This chapter provides a review of the relationship between employment and migration, focussing particularly on how this is manifested in terms of employability. Employability is the ‘ability to bring a particular kind of knowledge to a task, and be able to collaborate effectively with others to achieve a common task’ (Bentley, 1998: 103). This has two aspects, which broadly equate to quantitative and qualitative dimensions. In ‘quantitative’ terms, employability can be understood to encompass the ability of migrants to secure jobs, to maintain these, and to obtain other jobs, whether by choice or as a consequence of labour market restructuring. In contrast, in qualitative terms it can be understood to implicate the types of jobs obtained, and how these relate to the skills, competences and knowledge of the migrants.

International migration can be seen as one of the means by which individuals respond to employability issues. They may migrate because there are better opportunities for securing employment in other countries, whether in terms of getting any job, the security of that job, or the returns measured in wages, working conditions or the capacity for learning. They may also make decisions about employability in terms of differences between the country of origin
and the destination. Or they make take the longer term ‘spatial view’ and consider how international migration – or more precisely the learning and knowledge opportunities this affords – will influence their employability in their country of origin, or some other country, at a later stage in the cycle of migration. In its most positive form, this interpretation posits international migration as being a source of exceptional learning, particularly of nationally-specific enculturated and embedded knowledge that allows individuals to enhance their employability over time. The migrants, in this reading, are reflexive individuals, for whom migration is a component of life long learning and internationalised careers.

The above understanding of employability is based on bounded rationality and a substantial degree of voluntarism, indicating the significance of human agency in international mobility. This is, of course, a far cry from the experiences of many migrants. For refugees and asylum seekers – whether de facto or de jure – and for many labour migrants, and their families, employability issues are first and foremost about rights to seek employment in the formal economy. Beyond this, employability is about securing jobs with ‘fair’ wages, employment and working conditions, at least in comparison to indigenous workers, if not in terms of broader distributional issues implied by competing notions of social justice. But employability is also about their ability to retain these jobs and, or secure, other jobs which offer greater personal returns, however measured. In other words, employability is also about learning and the social recognition of migrants’ knowledge. This puts employability in the context, not only of workplace learning, but also of broader structural features such as the changing social divisions of labour, regulation and institutions, and issues of social identities, social recognition and discrimination. It is the intersection of these mediating influences that determines whether international mobility leads to labour market entrapment or stepping stones for individual migrants.
This chapter aims to set out a conceptual framework for analysing the relationships between employability and international migration. It examines the following themes: the significance of changing forms of international migration: the different meanings of employability to individuals, firms and national states; the changing nature of employability; and labour market entrapment v stepping stones.

Changing forms of international migration and employability

The diversity of individual experiences of employability can be approached through a number of cross-cutting migration typologies within which individuals can be located. These shape how individuals experience employability.

First, the intersection of migration and employment regulations determines access to the formal and informal labour markets. On the one hand, this involves the broad approaches of the State to employment and welfare, as typified by the ‘varieties-of-capitalism’ argument (Hall and Soskice, 2001). While neo-liberal tendencies have led to some convergence across Europe (Esping-Anderson, 1996), the national state remains the key site for employment and welfare policies (Favell and Hansen, 2002; Hudson and Williams, 1999). For example, the relatively small numbers of non-registered migrants in Scandinavian labour markets are related to the tightly regulated nature of those markets (Hjarno, 2003). National migration policies are to some extent influenced by these broad differences in varieties of capitalism, but are also driven by the politics of migration. As Morris (2002: 410) comments, migration policy ‘can be understood as the “management of contradiction”, in which policy and practice seek to strike a balance between concern over national resources, which tends to limit entry, and continuing employer demand and the assertion of human rights, which potentially expand entry’.
Migration and employment policies constitute what Brubaker (1992: 23) terms ‘both an instrument and an object of social closure’. Immigration and employment laws tend to be implicitly gendered, ageist, and racist, in the way that they close or open particular labour market segments to particular migrant groups, with consequences for employability. They are also increasingly skill- and sector-specific, privileging so-called highly skilled migrants, although there are significant differences in the specific policies deployed by national states, whether in relation to labour migrants or refugees (McLaughlan and Salt, 2002). The result of the prioritisation of skilled labour has been that the demands of employers for less skilled workers have been met, in many and perhaps most countries, by clandestine migrants and refugees or asylum seekers, rather than by labour migrants. The outcome, however, is that ‘Neither the more ‘flexible’, pro-globalisation regimes of the UK and Ireland, nor the more social protectionist regimes of France, Germany, the Netherlands or Denmark, have been able or willing to do much about this, while the governments of Southern Europe have been quite unprepared for it’ (Jordan et al, 2003b: 197-8). In reality, there has often been a fluid situation, with migrants moving between compliance, semi-compliance, and non-compliance (Ruhs and Anderson, 2006), seeking to enhance their employability in response to changes in their personal circumstances, the economy, and the regulatory framework. This reflects the way in which different regulatory regimes – for example, for employment and immigration – intersect in often a ‘contradictory and adhocratic’ manner (Guiraudon, 2003).

