Processes of migration and settlement are complex and life-changing for those involved. They entail risks, emotions and transformation, loss and empowerment, disruptions and growth. In no way are they ordinarily linear, cause-effect events and trajectories. As a result, conceptual and empirical accounts can only try to do justice to the main milestones of these processes.

This final chapter revisits the five sets of research questions posed in this book, presenting some final analyses and answers to them.

- What are the patterns of identification of the Albanian first and second generation? What is the role of ethnicity in identity construction?
- Do Albanian migrants and their children establish transnational ties with the ‘homeland’ and the Albanian culture? If so, what is the nature of these ties?
- What factors condition identity formation, transnational ties and pathways of integration, for example, the role of the family, the institutional framework and regularization processes?
- What are the patterns of the intergenerational transmission of ethnic identity, integration and transnational ties?
- How do ethnic identity, integration and transnational ties interact? What factors affect these interactions, and how do they ultimately impact on integration?

The first section reviews migration research in terms of links between identities, integration and transnational ties. Reflecting the general structure of the book, subsequent sections summarize and elaborate on findings regarding ethnic identity, integration, transnational ties and intergenerational transmission. The final section reconsiders theoretical assumptions related to identification, transnational ties and integration, and the concepts of agency, power and capital, demonstrating interconnections between identification, integration and transnational ties. As the main goal of this research was the study of integration, the book concludes with a reinterpretation of integration within the framework of agency, power and capital, and mobility, as contingent on time and space. The chapter rounds off with some remarks on the wider implications of research in this field, including reflections on the integration of Albanian migrants and their descendants, and on minority studies in general.
In short, it calls for a reappraisal of the purpose of social science research and the extent to which political agendas and the topics leading public discourse guide research and migration scholarship. Referring to the concept of the ‘second generation’, this book is critical of notions that may help to reproduce social divisions and ideologies that are not based on an egalitarian philosophy.

6.1 Links Between Identity, Integration and Transnational Ties

The way that the interactions between identification, integration and transnationalism are presented in the literature has been affected by academic ideologies and paradigms. Wimmer and Glick Schiller (2002) warn against a groupist way of thinking in viewing and studying migrant transnational social fields. They maintain that the term ‘community’ in the study of transnationalism has been ambiguously used as standing for sets of networks, without questioning the importance of ethnicity and a collective memory in their creation and maintenance. In turn, according to Glick Schiller (2004), development of assimilation as the master concept to explain immigrants’ integration neglects the role of transnational ties, despite a recognition since the early days of migration research that many immigrants learn to identify with their ancestral land only after they settled in the receiving country. Similarly, multiculturalism makes no reference to transnational ties, although it acknowledges the persistence of cultural differences and identities among some segments of immigrant populations, even in the post-migration generations. Although both the new assimilation theory and the segmented assimilation approach acknowledge the role of the country and context of origin in their discussions of migrants’ integration or lack of integration in the host country, it was only after the 1990s that transnational migration scholars added migrants’ transnational engagement as a third perspective in these conversations (Levitt and Jaworsky 2007).

Three main assumptions have framed the relationship between ethnic identity, integration and transnational ties. The first relates to classic assimilation theory—that migrants ultimately assimilate into the host society’s culture (Gans 1992). Very little theorizing has referred to mobility and cosmopolitanism. The second assumption is that assimilation and the maintenance of ethnic identity and transnational ties can coexist, thus they are not necessarily mutually exclusionary processes (Itzigsohn and Saucedo 2002; Levitt and Waters 2002). Gans (1997) maintains that ethnic identity is even compatible with assimilation, taking the case of ethnic activists who live public ‘ethnic’ lives, but assimilated private ones. This argument points to Vertovec’s (2009, p. 80) presentation of the relationship between transnationalism and integration not as a zero-sum game. Various modes or components of each of these constructs can be selectively combined by migrants. Gans’s ideas on acculturation and relationships with other constructs are also in line with recent developments on the role of culture and immigrants’ assimilation. Levitt (2005) maintains that early on researchers were more interested in the process of immigrant incorporation and
paid little attention to the cultural elements that were transformed along the way. Rather, culture and cultural influences were studied under the term ‘ethnicity’ and, with the latter’s decline, the role of culture was rather ignored.

As the immigration literature shows, historically the process of identification with and involvement in the host societies has gone hand-in-hand with engagement in transnational spaces. Trajectories are found to include different patterns of integration into different layers of the receiving society’s hierarchies, or variously labelled upward and downward mobility and ethnic enclave embeddedness, which apply to both immigrants and their descendants (Joppke and Morawska 2003).

Consequently, nowadays the discussion of transnationalism is closely related to the concept of ethnic identity or with patterns and processes of integration. Yeoh et al. (2003) point to developments in the field of transnationalism as being focused, firstly, on the shape of transnationality—its edges and the processes and relations that constitute them—and secondly, on what constitutes identity formation and identity politics in transnational social spaces. On this second point, Vertovec (2001) maintains that many migrants’ transnational networks of exchange and participation are grounded upon a perceived common identity. Dahinden (2009) finds that ethnicization and type of identification are related to migration history and reasons for emigrating. The act of migrating and motives related to it appear to strengthen ethnic belonging, giving rise to a kind of uniculturalist transnational subjectivity. Other research relates mobility and transnationalism with the role of family and kin, although the role of the latter is still very understudied. Concentrating on gender, Pessar and Mahler (2003) show that kin and friendship circles that stretch beyond borders continue to impact people’s gender and social positionality.

