"What Would You Do If You Were to Win the Lottery?" A Qualitative Tool for Overcoming Agency-Structure Issues in Migration Research

Gergely Horzsa

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18778/1733-8077.19.2.05

Keywords:
Acquiescent Immobility; Semi-Structured Interviews; Hypothetical Questions; Fieldwork; Life Aspirations; Migration Aspirations; Internal Migration; Rural Sociology

Abstract: This paper proposes a quasi-standardized hypothetical interview-guide question and demonstrates its applicability in addressing participants' general life aspirations, and, in particular, the embedded migration aspirations. The proposed interview question is related to the hypothesized behavior of participants in the off chance of having won the national lottery. Based on fieldwork results, conducted in rural Hungary between 2014-2019, the paper demonstrates how this question, introduced as a closing question during interviews, may be useful in addressing cultural values and attitudes in an agency-oriented way and with a reduction of perceived structural constraints affecting them. The question was eligible in differentiating between forms of geographical mobility, reflecting some migration-related phenomena that were formerly claimed challenging to be specifically addressed, revealing that pro-migration structural constraints might mask general attitudes to stay among those seemingly opting for emigration, and conversely, structural, restraining-constraints that, in some cases, mask pro-migration attitudes among those seemingly aspiring to stay.

Gergely Horzsa is a junior research fellow at the Center for Social Sciences, Budapest. His field of interest includes questions of rural sociology, development, entrepreneurship, and mobilities. For a decade, he led sociological fieldwork to a dozen localities within Hungary, leading to the successful defense of his dissertation in 2021, as well as to an ever-growing understanding of local societies. Besides his interest in qualitative methodologies, he also participates in community development in practice, and further, as the owner of a newly-formed Hungarian survey enterprise, he also engages in reforming how quantitative methodologies deal with respondents, hopefully leading to data with higher scientific validity.

email address: horzsa.gergely@tk.hu

This paper utilizes the results of an extensive series of qualitative fieldwork to demonstrate the convenience of an employed empirical tool in understanding development-migration interactions within personal narratives. Fieldwork research took place in peripheral rural settlements of Hungary between the period of 2014-2019 and was specifically focused on the investigation of connections between rural development and rural outward mobility prospects, including perceived rural-urban differences. Based on the transcribed 163 semi-structured interviews and responses provided for a quasi-standardized interview question enquiring about the prospective activities of participants if winning the national lottery, this paper aims to explore the "acquiescent immobile" form of mobility, as defined by Schewel (2015; 2019) while describing development-migration interaction.

Following the claims of Halfacree and Boyle (1993), this paper understands migration (geographical mobility) as being embedded in the general life stories (biographies) of participants. According to this viewpoint, migration is not (only) a distinct action within time-space; rather, it is intertwined with a personal understanding of life and personal life goals, as well as the personal understanding of the general societal environment, including social change. Thus, personal considerations about whether to move are, in essence, regarded as statements about the self and are influenced by these individual concepts of the social environment. As a consequence, concrete actions of movement might be considered only a small part of the phenomena of mobility. As in his 2014 paper de Hass—following the approach of Sen (2001) on development as freedom—puts it, migration should be viewed and defined as "the freedom to choose where to live" (de Haas 2014:26). According to the author, two distinguishable forces define this freedom of migration—namely, general life aspirations and opportunity structures, which strongly influence one another. If differentiated based on the absence/presence of these two factors, the forms of migration might be grouped into five major categories (voluntary immobility, voluntary mobility, involuntary immobility, involuntary mobility, and finally, acquiescent immobility).

