a homogeneous process, but it is in fact highly segmented. King (1995) identifies a hierarchy of labour migrants in respect to tourism. In the first rank are skilled managerial posts, typically found in the upper enclaves of major international hotels, and local branches of leading airlines. It can be
hypothesized that there will be greater reliance on immigrants to fill such posts in less developed economies where there are specific shortages of human capital (Hall and Page 1997). The second rank is composed of intermediate posts such as tour guides and agency representatives, where the ability to speak the language of international tourists, and even to share their nationality (if only for the purpose of consumer reassurance) is considered critical. Finally, the third level of the hierarchy constitutes unskilled labour which is relatively common, given low entry thresholds to most tourist jobs (Williams and Shaw 1988). The pay and working conditions of each of these three ranks in the hierarchy is likely to be varied, as also are the national origins of the streams of migrants. For example, although research is limited, there is evidence that in the Pacific islands, core positions are often taken by expatriate workers while ‘peripheral’ positions are taken by indigenous employees (Minerbi 1992; Hall and Page 1997). This represents a double-edged sword for Pacific island communities. On one side there is the possibility of resentment developing between core and peripheral workers, and the difficulties associated with underemployment and seasonal unemployment. On the other side, opportunities are created for local people, and women in particular, to obtain paid labour while maintaining traditional roles (Auger-Andrews 1995).

Tourism-related labour migration streams are also differentiated by gender, although as King (1995) notes there are consistent differences in this respect in relation to nationality and country of destination. Many tourism jobs are socially constructed as ‘men’s’ or ‘women’s work’, and this is due partly to wider systems of gendered inequalities in the labour market and in the home, as well as to tourism-specific factors (Burrell et al. 1997). There is both horizontal and vertical segregation in labour markets, and many immigrant women workers face the dual obstacles of their gender and their migrant status in seeking to improve their labour market position.

The significance of migration in tourism labour markets stems from three main features. First, it serves to fill absolute shortages of labour. This function is likely to be greatest in areas of rapid tourism expansion or where tourism is highly spatially polarized. However, the first two levels of the migration hierarchy may also function to fill particular employment niches, even where there are no generalized labour shortages. Second, the availability of migrant labour reduces labour market pressures, and consequently wage inflation pressures. Third, labour migration can contribute to labour market segmentation, and especially where the divisions are along racial/ethnic or legal/illegal lines this can serve to reduce the costs of labour to firms (Venturini 1992; Montanari and Cortese 1993). In short, labour migration serves to ensure that the process of tourism capital accumulation is not undermined.
Labour migration also serves two other functions with respect to tourism. The first of these is the generation of visits to friends and visitors, with the potential for flows in both directions. These are likely to be of more significance for the two upper ranks of the migration hierarchy, given the limited effective demand of unskilled tourism workers as a result of their low incomes. Second, labour migration experiences help to define the search spaces of both retirement migrants, as King et al. (1998) have shown with respect to retirement from the UK to southern Europe, and of life-style seeking labour migrants, as Champion (1989) demonstrates in a review of counter-urbanization tendencies.

Tourism and return migration

Labour migration is part of a cycle of emigration (King 1984), and many migrants are involved in one or more cycles of emigration and return. This type of fluidity is facilitated by changes in transport technology which have contributed to the ‘shrinking of space’. Whereas the early twentieth century transatlantic emigrant from southern Europe was likely to be a lifetime migrant, perhaps never returning to his or her homeland, the early twenty-first century migrant is likely to be a frequent return visitor, as is evidenced by the annual swelling of population numbers and the presence of foreign cars at village festivals during the summer (Cavaco 1993). This in itself is an important source of tourism, particularly given the remote and relatively impoverished nature of many of the regions of origin of the emigrants (King 1984).

In addition, however, there are ‘permanent’ return flows to many countries of origin. According to Ceraso’s (1974) widely quoted study of Italian emigrants to North America, the motivations for return are diverse, and encompass ‘retirement’, ‘success’ and ‘failure’. There are also at least two spatially differentiated streams of return: the return to origin, and a rural urban drift amongst those seeking a wider range of employment and individual and collective consumption opportunities (Lewis and Williams 1986). These motivational and spatial differences are significant in mediating the impact of return migrants on the tourism sector.

In general, (unskilled) return migrants, irrespective of the sector that they worked in abroad, tend to acquire few industrial skills, but they may return with financial capital (savings) and human capital (foreign language skills). They generally prefer employment or investment in the service sector and being self-employed or small-scale business owners (King 1984). As King (1986: 21) comments, ‘going to Germany seems to convert peasants into petty traders’. Low entry barriers and cultural factors (life style aspirations) attract many returnees to the tourism sector.
There is surprisingly little research on this topic, but three studies can be noted. First, King et al. (1984) showed that most tourism enterprises in Amantea in Calabria had been established by return migrants. Second, Mendonsa (1982) demonstrated that return migrants in Nazaré in Portugal had higher incomes than non-migrants, because they used their accumulated capital to purchase houses and rooms to rent to tourists. And third, Kenna (1993) identified the key role played by return migrants in developing the tourism industry in Anafi in the Cyclades; they had access to capital, some foreign language skills, and used local networks to secure both supplies and political favours.