The third framework assumption is that the process of integration is associated with different patterns of immigrant transnationalism, implying that the two processes proceed in parallel but at unlike pace. These different patterns of transnationalism are also marked among migrants of different socio-economic status and operate similarly at the local level of integration (Dahinden 2009). In particular, exclusion and disadvantage are thought to be related to transnational orientation. From its inception, the new immigrant transnationalism was conceptualized as a strategy of resistance ‘from below’ that members of marginalized and underprivileged racial or ethnic groups posed against the hegemonic powers of nation-states that regulated both their economic and political activities and conditioned their symbolic activities and commitments. However, the way that different migrant groups have reacted towards disadvantage has varied. They have combined strategies of challenging their status, retreating to their transnational identities and even adopting the dominant society’s negative stereotypes of themselves (Joppke and Morawska 2003). Elements of this last strategy are observed among Albanians in Italy and Greece (King and Mai 2008, p. 208, 209).

A final point is that most of the literature on the interactions between identity, integration and transnationalism draws on the experiences of the first generation. However, as pointed out by Portes (1999), the most dynamic part of the interaction between ethnic identity, integration and transnational ties takes place in the children of migrants, especially as regards socio-cultural integration. Following this line of
argument, this chapter presents the main findings of the current research, addressing each main research question in turn.

### 6.2 Ethnic Identity

The role of ethnicity in identification processes among Albanian migrants and their children was listed as the first unknown of this project. The question of what role ethnicity plays in migrant identification was then related to the research summarized in Chap. 2 on ethnic identity as a main factor in the integration of migrants in various situations worldwide. Related to the particular group under study here (Albanians), researching the role of ethnicity is even more important since previous research on other ethnic groups has suggested that widespread discrimination and stigmatization of the first generation could be interpreted as bequeathing a negative ‘legacy’ to the second generation. Chapter 2 analysed the identification processes of the first and the second generation of Albanian migrants, taking a broad approach towards the understanding of these processes and examining the effect that ethnicity has on them.

The experience of the Albanian first generation and that of the Albanian-origin teenagers in this study indicates that the specific ethnicity characteristic of an ethnic group is not—in this case—the central frame of reference that affects identity processes. As Barth (1969, p. 14) observed, there seems to be a difference between the process of self-ascription to an ethnic group, and the experience, and especially the performance, of an ethnic identity. In the current research, the choice (or not) of the ethnic label and articulations of belongingness seem to be rational and to change over time, depending on an evaluation of opportunities in the home and the host country, and the host society’s politicization of ethnicity and its attitude towards immigrants.

Therefore, the references to ethnicity, at least when primordial ethnicity is considered, seem to be instrumental and conditioned by its centrality in the host societies’ context. The patterns of identification processes, for both the first and the second generation, are context-bound and shaped by factors operating at different levels, related to the structural features of the host society and the characteristics of the immigrant group: the institutionalization of sharp symbolic boundaries by the dominant group and the politicization of the ‘other’; the positioning and the relative size of the migrant group; the mode and stage of incorporation of the first generation; and different sources of social capital interacting at different levels, especially within the family. As evidenced throughout this, these factors intersect with class (high skilled and low skilled, more or fewer years of education) and gender (see Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1992).

As a result, the blending of cultures—an expectation one would have when researching second-generation teenagers—is not the general main trend when the Albanian teenagers’ identification is concerned. Although hybrid identities appear to be under construction, the recognition of such identities is discouraged because of
stigmatization of the Albanian culture in the everyday environment and denial of full membership and belongingness to the host society and culture.

Albanians’ cultural repositioning as a group in a host society and the above-mentioned strategies of migrants and their children can be related to the structure of Albanian ethnic identity, as discussed in Chap. 2. Scholars point to historical primacy, cultural homogeneity and indifference towards religion as ‘myths’ of Albanian identity, employed symbolically by the Albanian diaspora in its historical struggles to build a national ideology (Malcolm 2002). Others see Albanian ethnic identity as based on the honour of the family and kinship and on respect for one’s given word, while considering the lack of a single common religion to be a historical obstacle to a strong ethnic identity (Dingo 2007), referring thus to a more micro-level ethnicity. However, rather than attributing these identification patterns to essentialized traits of identity, in the case of these settling and integrating migrants and their descendants, identification is affected by the ‘other’, or the native mainstream, which has a privileged power position in the host country and an affirmed and advantageous positioning at a national and international level. This positioning provides a positive signifier to the identity ambivalence and fragility, encouraging thereby an assimilatory form of integration.