A major challenge of this paper is to address the measurement of the—empirically most challenging—latter form of mobility. The term "acquiescent immobility" was introduced by Schewel (2015), who grasps with this term a group of people neither having the capacity nor articulating desires to move. Understanding the formulation of acquiescent immobility might be challenging, despite it covering a substantial fraction of migration. This paper provides a potential empirical tool for revealing internal attributes of acquiescent immobility and the behavior of participants labeled acquiescent immobile. Furthermore, with the use of narratives gathered from an extensive series of qualitative fieldwork, the paper demonstrates how, in practice, narratives of opportunity changes and personal aspirations are intertwined. This paper will argue that, by the analysis of general migration responses concerning the 'lottery question,' the methodological problem of separating opportunity structures and opportunity-influenced migration aspirations might—at least partially—be solved.

The paper is structured as follows: A summary of qualitative (non)migration research standpoints will be introduced in the next section, along with a short introduction of theoretical concepts of opportunity-aspiration interactions within

migration research. This section will be followed by describing the lottery question along with the general methodological setting of the fieldwork series and a brief summarizing description of the location, as well as participants. The following chapter will introduce the analytical steps leading to circumscribing acquiescent immobile participants, as well as unique responses provided for the lottery question. The discussion chapter will deal with the general assessment of the fitness of this approach for the analysis of development-migration interactions.

Background

Migration in Qualitative Research

Qualitative migration research is engaged with the understanding of geographical mobility behaviors of individuals, or even groups of people, on the micro-level and is embedded in complex socio-cultural settings. While macro-approach research is focusing mostly on where people move, micro-level investigations might answer questions related to the reasons for mobility, as well as immobility (Etzo 2008). As Halfacree and Boyle (1993) understand migration as a cultural construct, they propose it to be approached as a part of potential (instead of actual) migrants' biographies, including their past, present, and future, rather than as a discrete event within time-space. This understanding of mobility exceeds the rational cost-benefit approach by stating that immobility is as crucial as mobility, and considerations regarding mobility are embedded in the everyday lives of people instead of being a linear course of clean-cut calculation of 'push' and 'pull' factors. Instead, mobility is a cultural construct, as well as a statement of the self's worldview (Halfacree and Boyle 1993). This approach contributed to several qualitative investigations of migration that resulted in an ever deeper understanding of human mobility considerations (Findlay and Li 1997; Ní Laoire 2000; Schäfer 2010; Corbett 2013; Nugin 2014; Stockdale 2014).

Perceiving migration on the micro-level set path to analyses of the matter of immobility, which does not only concern the selection effect of migration, usually explained by personal characteristics (Etzo 2008). Instead, by understanding migration as a cultural construct, immobility and mobility became the two mutually non-exclusive sides of the same phenomenon, and research on immobility multiplies. In his work, Carling (2002) argues that reasons for immobility are rarely assessed, and even when they are, reasons lying in the scarcity of opportunities are mixed with reasons of a lack of personal will. Nevertheless, a large share of people is immobile not because push-pull effects are at a low level but despite it being high. The author refers to them as the involuntarily immobile and suggests that migration abilities and aspirations be assessed parallelly.

Recognizing the under-theorized nature of migration research, de Haas (2014) develops a possible general theory that might be useful in addressing several forms of migration phenomena under several circumstances. To be more precise, what the author proposes is not a new general theory for migration but rather the application and arrangement of former theories in migration research. He offers (de Haas 2014) a contextual theory for migration, or a "conceptual eclecticism," which connects particular research results to more general phenomena. Migration, according to the author, should be regarded as an intrinsic part of social change (rather than a phenomenon affecting or being affected by it). The proposal builds on the

development idea of Sen (2001) and the concept of involuntary mobility of Carling (2002). As much as Sen equates development with freedom, de Haas, as mentioned, regards migration as freedom (and thus, social change and development).

Migration is regarded as a function of capabilities and aspirations that are intertwined. Here, capabilities stand for negative and positive liberties, as understood by Berlin (1969), whereas aspirations are constituted by general life aspirations and perceived spatial opportunity structures (migration aspirations in a narrower sense). Distinguishing between negative and positive liberties concerning migration provides an opportunity to categorize migration under various circumstances. Therefore, connections could be set between particular research fields and results. On the other hand, the aspiration-capabilities framework is useful to categorize the different forms of migration (and non-migration). This brings together research dimensions and may create a common ground for analyses of different forms of geographical mobility, with the inclusion of those findings that deal with intrinsic forms of migration, as well as both involuntary and "acquiescent" (Schewel 2015) forms of immobility.