Tourism and entrepreneurial migration

In some ways tourism entrepreneurial migration constitutes a special case of both life-style seeking migration and of labour migration. It may assume one of three different forms. First, entrepreneurial migration may serve distinctive national tourist groups or resident communities in foreign destinations. Eaton (1995), for example, has analysed the role of British entrepreneurial migrants in restaurants and bars serving (mainly) British tourists in the Costa del Sol. Madden (1999) has also analysed British- and Irish-owned businesses in the Costa del Sol; she proposes a five-fold classification based on legality of the business, ‘visibility’ of the business and the legality of the migration. The migration decisions of the vast majority of the business owners had been motivated by life style or social reasons, and ‘good business prospects’ influences only 8% of respondents. Entrepreneurial migration is not, of course, restricted to the Costa del Sol, and there are large numbers of British and other foreign entrepreneurs in most major tourism destinations in southern Europe, serving not only the tourists but also the resident expatriate communities. Similarly, Korean migration to Australia and New Zealand in recent years has coincided with the entrepreneurial opportunities provided by a substantial increases in Korean travel to those countries. In both cases, while some entrepreneurs have privileged access to particular (familiar) goods and services demanded by tourists and residents, their main comparative advantage is a shared language and, to some extent, a shared cultural background.

Second, major (mass) tourist markets provide opportunities for any tourist entrepreneurs, irrespective of nationality. These flows operate at both the national and the international level. For example, Williams et al. (1989) demonstrate the importance of tourism (both in defining search spaces and creating opportunities) for tourism entrepreneurs in Cornwall, England; only a third had been born in the county and more than a third had been attracted to the area by its attractions as an arena
for consumption. A different example is provided by the Senegalese street traders who line the tourist circuits in most of the major tourist destinations in Italian cities (King 1995).

A third group of entrepreneurial migrants are the amenity-seekers, who are attracted to live in tourist areas but not specifically to be tourism entrepreneurs. Snepenger et al. (1995) provide a case study of such entrepreneurial migration in the Greater Yellowstone district in Montana. They considered recreational, community and natural environment factors to be more important than business factors as ‘business location values’.

Tourism and retirement migration

Retirement migration constitutes a special case of the more general category of consumption-led migration. In common with life-style-seeking labour migrants, they are part of a generalized counter-urbanization tendency which has been a major feature of demographic shifts in the more developed countries. Unlike most labour migrants (teleworkers are an exception) they are not however dependent on employment opportunities and local economic structures.

This group poses some of the greatest definitional challenges in respect of differentiating tourists from migrants. One approach is to use the criteria of property rights and length of residence to define a typology of retirement migrants/tourists (King et al. 2000). The critical length of residence is that which invokes legal requirements of registration, and associated rights and responsibilities; this is usually, but not invariably, a period of six months for foreigners resident in western European countries. In practice, there is evidence of widespread evasion of such requirements. However, a four-fold classification can be proposed on the basis of these criteria (King et al. 2000: chapter two): seasonal (long stay) tourists, who usually rent accommodation; second home owners (mostly short stays); seasonal migration which is relatively long and may or may not require legal registration; and permanent migration which usually involves property ownership and legal registration.

O’Reilly (1995) provides an alternative five-fold typology based on sense of commitment and relative orientation to host and origin country, including the distribution of time between these. Her five categories are: expatriates (permanent, identify with host country); residents (in terms of orientation and legal status, but seasonally visit the country of origin for 2–5 months); seasonal visitors (orientated to the country of origin, and spend 2–6 months at the destination each year); returners (usually second home owners, who visit irregularly); and tourists (identify with the area as a holiday destination). The different typologies have their relative merits, but perhaps the key point which they emphasize is the complexity
of defining retirement migrants, and of differentiating them from other
visitors or migrants.

The reasons for the rapid growth of international retirement migration
from northern Europe to southern Europe, and from Canada and the USA
to selected Caribbean islands (and from the former to Florida) are reviewed
elsewhere (Longino 1992; Williams et al. 1997; Rodriguez et al. 1998).
In brief, they include an ageing population, extension of active old age,
increased but polarized disposable income, changing working and retire-
ment patterns, and increased familiarity with the ‘global’ through work
and leisure. There are also far more extensive patterns of intra-national
retirement migration (Law and Warnes 1976; Rogers et al. 1992; Neyland
and Kendig 1996). The three main motivations (after Cribier 1993) for
retirement migration are family re-unification, a return to roots (areas of
origin) and the seeking out of leisure spaces (search spaces informed by
tourism experiences).