Secondly, there are obvious differences in employability, in terms of whether labour migration is realized via intra-company mobility versus ‘free agent movers’ (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996; Williams, 2006). Migrants moving within companies have guaranteed jobs, of course, so that employability for them is a qualitative issue of how this international experience influences their long-term employability (McCall, 1997). In contrast, for international free agent movers (the ‘term’ free is conditional of course) mobility has to be
understood in terms of their employability in their countries of origin, and prospects of securing any, or particular types of jobs, in the country of destination.

Thirdly, *the nature of migration* is changing. The classic (but overstated) view of the once-in-a-lifetime migrant who eventually becomes a return migrant (King, 1986), has been supplemented by other models (King, 2002; Hardill, 2004) including nomads, whose travels could take them anywhere (Clifford, 1997), and serial migrants (Ossman, 2004) involved in cycles of migration to a single, or multiple destinations. Migration has also tended to become more short term – although this applies more to migrants from the more developed than the less developed countries. Refugees and non-regular migrants also face more constraints than regular labour migrants in moving across international borders, although there is evidence that their position is sometimes more fluid than is assumed (Jordan and Duvell, 2002). Returned or circular migration can be a response to their changing employability (loosing jobs, or facing lower wages) but also determines their employability, particularly in companies or industries where promotion and advancement is determined by length of services.

Fourthly, there are also significant differences in the employability of primary or lead migrants as opposed to trailing migrants, whether spouses, children or elderly relatives. Immigration regulations frequently restrict the employment rights of accompanying migrants, perhaps absolutely, or in terms of the numbers of hours they can work. The result is that employability means different things to lead and trailing migrants, and these differences are gendered and age related (Kofman, 2004). It is therefore important to theorise the contrasting employment, career and employability experiences of migrants within households. This does not imply that all ‘accompanying’ persons’ face reduced employability prospects, and are necessarily passive victims of regulatory regimes. Some national states have liberalized the employment rights of the spouses of skilled migrants, in order to provide a more attractive regime for the latter in context of global talent wars. In other cases, migrants excluded from
formal employment, have sometimes turned to various forms of self-employment. But the resources that this requires also underline the mediating influence of social class on migrant employability.

The employability of migrants and refugees is determined then by their positions in relation to a complex array of immigration and employment regulations, which vary between countries. Moreover, these regulations change over time, as do the rights to permanent residence or citizenship. The result is that employability is the outcomes of ‘a bricolage of territories with differentiated rights for different migrant groups’ (Williams, 2001: 103).

Multi-level understandings of employability
Although this chapter started with a single definition of employability, this has different meanings for different social actors. In particular, individual migrants, employers and the national state understand employability differently. Of course, there is no shared understanding within any of these three categories, but here we focus on the differences amongst them.