Figure 1. The theoretical concept of migration typology in the aspirations-capabilities continuum

		Migration capabilities	
		Low	***High***
Migration aspirations (intrinsic and/or instrumental)	***High***	**Involuntary immobility** (Carling 2002) (feeling 'trapped')	**Voluntary mobility** (most forms of migration)
	Low	**Acquiescent immobility** (Schewel 2015)	**Voluntary immobility** *and* **Involuntary mobility** (eg refugees, 'soft deportation')[13]

Source: de Haas 2014:32.

Qualitative Migration Research: Aspirations and Place Attachment

Geographical mobility aspirations are a widely discussed topic in both international and intra-national settings, employing various statistical (Garasky 2002), survey (Hodge 1985; Bjarnason and Thorlindsson 2006; Thissen et al. 2010; Coulter and Scott 2015; Van Mol 2016), and qualitative tools. Intra-national investigations address the factors of the urbanization and counter-urbanization processes, often reflecting—besides wage and career differences—the cultural construction of urban and rural areas appearing in the narratives of both urban and rural dwellers. Results from such qualitative research on migration aspirations witness a large

influence of education on the outmigration attitudes of the youth. This, however, concerns not only the level of education but, as both Corbett (2005; 2013) and Dabasi-Halász, Lipták, and Horváth (2017) point out, also the institutions themselves. Rural outwards mobility can be regarded as a source and also answer to Beck's understanding of risk, which is demonstrated in an East-West German context by Schäfer (2010). Furthermore, as it unfolds from the narratives presented by Corbett (2013), in traditional rural communities, the cultural norm of progress and education, and locality, family, and other traditional norms are present in parallel, often causing conflicts for young people in migration decision-making. If understood as a statement of the self on its identity, as Fielding (1992) proposes, migration decision-making unfolds in rural dwellers' narratives as strongly connected with not only vertical mobility but also the general cultural value of progress in life. Thus, in rural mobility narratives, 'leaving' is a strong synonym for 'moving forward' rather than 'moving away,' and the opportunity of physical returning never ceases to be an option (Findlay and Li 1997; Ní Laoire 2000; Nugin 2014). This invokes, once again, the difference between attachment and actual geographical location, where the attachment can be reinforced by the idea of the rural idyll, even though, in several cases, migration seems to be influenced by ad hoc life events (Stockdale 2002; 2014).

Place attachment is an often recurring concept in constructivist qualitative research on migration. Although describing complex cultural attitudes, the various approaches include the ones employing quantitative tools. For instance, Heleniak (2009) analyzes an industrial region of post-socialist Russia by employing statistical data analysis and survey methodology to find a relatively great level of attachment to the region contrary to the economic decline. Survey methodology was employed by Barcus and Brunn (2009) and (Raymond, Brown, and Weber 2010) for a US (Kentucky) and Australian social environment, respectively. The surveys consisted of both questions regarding general attitudes about given areas and very direct questions and statements about place attachment ("I am very attached to..."). Qualitative research might grasp this question in more detail, for instance, by revealing interactions between attachment to the place and the local community (Lokocz, Ryan, and Sadler 2011; Baldwin, Smith, and Jacobson 2017). Wiborg (2004) conducts interview-based research with secondary school students with rural origins and finds a great variety of environmental, social, and cultural elements used by them when discussing their relationship with their respective rural localities. Similarly, Morse and Mudgett (2017) analyze the phenomenon of "homesickness" in those Vermonters living in other parts of the US. Other scholars emphasize the role of social connections and social capital in attachment to place (Milbourne and Kitchen 2014).