6.3 Integration

The study of integration, seen in relation to ethnic identity, was the main focus of the TIES project, from which this book’s research was drawn in its broadest sense (but not in its methodological or empirical detail). A major hypothesis underlying the comparative approach of the TIES programme of research is that different contexts within Europe impact on the integration of the second generation in a different way to produce different outcomes. Chapter 3 focused on the integration dynamics both of the first-generation Albanian migrants and of their children. Integration was conceptualized as a process rather than a state. While certain factors such as, for example, regularization schemes, the institutional environment and the media were expected to impact on integration, as other research in the field has shown, the inductive approach of this research uncovered other patterns and outcomes. Furthermore, this research has added value because it studies integration across two generations at the same time, as well as in three cities, each located in a different country, adding a comparative dimension.

Important differences were found in integration between the different groups and sites and between the structural and socio-cultural dimension. The first and the second generations differ in terms of their tendency and expectation to integrate and in the sectors of the host society to which they strive to belong. The different policy frameworks and institutional arrangements indeed appear to be important factors affecting the integration of both the first and the second generation, justifying the ‘comparative integration context theory’ (Crul and Schneider 2010, p. 1249). In terms of different dimensions of integration, structural integration is the main goal.
of the first-generation migrants, whereas the second generation is geared more towards the dimension of social integration, seen through socialization, friendship circles and host-country youth culture. This latter trend (socio-cultural integration) could be the focus of future research on the integration of youth of immigrant origin, since as Glytsos (2005) points out, social integration affects structural integration and vice versa.

It also appears that the relative and absolute size of the Albanian immigrant community is an important factor in the emergence of stigmatization and discrimination at a macro level and the formation of stereotypes that block interactions at a micro level. In Greece, and for some time also in Italy, Albanians were the largest immigrant group, while in Britain they are a small group. Following Esser’s (2004) theory of integration on the basis of relative and absolute size of the immigrant group, and also Barth’s (1969) ecological model, this differentiating fact alone likely played an important role in the way they were perceived in these host countries and the characteristics of the respective inter-ethnic boundaries. At the two southern sites, in the face of bright boundaries, assimilation into the host society was attempted by means of an individual boundary-crossing strategy, but was obstructed by the exclusive nature of ethnic identity as developed in the public discourse in the host societies. This exclusivity is especially marked in the Greek case. As Dümmler et al. (2010, p. 34) conclude:

> [I]f symbolic boundaries are widely agreed upon and institutionalised through reified ideas about culture, nations, tradition and gender relations, then minority groups have to deal with social boundaries that assume a kind of natural and objectified character. This in turn renders it impossible to blur, cross or shift the boundaries.

Similarly, Wimmer (2008), observing earlier developments in the literature, rightly notes that boundary-crossing can be made even more difficult by the dominant groups’ sealing their boundary against trespassers. At the two southern sites, the problematic Albanian ethnic identity was instrumentalized and stigmatized in order to bolster the ‘purity’ of the respective national identities.

In this research the politicization of ethnicity appears to have reinforced the basis of social exclusion; religion counts as the main element on which the racialization of minorities is constructed. For Albanians it is not so much their ‘Islamic’ identity for which they are vilified, for—as we saw—Albanians wear their religious heritage lightly. Rather, it is their non-belonging to the hegemonic, national religions of Greek Orthodoxy in Greece and Roman Catholicism in Italy. The cases of Greece and Italy thus show the institutionalization of bright boundaries or sharp symbolic categorizing distinctions based on religion, citizenship and language (Alba 2005; Lamont and Molnar 2002). Therefore, while national belonging at an international level is increasingly defined in terms of civic participation (Tzanelli 2006) and in transnational studies single loyalty to the nation-state and the consequent pressure on immigrants to assimilate is regarded as a thing of the past (Glick Schiller et al. 1995, p. 51), this is not yet the case in the new immigration countries in the Southern Europe. In turn, multicultural organization and specific policies in London seem to tone down salient expressions of discrimination and create social and institutional spaces for people of immigrant origin to integrate. Nevertheless, the class distinctions and the parallel societies created by the faults of multiculturalism
(Johnson 2007) make Albanians part of the struggle of minorities in London to join the native mainstream, by counting on their racial invisibility.

Otherwise, the Albanian-origin teenagers show a weak ‘ethnic agency’ to implement strategies that target the location of existing boundaries or to modify their meaning by challenging the hierarchical order of ethnic categories. The boundaries are externally erected, and strategies that require a group’s ethnic action are not distinguishable. More visible is the tendency towards boundary-crossing and repositioning, performed at an individual level and accompanied by an indifference towards co-ethnics, referring to the negatively articulated ‘Albanianness’ as a reason for distancing. When positioning themselves along ethnic and social boundaries, external categorization and identification by others are the main frames referred to by Albanian-origin teenagers, although there are differences between the middle- and lower-class second generations, with the former being more autonomous in their inclination towards the retention of the culture of their country of origin (see also Morawska 2003, p. 157). This also reminds us that, in contrast to what US authors maintain, the operation of structural factors can have a reverse effect on ethnic identification. In the absence of ethnic agency, a structural factor such as discrimination can weaken rather than strengthen the vitality of the ethnic group (Waters 1990). Furthermore, although discrimination is an important factor hampering integration, this research shows that the role of the family, the educational system and micro-level socialization can significantly enhance patterns of integration.