The national level. In economic terms, national states have to take a fundamental decision as to how to accumulate stocks of human capital, whether via indigenous sources (that is via investment in training and education) or external ones (that is, via immigration). However, in practice there are a number of discourses that influence immigration policies, ranging from alleviating labour shortages or supporting national growth and productivity strategies, to promoting post-colonial or other political relationships and facilitating cultural ties and exchanges (Ruhs, 2005). However, policies increasingly are influenced by neo-liberal discourses (Jordan and Düvell, 2002), with significant implications for how the employability of migrants is understood at this level.
In general terms, there has been a broad shift in the European Union and in individual member-states towards understanding the employability of migrants in terms of filling specific labour market skills shortages (notably in the IT and health sectors), and in terms of making national economies more competitive (Jordan et al., 2003a), including addressing the issue of flexibility (Green and Turok, 2000: 599). The shift is far from uniform, of course, and has favoured more skilled workers, as well as particular sectors which face labour shortages. This resonates with debates about the knowledge-based economy, and is necessarily elitist in terms of occupations, sectors and places (for example, skilled immigration policies in the UK are to a considerable extent driven by the specific needs of London as a global city). In contrast, immigration policies for less skilled workers are usually framed in terms of meeting supposedly ‘short-term’ labour shortages, and are typified by particular regimes for seasonal agricultural workers, construction or care workers. In reality policy shifts are uneven and discontinuous, being implemented within migration systems that for several decades have been seen as national custodians of a Fortress Europe (Geddes, 2000). Policies towards refugees and asylum seekers are driven less by such economic logic and more by the interface between the domestic politics of immigration, and political visions of countries’ roles in the international order. Employability features little in the discourses about such mobility, other than in relation to employment rights.

The firm/employer level. Employability for individual firms is understood in terms of their production strategies and increasingly – although not exclusively - this has focussed on the notion of firm-level flexibility in context of neo-Fordism (Amin, 1994). Labour market flexibility lies at the heart of flexible production strategies, and there is a well-developed literature in this area. In practice, there are a number of different discourses surrounding flexible labour in firms, which ascribe different roles to the flexible worker: they can be ‘flexperts’ (van der Heijden, 2002) who rapidly acquire expertise, sources of just-in-time
expertise (Brandenburg and Ellinger, 2003), ‘warm bodies’ for hard to fill vacancies, or gurus who transfer critical knowledge to firms (Barley and Kunda, 2004). There is also a well-established literature on generic labour market flexibility dating back to Atkinson (1984) and later researchers who have followed in the same vein (for example, Regini, 2000). They recognise four types of labour market flexibility - numerical, functional, temporal and wage. Each of these relates to different notions of employability in the employer’s perspective – ease of recruitment/dismissal, amenable to moving between jobs within the organization, willing and able to work variable hours in response to fluctuations in demand or production conditions, and an aggregate ability to manage wage levels.

There are many ways in which employers can source the labour required by these different flexibility strategies, and labour market segmentation is often at the heart of these, with gender age, and ethnicity commonly being implicated. However, international migration is increasingly significant for the flexibility strategies of firms in many countries. This can be illustrated by the following idealised schema (Table 1), which illustrates some of the key issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of flexibility</th>
<th>Employability association</th>
<th>Implications for migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numerical</strong></td>
<td>Casual and seasonal</td>
<td>Work permits, visas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional</strong></td>
<td>Multi-tasking</td>
<td>Assumed attitudinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>competences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wage</strong></td>
<td>Low-wage acceptability</td>
<td>Vulnerable and informed by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lower wages in countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporal</strong></td>
<td>Flexible working hours</td>
<td>Seasonal work permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited alternatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The employability of migrants is of course viewed differently by firms in different economic sectors and countries. For example, in Silicon Valley Chinese scientists are a source of substitute human capital in the face of declining numbers of American PhD science students, but in China the same individuals as return migrants are an important source of embedded knowledge and social networks (Saxenian, 2006). In terms of filling less skilled posts, some firms prefer employing unregistered migrants because of their greater vulnerability and consequently being more amenable to flexible employment practices; this can also be a way of creating competitive relations between unregistered and registered migrants and between newly arrived and more settled migrants (Solé and Parella, 2003: 129). Similarly, Matthews and Ruhs (2007) report on the (flexibility) advantages of employing unregistered migrants for employers in the hospitality industry.