Acquiescent Immobility

The concept of acquiescent immobility is introduced by Schewel (2015) in a working paper on Senegalese youths' international (im)mobility aspirations. The author refers to the term as one challenging the common standpoint of classical migration theories expecting everybody with potential gains from migration to, at least, aspire to emigrate. In contrast to these beliefs, the author finds persons neither having the capacity nor articulating desires to move. This is defined as "the state of preferring to stay in one's homeland even though one does not have the capability to migrate. *Acquiescent non-migrants* lack the choice to stay in the same way that a voluntary

non-migrant, with the resources to migrate, does and yet they, nevertheless, prefer to stay" (Schewel 2015:28). The author finds that around a quarter of those lacking actual means for moving do not desire to move either, and reported reasons echo those ones heard from voluntary immobile participants (such as family ties, religious connections, and patriotic considerations). It is argued to be a concept to challenge classical migration theories by stating that the lack of (financial) capabilities, in many cases, does not result in the desire to balance out this lack by territorial mobility (or only to an extent similar to higher-status people).

Second, however, there is yet another subgroup within the acquiescent immobile category, defined by the interaction between capabilities and aspirations. This is referred to as "adaptive preferences" by Carling and Schewel (2018) and "post hoc rationalization" by Schewel (2015). The idea is that capabilities might affect aspirations through psychological courses and, "in the face of limited migration ability, individuals could react by subconsciously subduing their migration aspirations" (Carling and Schewel 2018:958.). This idea is in alignment with what Sen (2001) argues, namely, that differences in personal freedom or capabilities are crucial to be identified when addressing otherwise similar sociological outcomes. Also, this echoes the arguments of de Haas (2014), too, on the strong interrelations between capabilities and aspirations. These might stress that aspirations among the acquiescent immobile group cannot validly be understood without the parallel assessment of capability structure differences. After all, by analyzing interactions between development and migration aspirations, essentially, the effects on capability structure changes are meant to be measured (capability structures including cultural and social forms of capital, too). The problem is with the analysis of (this, 'pure' form of) acquiescent immobility, as it is easy to be mistaken for voluntary immobility. As Carling and Schewel (2018:958) put this: "Migration aspirations then become even more elusive, for both methodological and theoretical considerations. Within the capability approach, adaptive preferences are widely seen to undermine the value of subjective self-assessments. By extension, one could argue that asking people about migration aspirations is meaningless if they have internalized obstacles to mobility." The exact methodological problem to be solved originates from this argument: how can aspirations to stay be measured if the aspirations themselves are only the product of external circumstances (i.e., lack of opportunities)? This paper argues that enquiring about what participants think they would do in the fictional setting of having won the national lottery might provide one solution to this problem.

Exploring Acquiescent Immobility

The Case of Hungary

To help contextualize the concrete research, a brief description of the Hungarian case might be necessary. The current economic situation of the Hungarian countryside can be understood considering three major tendencies: first, the historical belatedness of industrialization, which resulted in a relatively high ratio of non-urban dwellers and a lower level of urbanization (Enyedi 2011). Second, the automatization in agriculture is in parallel with the regress of the manufacturing industry. And third, the changes in financial redistribution sources.

Authors describe the post-socialist period as an era with a further shrinking of agriculture, for which

reason was that even though several co-operatives have survived the system change, privatization of the lands was happening more rapidly than privatization in any other economic sector (Csite and Kovách 2002). Juhász (2006) describes the political action of land privatization and compensation as an act of taking lands from those making their livings by agrarian production and giving them to those unable to engage in farming. The author's diagnosis on agricultural privatization is echoed by Kovách (2016), who states that as soon as by 1996, 94 percent of all lands were sold and, consequently, around 15 percent of the population became land owners, resulting in land structure stipulated by small holdings. On the other hand, it is stated, too, that two-thirds of all lands were not used by owners and were rented out instead.