It is important to distinguish between the integration strategies of the two generations. In the case of the second generation, we see a different perception of the space in which they integrate. The literature on the second generation’s integration developed in the USA has emphasized ethnicity, while European scholars have developed models that concentrate on the institutional aspects of different national contexts in Europe, without giving any rationale for the indirect exclusion of ethnicity and culture. The element of space has appeared rather scarcely in literature on the first generation, and mainly in terms of their transnational ties and practices. In the case of the second generation, Christou (2011) relates space and locality to experiences of return to the homeland. However, to date, no research on the second generation has made any mention of the role of space in terms of integration in the ‘host’ country.

The second generation appears to be more engaged in discourses on city identity and culture and more observant towards the qualities of space and beauty, which affect feelings of belongingness. Cosmopolitan orientation, predisposition towards mobility and appreciation of diversity are much more evident among the second generation. This represents their different understanding of the nation-state as a ‘unit’ of integration. However, the cosmopolitan orientation could also be linked to age-related attitudes and aspirations. Research on young people has shown that the emergence of the youth as a social category is consonant with Western modernization. As a result, tendencies towards experimentation, hedonistic consumption and mobility are considered important markers of teenager identity (Kjeldgaard and Askegaard 2006). It should be mentioned nevertheless that while this research contributes to the literature on new immigrants in Europe by including both the first and the second generation, future studies should extend this focus to other regions and groups.
6.4 Transnational Ties

Transnational ties were treated in-depth in Chap. 4. According to the literature, transnationalism and integration are not exclusive phenomena; they coexist and take place with different relationships and pace in different contexts and across different immigrant groups. This research investigated the establishment and performance of transnational ties of both the first and the second generation and the intergenerational transmission of these ties between the two.

Transnational ties were found to develop along with the process of settlement in the host country. Nevertheless, transnational ties do not develop in isolation from the bumpy developments in the receiving and home country and family and kin politics. In contrast to a large body of research on transnationalism, this study found transnational ties to fade or be disrupted by tensions in transnational social fields. These findings contrast especially with studies on families and transnationalism that support the persistence of family and kin networks and of ethnic solidarity. For example, Lima (2001, p. 91) maintains that ‘the transnational family is buffered by its extensive social networks, allowing the transnational experiences to form a fluid continuum rather than a radical divide compartmentalising life into two separated worlds’. The contrast is even more striking with studies pointing to a centrality of migration in families’ identities and ethos, resting on a basis of loyalty towards the family back home (Chamberlain 2005, pp. 64–66). Instead, rather more akin to what Levitt (2009) observes, the transnational ties of Albanian immigrants and their children expose the moral disjunctures between migrants and those remaining behind, since each group relies on different cultural references.

Other researchers have picked up on the role of kin and the pressure they exert on transnational networks, although not in relation to return visits. Glick Schiller (2004, pp. 461–462) observes that studies of transnationality should take into account the contradictions and disparities within transnational social fields and focus on the intersections of kin and local and national institutions. This finding on the role of kin and its impact on transnational ties is reiterated by Carling (2008, p. 1474):

[T]he differences and tensions between the two groups must be taken seriously. When transnationalism coexists with ever greater barriers to migration, there is a danger of obscuring these frictions through a focus on hybridity and flux and an abandonment of the traditional binary of origin and destination.

There is thus a need to focus on cultural changes under way in the sending countries and within immigrant families which may lead to redefinitions of cultural norms. In a broader sense, these findings support a research emphasis on the role of culture in transnational engagements and experiences, seen now in relation to micro-level interactions and migrants’ interpersonal ties, without overlooking the national and transnational structures that condition migratory movements (Olwig 2003).

In terms of adaptation in the host country and migrants’ transnational orientation, this study’s findings contrast with research that has associated a high degree of discrimination in the receiving country with reactive transnationalism (Itzigsohn and Saucedo 2002) or a tendency towards engagement in activities that reaffirm
migrants’ collective identity and open up ‘entrepreneurial enclave’ opportunities for economic prosperity (Faist 2000a; Popkin 1999, p. 232). While ‘reactive transnationalism’ is not the case, ‘linear transnationalism’ and ‘resource-based transnationalism’ (Itzigsohn and Saucedo 2002, p. 789) are common among Albanian migrants and their children in the three cities. Experiences of discrimination in the receiving country were shown to disrupt transnational visits and lead some in the second generation to distance themselves from transnational ties, since migrants’ ethnic identification is linked to their proneness to visit the homeland, while transnational orientation is maintained or rejected on the basis of migrants’ self-identification and identification by others and their perception of homeland (Leichtman 2005, p. 281).

These insights also point to the existence of variation in transnational engagement according to factors such as gender, social class, migration channel, legal status, economic means and migration and settlement history, often combined with factors related to community structure, gendered patterns of contact and political circumstances in the homeland (Pessar and Mahler 2003; Vertovec 2009). The length of stay in the receiving country also matters (Dahinden 2009). But instead of talking of increase or decrease we should concentrate on the redefinition of transnational ties by both immigrants and their countries of origin.