The individual migrant level. Individual migrants are neither economic dupes nor unconstrained human agents (Hudson, 2004), hence their employability should be viewed as shaped by, and shaping, the firm and national levels. For many migrants employability is about survival, or about fulfilling specific economic goals in terms of savings or remittances, rather than about learning and career progression. Indeed, the career implications may be negative, especially where length of service is a condition of promotion. Trailing spouses are particularly like to incur the career penalty of moving with a partner who is the lead migrant. However, all migrants are reflexive, and to varying degrees can utilise regulations and firm practices to their advantage – up to a point. Hence, migration and flexibility are increasingly seen as something to be aspired to (Ong, 1999), and as contributing to career development. This is associated with a number of theoretical perspectives including the Foucauldian view of the individual as a self-governing entity (see Hardill, 2004 on migrants), and Beck and Beck-Gernsheim’s (2002) notion of individualization (see King and Ruiz Gelices, 2003 on student
migrants). Moreover, the meaning of migration in terms of employability for individuals is not fixed – rather it may shift at various points during the migration cycle. For example, after first migrating individuals may be less employable because they lack nationally specific human capital, but then their employability may increase as they acquire such knowledge (Becker, 1975). If they decide to return to their home countries, they may find that their employability is even greater if their sojourn abroad has resulted in the acquisition of particularly scarce human capital (Dustmann and Weiss, 2007).

While we have discussed these three levels separately, they are in fact inter-related. This is similar to Amin’s (2002) notion that different scales are folded together – what happens at one level is both influenced by and influences other levels. Or as Goss and Lindquist (1995) stated, specifically in relation to migration, this can be understood in terms of how life cycles and individual careers intersect with broader changes in the organization and structure of the economy.

The changing nature of employability

Structural economic changes have been accompanied by a relative shift to more discontinuous careers for individuals. This has meant a shift from employment security to employability security (Opengart and Short, 2002: 221) – in other words, the expectation of being able to find new employers, in a labour market where employment is understood to have become increasingly uncertain. Gold and Fraser (2002) argue that there has been a shift away from seeing careers as planned linear progressions within organizations, with strong internal labour markets, and long-term employment with individual employers. Instead, individuals increasingly have ‘boundaryless’ careers, which include ‘a range of possible forms that defies traditional employment assumptions’ (Arthur and Rousseau, 1996: 3).
This has important implications for understanding the employability of many individual labour migrants that is their ability to find new employers in the course of their ‘boundaryless’ careers. In its most limited sense, this simply means that migration is a way of extending the options that are available when confronted by labour market uncertainty. However, for selective migrants who are more favourably positioned in the labour market, migration may be empowering in terms of advancing their careers. For these more favoured migrants, the migration experience can be constructed around the acquisition of what Sennett (2000) terms ‘flexpertise’ – the ability to learn and adapt quickly to changing circumstances. In other words, migration can be about acquiring learning competencies, or learning how to learn. Migration may be interwoven into the flexpertise that allows boundaryless careers to be pursued, while enhancing individual employability – although these relationships are mutually inter-dependent rather than uni-causal.

For refugees and many labour migrants, who previously had no employment security at all, the shift from employment security to employability security is probably of limited relevance, compared to the over-riding need to secure their economic survival and basic rights of residence or citizenship under adverse circumstances, at least in the initial stages of migration. For them, discontinuous employment is not being transformed into boundaryless careers, characterised by continuous learning to learn, but by increasing labour market insecurity and impoverished employment opportunities. This is explained by Solé and Parella in relation to those migrants who are also ethnic minorities subject to racism (2003: 124):

‘Racism as a system of the ‘ethnification’ of the labour force permits the increase or decrease, according to the needs at any given time, of the number of individuals available for those economic activities that are worst paid and least attractive in a given moment of time and space’
The determinants of changes in employability for them are far more likely to be rooted in the politics of discrimination and racism, and how these are contested in both broader societal struggles and by the migrants themselves via both collective and individual actions. The employability of all migrants, irrespective of ethnicity, will also be influenced by state and voluntarist initiatives to enhance their employability (such as language classes, and other forms of training, as well as social welfare and housing policies).

Migration: labour market entrapment or stepping stones?