Second homes

There is significant conceptual blurring of the boundaries between the
different forms of migration at both the international and domestic level
with respect to the second home, one of the most researched interfaces
between tourism and migration (Wolfe 1951, 1952, 1970; Bell 1977;
Coppock 1977; Whyte 1978; Dingsdale 1986). Life-style choice has been
recognized as being a significant factor in migration and residential relo-
cation behaviour, especially at particular stages in the household or
Migration to rural areas (Davis et al. 1994; Riebsame et al. 1996) or the
rural hinterland of urban areas (e.g. Gober et al. 1993; Halseth 1993) is
typically associated with a desire of migrants to satisfy life-style choices
often related to recreation and leisure amenity values, including amenity
landscapes.

Such behaviour may have significant implications for existing agricul-
tural activity which may be in conflict with the idealized perceptions of
rurality held by both permanent life-style migrants and non-permanent
second home owners. For example, the price of agricultural land may be
inflated by high demand from ‘life-stylers’ migrating from urban centres,
while rural gentrification may lead to fragmented land ownership and
increased human presence and disturbance of local ecosystems (Riebsame
et al. 1996). In such situations, local populations and migrants (second
home, temporary and permanent) may occupy a ‘shared but separate’
geographic space with substantial implications for local community insti-
tutions (Halseth 1993; Lowe et al. 1993; Phillips 1993), including
environmental and political issues (Halseth and Rosenberg 1995; Ward
et al. 1995) and longer-term sustainability (Flynn and Marsden 1995). For example, viticultural practices (including the use of bird-scarers and helicopters) may not be welcome by second home owners who are attracted by tranquil images of vineyards in pleasant rural areas. In New Zealand the noise from such activities has come to be opposed by a number of residents (including second home owners) in some grape-growing areas, leading to attempts to control the use of helicopters (Hall and Johnson 1998). Second homes, perhaps more than most forms of tourism migration/settlement, therefore tend to be the focus of contested space issues.

Conclusions

Tourism–migration relationships are important for understanding not only this nexus, but also the two separate processes in their own right. Furthermore, the focus on tourism–migration relationships emphasizes the need to set our analyses in the context of contemporary global economic and political processes, and the circulation of capital and labour.

With the exception of second home development, the relationship between tourism and migration has been relatively neglected in tourism studies, and this applies especially to the grey zone of the complex forms of mobility which lie on a continuum between permanent migration and tourism. But it applies also to the determinants and consequences of labour and entrepreneurial migration, and to the impact of retirement and second home growth on resort destination. Although Foster and Murphy (1991) have examined the modification of the resort cycle by second home development, there is a need for a long-term comparative study of this phenomenon. For example, in a number of New Zealand rural centres, second homes have gradually become transformed into permanent retirement settlements and have also served as the base for the development of more substantial tourism resorts (Kearsley 1998). In the same way that mass tourism destinations have entered a period of decline, questions need to be asked of the potential transformations of second home and retirement settlements as populations undergo substantial demographic and life-style change.

One of the important consequences of the analysis of the relationship between tourism and migration is that it provides an opportunity for tourism researchers to relate to and contribute to the work of other social scientists. A number of important inter-disciplinary themes can be identified for research which will require that these broader theoretical and methodological links are explored. Some of the more fruitful of these, include: the relationship between the life course and migration pathways of individuals, and their travel careers; the role of family and friendship networks in VFR tourism (but see Williams et al. 2000); the role of
government and governance in influencing tourism and migration, and how some migrants can exploit gaps in the regulation of tourism; the distribution and mutual interaction of the cultural/economic/environmental impacts of both tourism and tourism-related migration; the role of tourism and migration in creating and recreating identities, and personal and place images.

The complex links between tourism and migration are likely to become even more intricate in the future as changes occur in the nature of work, leisure and family organization. Space is being used in new and more imaginative ways for both production and consumption, and this often involves transborder movements and transactions which exploit place differences. In another context – the ownership and control of transnational capital – Reich (1989) has argued that it is increasingly difficult to say ‘who is us’. New trends in tourism and migration similarly make it difficult to determine ‘where is home, what is our identity and why are we here?’.
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Résumé: Tourisme et migration: nouveaux rapports entre production et consommmation

Il y a une conceptualisation peu convaincante de la différenciation entre migration et tourisme, ce qui a contribué à une négligence relative de la relation entre les deux. Cet essai examine quelques influences majeures de ces relations en les divisant en deux catégories généraux, mais entre-liées: des trajectoires socio-économiques et des facteurs touristiques généraux. Plusieurs formes spécifiques de tourisme-migration sont examinées dans le contexte de ces trajectoires socio-économiques. L’article explore la main-d’œuvre migrante, la migration retournant, l’émigration d’entrepreneurs, la migration de retraités, et l’aspect spécial des résidences secondaires. La conclusion fini par accentuer le besoin d’y mettre en place de plus en plus des études de liens entre tourisme-immigration dans les débats des sciences sociales, et présenter quelques sujets fructueux de recherches dans l’avenir.
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