Again related to capital, this study shows that transnational orientation and experience differ between the skilled and unskilled migrants and their children. This resonates with previous research, which has shown that transnational ties and cosmopolitan orientation can vary according to class (Kothari 2008).

Whether referring to transnationals, translocals, cosmopolitans, hybrids, creoles, *hommes des confins*, postnationals or anything else, we have to be aware that there are different personal and institutional subject positionings vis-à-vis nation, ethnicity, culture and class, that multicultural and intercultural practices … may take many different forms, and that there is no magical state, accessible through transmigration, which allows people readily to escape national, ethnic and cultural rootedness. (Grillo 2007, p. 212, 213)

Attitudes towards return are another important element analysed under transnational ties. In previous research, intention to return has been examined mainly as a factor affecting migrants’ contribution to the home country (see, e.g., Duvall 2004). The current study found attitudes towards return to be developed through a transnational understanding and evaluation of opportunities in both home and host country, thus also throwing light on integration patterns. This research findings presented here offer powerful evidence of the key importance of the transnational paradigm in analysing attitudes towards return (King 2000). The literature on migration and return is responding slowly, with literature on transnationalism, migration and mobility developing along separate paths. As Byron and Condon (2008, p. 231) put it, ‘the return migration narrative, as we may call it, is often represented as fixed, yet the study of successive generations of migrants and returnees at different points in time reveals a dynamic system constantly nourished by information flows’. Future research could elaborate on this aspect of transnational ties by including attitudes towards return as part of research on transnationalism and integration. More research could also focus on the role of locality on integration and transnationalism and the cosmopolitan orientation of the second generation: these being insights that emerged particularly during the field work in Florence.
6.5 Intergenerational Transmission

Inclusion of intergenerational transmission in this study’s research design reflects the need to consider how the two generations interact and impact on each other’s identification, integration and transnational ties while they settle in the host country. As such, this study responds to the current gap in research on intergenerational transmission, especially through a qualitative methods approach (Attias-Donfut et al. 2012).

In terms of content, the process of intergenerational transmission consists both of intergenerational discontinuities and linear transmission. For example, parents’ lack of interest in transmitting the Albanian language and the second generation’s autonomous development of religiosity constitute cases of intergenerational discontinuity. Moreover, the intergenerational transmission process is far more complex than the one-way transmission (parents to children) which is embodied in most standard thinking and research on the topic. The current research showed intergenerational transmission to be bidirectional, although the intensity, mediation and content differ for transmission from parents to children and from children to parents. This is in line with findings on intergenerational transmission outside of migration research, which finds parents’ role and influence to be stronger than that of the teenagers (see, e.g., Pinquart and Silbereisen 2004); but the reverse process is by no means absent.

Far from being a quantifiable process, intergenerational transmission appears to be complex and fragmented, changing over time and involving redefinitions of concepts, values and practices and their importance by both parents and children. This process is conditioned by parents’ capital (human, social, cultural, etc.) and moderated by discrimination. Means and strategies of transmission are focused on counteracting stigmatization and lack focus on ethnic identity and culture of origin, in favour of achieving financial security and equipping the second generation with universal values and lifelong lessons. The process of intergenerational transmission is characterized by negotiations and strategies that counteract the disadvantageous status as migrants and as a stigmatized group. The dynamics and content of this transmission appear to be positively affected by the empowerment and accumulation of various forms of capital by the parents, who aim to ensure that the second generation experiences upwards mobility. There are, however, significant differences across the three cities. Due to the familiarity and affinity of the first generation with Italian culture in general, and language in particular, intergenerational transmission there is less conflictual and fragmented than in the other two settings and groups.

Discrimination appears to be an important factor that disrupts intergenerational transmission, especially in the case of ethnic identity and transnational ties. From a theoretical perspective, Esser (2004) holds a similar view. He maintains that structure—that is, institutional and cultural factors at a national level—are the most important determinants of intergenerational transmission, taking as example the educational system. He attributes a major role in the process to generalized forms of capital, not restricted to ethnic limits, and especially to human capital in the form of technical and administrative knowledge.
The findings of this research indicate that intergenerational transmission is significantly affected by the first generation’s particular patterns of identification, integration and transnational ties. For a hybrid identity to be constructed and acknowledged by the second generation it is important that a healthy intergenerational transmission of ethnic identity and transnational ties takes place. Although early-life experiences of discrimination or social acceptance certainly influence the ethnic identification of the teenagers, emotional and social support, alongside the capital transmitted by the family, cushion discrimination and enable teenagers to draw on different cultural resources during adolescence and later in life.

6.6 Re-interpreting Integration: Agency, Capital and Power

Finally, this book has dealt with the relationship between ethnic identity, integration and transnational ties, the factors that affect this interaction, and its impact on integration. The findings presented in Chaps. 1 through 5 confirm that identity, integration and transnationalism interact with each other. Most previous research, however, does not explain why some identities become salient and are activated in the transnational social context (Levine 1999, p. 168).