We have already noted that migrants, because their knowledge is not fully recognised (perhaps because they lack actual, or designed-to-be exclusionary, national knowledge), or because of obstacles such as labour market regulations, may enter the labour market sub-optimally. This is fundamental to the thinking behind human capital theories (Becker, 1975; Chiswick 1978). However, it does not automatically follow that the acquisition of nationally specific human capital over time will lead to higher wages and occupational mobility for the migrants. The eventual employment outcomes depend on whether these initial jobs constitute labour market stepping-stones or labour market entrapments (discussed further in Williams and Baláž, 2008). In the case of ‘stepping stones’, there is a gradual matching of knowledge and occupational position, as migrants overcome barriers to using and acquiring knowledge. Migrants use their initial jobs as stepping stones to jobs that are more rewarding in some way. To some extent this is based on positive assumptions about the employability of migrants, although this is also informed by sectoral and individual differences. In the case of ‘entrainment’, an initial sub-optimal labour market entry has enduring consequences, as individuals become ‘trapped’ in a particular job or labour market segment, which implicitly means not only a failure to progress their careers but also being condemned to relatively poor returns, whether in terms of wages or learning.
It is however, necessary to place this evaluation in context of the cycle or cycles of individual migration. A migrant may move to a job abroad in which (s)he appears to be entrapped, not being able to make further progress in the destination country labour market. However, their experiences in this job may provide stepping stones to jobs in the country of origin. For example, individual migrants may accept sub-optimal jobs abroad, in order to acquire particular knowledge for which a premium is paid in their countries of origin; this may be a technical skill which is in abundant supply in the destination, and for which a low return is payable compared to the country of origin, where there is a skills shortage. This is a classic illustration of the notion that migration may constitute ‘significant learning moments’ for individuals, whereby they acquire particular forms of knowledge and enhance their employability – although only in particular places.

The occurrence of such significant learning moments is especially pertinent if we look beyond formal qualifications and technical knowledge to the acquisition of a range of social skills and competences, such as self-confidence, networking skills, learning and adaptability competences, and self-reliance (Williams and Baláž, 2005). It may also be the case that employment in a job that seemingly represents labour market entrapment can be construed as a stepping stone because it provides a platform for learning outside of the workplace – of, for example, social or language skills. This is illustrated by the example of au pairs working in the UK, a caring and cleaning job which in itself usually is not a stepping stone. However, migrant au pairs do acquire social skills and competences, as well as language skills, both in and outside of their work roles, for which a premium may be payable in their country of origin labour market. In this instance, these jobs do represent stepping stones.

While there are many examples of migrants’ first jobs, or even of migration itself, being constituted as stepping stones, or potential stepping stones, these should not be over-stated. The international experiences of many migrants are constituted of deprivation and hardship,
with scant opportunities for knowledge acquisition, learning and enhancement of their curriculum vitae. Instead, they may become entrapped, with their knowledge being under-valued, and few opportunities to add to this. Entrapment can occur in all three segments of what Portes and Bach (1985) term the ‘triple labour market’ – the primary, the secondary and the ethnic enclave. Employability prospects are likely to be different for migrants in each of the three sectors. The primary sector, with better-paid and more secure jobs, provides the best opportunities for formal training, simply because employers will have a greater incentive to invest in them given their more stable workforces. It therefore offers the best means to enhance employability, even if it is initially more difficult to find employment in this section. Migrants may be more employable in the secondary labour market, not least because this is often strongly influenced by, while influencing, irregular migration (Piore, 1979).

Where migrants face obstacles to social or occupational mobility in the primary labour market, this is understood as the ‘blocked mobility’ thesis (Bonacich and Modell, 1980), but it also represents problems in their employability. Under such conditions, migrants are likely to be most employable in the enclave labour market, where there is also a strong presence of co-ethnic employers. However, this may also be a labour market segment which provides poor opportunities to learn from co-workers (particularly about the culture and language of the country of origin) and may become a form of entrapment.

A different perspective on labour market entrapment and stepping stones is provided by the notions of ascription, acceptability and suitability (Jenkins, 2004: 153). Suitability emphasizes achieved or acquired characteristics; migrants have more power to change these by acquiring particular skills or knowledge of the national culture in the destination country. However, the social recognition of their suitability is mediated by ascription and acceptability. Ascription – who you are – is likely to influence perceptions of acceptability, or whether you fit into the networks and values of an organization. Migrants may be ascribed as outsiders, newcomers,
or – in some cases - as ethnic minorities. Ascription applies to all migrants, and not only to those who are conventionally considered to be unskilled. This is a process which can be observed in both the skilled and unskilled labour market segments, with Saxenian (2006), for example, reporting that many Asian scientists in Silicon Valley encountered glass ceilings in their employing organizations when they tried to move into senior management posts. Similarly within the health sector, all occupational grades are subject to ascription and acceptability barriers, even though we know more about the experiences of doctors and nurses (see Larsen et al, 2005, and Raghuram and Kofman, 2002) than of cleaners and porters. Migrants, like most newcomers, are also likely to be ascribed a peripheral position within work groups within organizations (Lave and Wenger, 1991). If they are to overcome ascription barriers and achieve acceptability then this involves, as with all newcomers, moving 'incrementally along a continuum from the domain of stranger toward that of friend' (English-Lucek et al, 2002: 97). This may be critical to their employability and in shifting from potential labour market entrapment to labour market stepping stones.