In their recent work, Csatári, Farkas, and Lennert (2019) provide a systematic summary of the agriculture-related changes in the economy of the Hungarian countryside. The authors agree with Kovách (2016) when describing the last few decades as the history of continuous concentration and the automatization of Hungarian farm holdings, which is, on the other hand, regarded as the only profitable form of agricultural production. The East European (and Hungarian) countryside became very differentiated in previous decades and in several aspects, and should not be regarded as one (Csite and Kovách 2002; Virág 2010; Kovách 2012; 2016; Csurgó 2013; Váradi 2013; Valuch 2015,). Understanding these differences and variability, several authors have tried to provide category systems for Hungarian villages. The socio-economic differentiation between villages might be explained based on the growing importance of urban-rural connections. Those rural areas being strongly connected (mostly in an infrastructural and economic sense) to larger urban centers are described as being developed, whereas those are mostly smaller villages on the peripheries in which social problems heighten. According to Eurostat, in general, the share of rural dwellers in Hungary, who are at risk of poverty and social exclusion, is twice as high as those living in urban areas. In this sense, Hungary is very similar to other Eastern-European countries, whereas, in the West, the contrary is seen as more prosperous.

On the macro level, after the transition, peripheral micro villages of Hungary are characterized by a decreasing level of the population supporting capacity in the terms of labor opportunities, but depending on their positions in the settlement structure. This general attribute, as Kovács (2008) unfolds, leads to various results and a variation among even the smallest of settlements. According to the author, villages might be marked on a scale leading from those having immobile, segregated but growing populations towards those realigning, integrated villages suffering great population loss during the first decades of the post-socialist period.

On the micro level, these disadvantages might be unfolded through narratives of personal life strategies. Based on a series of interview-based field research, Váradi (2015) examines strategies of the most up-staged population (partially belonging to the Roma ethnic minority). The author considers poverty as a multi-element status including factors of not only the economic and labor market status but also (and mostly originating from economic status) elements of social ties and physical, as well as psychological, well-being.

The Hungarian countryside is characterized by a great and growing variability, even among rural

areas marked by a similar spatial-geographic pattern, such as agglomeration (Kovách, Kristóf, and Megyesi 2006) or peripheral (Kovács 2008) regions. As the rural countryside is populated by up to 70 percent of the Hungarian population, depending on the definition of rural (or non-urban) (Kovách 2012), the social context of rural research is incredibly diverse in the Hungarian case.

Methodology, Field, and Participants

From 2014 to 2019, fieldwork in altogether eight Hungarian, non-agglomeration villages was conducted[1] with the definite aim to address questions of socioeconomic change in rural areas, as well as questions of rural-urban linkages and mobility. Altogether, 163 semi-structured interviews (78 minutes average length) were voice-recorded. This provides around a 211-hour length audio source that was the subject of verbatim transcription. Field variety concerns the villages' migration and labor market tendencies, as well as development (EU-subsidizing) patterns. Four villages belong to those third of all Hungarian agglomeration villages receiving the highest per-capita amount of rural development funds, whereas there are three of all eight villages that receive below-average funds, thus belonging to the least assisted third. Furthermore, the fieldwork was conducted in both villages located nearby Budapest (1-1.5-hour travel time), and those being further.

Even though random sampling was not employed in either of the research, during the fieldwork, the research teams aimed to ask people with different demographic statuses and socioeconomic backgrounds for a response. We also wanted to include people with different roles in the localities, thus, to call employed and unemployed, active and inactive people, employees and entrepreneurs, farmers and service sector employees, NGO members and members of the local administration, priests, students, and retirees proportionately. As a result, interviewees show a variety considering gender and age.