The Albanians in Thessaloniki, Florence and, increasingly, London have now completed the ‘golden’ first 5–10 years of immigration and settlement, and have put plans for return ‘on hold’, partly to secure a better education and potentially better life prospects for their children. Indeed, the successful settlement and integration of the children is an important goal and also an indicator to which the first generation constantly refers to when evaluating the outcomes of their migration project. The lack of resistance towards discrimination and the forced assimilation experienced in the early years of settlement (especially in the two Southern European sites), alongside the change of attitudes over the years, could well be explained within the framework of capital and power. Barth (1969, p. 28) does not elaborate extensively on this element, but senses an ‘anomalous’ general feature of ethnic identity as a status: while ascription rests mainly on origin and commitment, the performance of the roles required to realize identity is conditioned on certain assets.

Similarly, the current research found ethnic identification to be significantly related to the distribution of resources. According to Levine (1999), it is common for social and cultural factors that become progressively established and elaborated upon by being used for describing identities and social situations to be related to differential access to resources. This differentiation is thought to be inevitably related to conflict and ideological perspectives, which in turn contributes to ethnicity becoming institutionalized. Jenkins (1997) observes that the relationship between

---

1 As mentioned earlier, a significant number of migrants and their families, primarily from Greece, have returned to Albania since the beginning of the economic crisis in 2008 (when field work for this book was carried out).
the distribution of resources on the one hand, and penalties of identification on the other, is characterized by a combination of domination and resistance, taking place in both the internal and external dimensions of identification. Identity in these processes is an important criterion for distribution, while the distribution patterns are in turn significant in the constitution of identity. Furthermore, Barth (1994) maintains that ethnic competition for resources and all other ethnic processes can only be understood by referring to and including the state as an important actor in the provision of public goods and the regulation of the lives and movements of groups and categories of people.

Experiencing migration as the only way to improve their existence, and then facing discrimination, made Albanian migrants in the three countries unable to draw or rely on any resources, while experiencing harsh identification penalties. Therefore, the ‘shift’ among Albanian migrants towards ethnic identification also reflects the relevance to them and their understanding of generic principles of hierarchical social differentiation—and how access to economic resources conditions the ability of different actors to categorize others (Jenkins 1997). It also shows that access to economic resources obstructs or enables a group’s collective ethnic agency and its ability to define its own ethnic identity. Todd (2005, p. 452) explains identity change in terms of three variables: existing identity structure, power relations and resource distribution. Due to the micro-level ethnicity that Albanian migrants display and all of the structural conditions they have faced in the host countries, it is migrant and parental identities that characterize the first generation. From their narratives, it seems that the ethnic identification of their incorporation strategies is indeed the realization of their migration project: a better life for them and a brighter future for their children. This strongly impacts the individual boundary-crossing strategies of their descendants.

The contraction and transformation of identity can be better understood in light of research which has shown that agency and culture, and all the interrelations of which they are a part, are marked by the notion of power. As Ratner (2000, p. 430) maintains, the individualist notion of agency as based only on personal meanings ignores the barriers agents encounter in their struggles for a sense of equality, democracy and fulfilment. A common view in the literature recognizing power as a factor shaping the social world is that people are situated in different social locations, which are influenced by power hierarchies, including those attached to gender (Pessar and Mahler 2003). Power hierarchies are also taken as the mechanisms that make individuals into subjects through the imposition of categories and their impact on actors’ individuality (Foucault 1982, p. 781). In turn, power and capital are interrelated, with the possession of capital resting on the basis of power (Bourdieu 1989). It is for this reason that the emergence of mimicry—discussed by other researchers as a sign of losing oneself in favour of social integration (Romania 2004)—at this stage of integration contains a strong element of intentionality (Todd 2005). The accumulation of capital strengthens a sense of autonomy, which in turn makes mimicry itself a strategy of integration informed by new competence in understanding social hierarchies and identity politics. These findings are in line with the revival of interest in ‘power’ in identity studies.
To create a theory of a social self as constituted and constitutor of social life, which situates individual beingness with multiple simultaneous various connected interrelationships, we need to also acknowledge that relationality does not mean equality and that social networks connect us all to institutions linked to various states of unequal power. (Glick Schiller 2012, p. 527)

The inclusion of capital in studies of immigrants’ integration, and that of the second-generation in particular, is not new (see, e.g., Zhou and Bankston 1994), although theories of integration and the limited studies of intergenerational transmission have not yet really acknowledged capital and its relations to power and agency as factors affecting integration. While parents’ insistence on children’s education appeared to be an important factor in this research, as in many other studies of the integration of the second generation (Modood 2004; Zhou 1997b), the main finding here is that capital appears in various forms and at various levels (see also Bankston and Zhou 2002; Coleman 1988) in its impacts on integration. Furthermore, different forms of capital are differently important to the first and the second generation. Financial and human capital appears more important in the case of the first generation, who ascertain through experience that expertise and skills in the workplace will provide more security and increase their agency. As mentioned in Chap. 3, social capital based on individual characteristics that affect socialization, and that derive from peer group networks—an aspect almost completely ignored in the second-generation literature—is very important in immigrant-origin adolescents’ feelings of being integrated. Therefore, the second generation is more appreciative of the social and cultural capital that can be harnessed to create opportunities—for instance, in accessing employment once their education has come to an end.