CONCLUSION

There are complex relationships between migration and employability. At an aggregate level, the structural and institutional features of the destination are important in determining the employability of migrants. Both the broad political economic differences between national states in relation to employment and welfare regimes, and different approaches to migration policy are important in this. Within this broad context, there are also significant differences in the experiences of lead and trailing migrants and the outcome is highly ageist and gendered experiences of employability. The nature of migration itself also influences the employability outcomes. The most obvious differentiations are between labour migrants and refugees/asylum seekers, and between registered and non-registered migrants, both of which tend to be
racialised. But the changing nature of migration, with more temporary and circular mobility, also has implications for employability. There is therefore a need to understand employability in terms of changing individual experiences within a broader canvas of economic and regulatory changes. Migrants are not passive dupes in this bigger picture but, to sharply varying degrees, individuals who can shape their employability, whether in terms of survival strategies or career building.

This chapter has also argued that employability has to be seen as being at the nexus of multi-level interests and actions. Key amongst these are the national state, firms and individuals. The interventions of national states are driven by both the competing economic needs of different sectors of the economy, and the discourses which surround these, and by the politics of migration. Moreover, the national state still strongly shapes the operating environment for firms, even in face of globalisation, as well as the conditions of entry, and the social and labour market integration of migrants, and their employability. Firms, or more precisely their associations, are one of the main contributors to the national discourses about migration. They are heterogeneous, and the requirements of farming are likely to be very different to those of the health service or say biotechnology. However, there has been a relatively generalised shift to greater emphasis on flexibility, even if the extent and precise nature of this remains contested. Migrants can feature prominently in relation to firm strategies that seek to build competitiveness around different forms of flexibility. This has implications for the employability of migrants in terms of the types of jobs available to them, and the propensity of employers to prefer migrant to non-migrant workers. There are therefore wider employability implications for the labour force as a whole, as well as for migrants. Finally, while migration can be one way in which individuals respond to employability constraints in their country of origin, it can also be a positive strategy to add to their CVs, and a valuable learning opportunity.
Outcomes do not always match aspirations and expectations. This is highlighted by the question of whether migration functions as a stepping stone or a form of entrapment in the labour market. The answer is conditional, for there are differences in relation to age, gender, ethnicity and skills. These reflect the ways in which the notions of ascription, acceptability and suitability inform the ways in which firms, and fellow workers, approach the employment of migrant workers: their recruitment, allocation, promotion, and co-learning. Faced with barriers in the primary labour market, many migrants have sought jobs in the secondary or ethnic enclave labour markets. These provide contrasting learning and employability outcomes.

Finally, this chapter has explored the usefulness of employability as concept for understanding the relationship between migration and employment. First, and most obviously, it tells us about the labour market experiences of migrants – whether in quantitative or qualitative terms. Secondly, it opens up issues about social equity, in terms of the experiences of migrants v non-migrants and amongst migrant groups. Thirdly, the employability outcomes of migration have to be understood not in terms of a single act of migration, but of a possible cycle or cycles of migration. The most positive reading of this is that labour market entrapment in the destination country may turn out to be a stepping stone to occupational mobility in the return country. However, a more negative reading may be that migration can lead to labour market entrapment in the destination country, combined with little prospect of enhancing employability in the country of origin, especially when length of service or social connections are the drivers of career enhancement in the latter. Fourthly, the relationship between migration and employability has to be seen as multi-faceted, involving not only the lead migrant but also trailing migrants, as well as the non-migrant family members whose employability may be changed by the availability of remittances to invest in their education.
In all these instances, we need to take a longitudinal perspective, to fully understand how the relationship between migration and employability is played out over the life course.
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