Mobility and cosmopolitan tendencies among the second generation are one of the most important findings of this research. Where integration is concerned, the dichotomy between homeland and host country was especially emphasized by the second-generation respondents. While, in the case of the first-generation, research often focuses on their migration process and economic dimensions of their lives in the country of settlement, research on the second-generation has often focused on their allegiances, ties and sense of belonging. One reason for this is a common view among scholars of immigration that the integration of the second-generation is a good indicator both of immigrants’ degree of integration and of the more general legacy of contemporary immigration for the receiving societies (Portes 1994; Thomson and Crul 2007).

It is uncommon for the literature on the second-generation to make any reference to cosmopolitanism. One of the few studies to do so, Warikoo (2004), observes a change in the ethnic identification of the Indo-Caribbean second generation in New York and talks about a cosmopolitan ethnicity. One explanation for the emergence of a cosmopolitan ethnicity relates to the alleged influence of the media, causing more fluid identity ‘choices’, changing previous patterns of understandings of race in the USA. Colombo et al. (2009a) introduce cosmopolitan identification as one of the collective identification types among adolescent children of immigrants in Milan, referring to the particularities of the ‘Italian setting’ and lack of institutionalized forms of assimilation. In most of the literature on the second generation, however,
the descendants of migrants are measured against their native peers; what is of interest in this context is whether they retain their parents’ culture or assimilate into the host country’s culture. Not surprisingly, a hyphenated identity—seen as a new identity of the descendants of migrants drawing from the cultures of both the host country and the country of origin (or ‘homeland’) is one of the main findings in the second-generation research (Gans 1994, 1997).

As a result, the ‘social sciences as static’—or the failure of research to recognize the role of mobility—applies especially to studies on the integration and transnational ties of the second generation. Sheller and Urry (2006, p. 208) introduce the mobility paradigm:

> Even while it has increasingly introduced spatial analysis the social sciences have still failed to examine how the spatialities of social life presuppose (and frequently involve conflict over) both the actual and the imagined movement of people from place to place, person to person, event to event.

Only recently has research on second-generation transnational ties identified a difference in the way the second generation establishes and experiences these ties, as compared to the first-generation. According to Leitchman (2005), the criteria that inspire the transnational ties of the later generations are different from the primarily economic and political ones of the first generation of migrants. Other research notes that the transnational behaviour of the second generation is more complex than portrayed to date in the literature. Arguably, the second generation is not looking for a home; neither are they involved in a ‘zero-sum game’ between an attachment to the host country that leads to detachment from the homeland, or vice-versa (Gowricharn 2009, p. 1634). Yet, the relationship of the second-generation to space and locality is rarely studied. Meanwhile, as Graham (2000) points out, there is a need for interdisciplinary studies in the broad field of population studies to integrate understandings of space and place developed in social sciences and beyond.

As discussed in Chap. 4, Albanian-origin teenagers show strong cosmopolitan tendencies and consider the migration of their parents as capital, capital that they further harness through their imaginaries, intentions and plans to be mobile and explore other cultures and places. These findings challenge methodological nationalism to the core; viewing second generations’ integration, transnational ties and identifications through the home-host country dichotomy has served to reify the nation-state and reaffirm said methodological nationalism.

The mythscape of the nation (and of what is seen as ‘home’) is one of the romance of nostalgia—a longing for a lost past and a projection of a restored future purity, which plays off the binaries of past and future and here or there, without acknowledging global connectivity. (Glick Schiller and Salazar 2013, p. 195)

The ‘global connectivity’ cultivated or aspired to by the second generation is testimony to the importance that mobility has in understanding ‘second-generation’ experiences. Since the second generation is seen as the legacy and measure of integration of migrants and minorities in a receiving society, it also brings a new dimension to the study of the nation-state as the potential container of socio-political processes in which those who experience mobility and stasis are involved. The
translocal, transnational and global and cosmopolitan references of these teenagers offer new insights to the study of identity, integration and transnationalism. These references challenge binaries of difference—native and the ethnic ‘other’—in terms of identification and spatial home-host country dichotomies, in terms of integration and transnational ties, which have long dominated social sciences and migration research (Glick Schiller 2012a, b).

Therefore, the integration of the second-generation does not relate directly to their primordial ethnicity. Although the way that primordial ethnicity is articulated in the host country’s discourse affects the way the second generation perceives their culture of origin, it is capital that affects their integration. The two generations give importance to and harness different forms of capital. Nevertheless, both the social and the financial and human capital disposed and transmitted by the parents impact on the second generation’s integration because they enable the second generation to harness more social and cultural capital. The opposite—the lack of such capital—obstructs teenagers’ integration strategies.

Mobility and cosmopolitanism are forms of such capital, existing and harnessed, which, in the case of the descendants of migrants, display significant interrelations with power and agency. This research found that the second-generation teenagers aimed for social mobility through the acquisition of native citizenship, so that they could move away from the ‘migrant’ category. The relation that these processes have with space and place adds another important dimension to this study and to migration research more broadly. However, spatial mobility is the main goal behind the desired citizenship, not least because of the recognition that being mobile is an indicator of ‘belongingness’ vis-à-vis the mainstream, and therefore, of upward social mobility. Here, then, is another important opportunity for future research on the Albanian second-generation: investigating their education-to-work transition, which is usually seen as crucial to the social mobility of people of immigrant or minority origin. The next few years will be a good opportunity to carry out this research, given the cohort-age of the second-generation currently.

Meanwhile, in both generations, the existence of capital appears to increase their autonomy and to affect their perceptions of integration, by making integration in the host society, and the embracing of its culture, more of an option. Capital thus affects the building of boundaries and their permeability. Therefore, the increase in the experience of Albanian migrants, associated with a steady accumulation of resources and capital enabling the gaining of power and vice versa, has caused a significant change in agency; alongside this is a growing knowledge of identity politics and class, and a capacity to recognize symbolic boundaries and the mechanisms that determine them. This process of external identity contestation, followed by self-questioning and hybridization at a later stage, may well constitute the genesis of a delayed ‘reproduction’ of ethnicity in the Albanian diaspora.

Furthermore, although the notions of the second generation and hybridity have been widely related to the broader concept of diaspora, the findings of this book show a more dynamic picture. As mentioned above, although hybrid identities are emerging, they are not explicitly claimed by the first and second generation. As with patterns of mimicry, the attitude towards hybridity is affected by external
categorization, as is the claim of a common homeland. With the accumulation of capital and the gaining of power, which affect the understanding of identity politics and the opportunity structure in the ‘host’ country as well as attitudes towards Albanian identity, there is now a clearer recognition of the connection with others of the same origin in the country where they live—and beyond.

Among Albanian migrants in these three cities, the idea of diaspora as a source of positive identification is thus a recent development, with different features at each of the sites. In London, this idea is rooted in Albanian organizations’ actions towards achieving recognition of the Albanian ‘community’ as one of many ethnic communities in Britain. More symbolically felt is the ‘self-recognition’ among Albanian immigrants in Florence—based on a feeling of permanence and settlement in the receiving country. In turn, a very strong contestation of the Albanian identity in Greece, and the unsettling situation with papers, makes the Albanian community in Thessaloniki oriented towards Albania in less symbolic terms—so the issue of hybridity here is a more ambivalent one. These findings make the concept of diaspora largely irrelevant for the analysis of the identification and settlement patterns of Albanian migrants, in line with other work that discusses the limitations of the concept of diaspora as based on common historical roots and destinies and on internal coherence and unity (Ang 2003; Clifford 1994).

An in-depth study of a cross-generational migration and settlement in different contexts and sites creates an acute awareness that the study of the second generation has been essentialized. The ‘second generation’ is seen as a very particular group in the migration literature, expected to perform, outperform, fail, or assimilate, integrate or cause a ‘Balkanisation’ (Aparicio 2007, p. 1170) of the places where they live. By constructing the ‘second generation’, we reify ethnicity and emphasize the nation-state and its impact, in the definition of identities and also as a frame of reference for immigrants and their descendants. This study shows that the second generation is externally defined, at least culturally speaking, and that second-generation teenagers do not see the ethnicity of their origin as an intrinsic quality of them. More importantly, they make use of all the limited resources at their disposal and beyond, and view their integration processes through broader geographies—showing sometimes a cosmopolitan orientation, but also using localized reference points, such as the school, city or urban neighbourhood.

It is thus important to reflect on the semantics of academic concepts and more so on the way power differentials may be reproduced in the academic discourse. Positionality issues aside, doing work with particularly stigmatized and vulnerable groups presents professional dilemmas, and questions concerning the purpose of such a study are inevitable: ‘We do research in order to help people. I don’t know about you; who are you thinking to help?’ Although this project does not fall into an action research design, its main goal is to give voice to the participants, not least because Albanians have been criminalized and marginalized in the countries in which they live. By leaving the reading, evaluation and interpretation of this research to the academic community, the book ends with a note on the fascinating strength and resilience that Albanian migrants and their children have shown throughout these 20 years of settlement in different European countries, despite facing persistent
adversities. The humility, hope and courage, the significant improvement of their families’ welfare, and the strength of the teenagers contributing to this research (which academics frame into concepts and theories) are a significant and positive story. Paralleling the historical research on other, older, immigrant groups within Europe, such as the Irish or the Italians, this may well be a defining moment in the history of ‘successful’ settlement and assimilation of Albanians in other European countries. Albanian migrants and their children show nothing less than remarkable cultural mechanisms and versatile attitudes towards integration in the ‘host’ country. Is this not what we refer to when we speak about the modern notions of culture, and what European societies expect of immigrants after all?

**Open Access** This chapter is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial License, which permits any noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.