Around half of the interviewees[2] were born locally, whereas the others moved in only later (on average, in their 20s). Among immigrants (people coming locally from other Hungarian settlements), gender ratios are 4:5, with females being overrepresented. The median age of moving into the settlement is 22.5 years among males and 26.0 years among females, suggesting that women are more likely to move in after marriage. As for their marital status, we have no information about 21 respondents. Altogether, around half of all interviewees were married, 10 percent (17 persons) were single, and 16 percent (26 persons) were widowed. As they were not directly asked, and the reconstruction-categorization based on the interviews is often very challenging, exact data on the highest level of education has low validity. However, in general, it can be determined that a third of the participants are vocational-school skilled laborers, around 15 percent of interviewees have attended and passed higher education, whereas

[1] Fieldwork was led by the author; interviewees were recruited among university students (mostly sociologists) and, in particular, among the members of the youth organization *Angelusz Róbert College for Advanced Studies in Social Sciences*. Excluding the author, 34 young scholars participated in the research throughout the years, for whose engagement the author is extremely grateful, especially considering the fact they participated mostly at their expense, out of sheer scientific commitment.

[2] An ID number is rendered to all participants, computed as follows. The first digit grasps the number of fieldwork, the second digit refers to the field number within the fieldwork period, whereas the final two digits are a simple chronological, fieldwork-specific, ordinal number of the participant.

some 20 percent have only elementary qualifications. The rest has other middle-level qualifications.

In general, the variety of both the fields and interviewees allows a multi-perspective approach when answering the research questions. The narratives provided by participants on perceived social change and migration considerations are fit to describe a phenomenon in its entire complexity and from different perspectives. Furthermore, a somewhat standardized, 'final' question was raised in 90 interviews during the fieldwork. In this question, interviewers enquired about what participants would do in the hypothetical scenario of having won the national lottery. The idea for the question was facilitated both by previous fieldwork experiences, during which several respondents spontaneously addressed this, and the usefulness of the generated discussions in relieving stress and tension as the interviews come to a climax, as well as a means of transitioning the interview into an off-record, more informal talk. The exact question sounds as follows: *What would you do if you were to win the lottery?* [trans. GH]

The analysis of the transcribed 163 interviews was done with Atlas.ti software, which consisted of the following steps:

1. Identifying and labeling (coding) the parts (from a few sentences to longer paragraphs or pages) of narratives separately, in which the following topics were discussed by participants:
   - changes (or the lack of changes) in the local setting (607 quotes)
   - development in the local context (319 quotes)
   - migration (367 quotes)
   - rural-urban connections (256 quotes)
   - the lottery question (105 quotes)
2. Inductively collecting typical narratives. Types of "change," "migration," as well as typical "lottery" responses were identified based on narratives coded into the respective three categories.
   - change narratives: typical narratives included narratives of "no local change," "local deterioration" (post-socialism, local community, demographic changes, local services, local governance, cultural-mental, aesthetic), "local development" (aesthetic, infrastructural, political, economic, cultural), "change in comparison (with other places)," "natural," "national-global"
   - migration narratives: typical responses included narratives of "pro-move statements" (no social life, necessity of housework, commuting, self-actualization, incomes, lack of jobs, fear of security change or social downfall, personal ties, adventure/moving forward, cheaper city life, boredom) and "pro-stay statements" (community, family, fear of the new, escaping, moving costs, rural idyll, local career, undervalued local property)
   - lottery narratives: typical narratives included "modern values" (house, vehicle, debt payback, financial deposit), "hedonistic values" (travel, party, sports car), "community values" (social, communal, local infrastructure, religion, politics, family) and "self-actualization" (career, entrepreneurship, hobby), as well as neutral standpoint ("wouldn't need"). Based on these responses, it was evaluated whether participants explicitly or implicitly suggested that they would emigrate from the locality.

Analysis

Lottery Responses in General

Participants in altogether 87 cases provided valid answers for out of the 128 interviews conducted

based on guides including the lottery question. By complementing them with the 3 cases in which interviewees spontaneously addressed this question in the earlier fieldwork, 90 narratives are provided. Participants gave various types of answers when asked to imagine their behavior after winning the lottery. Even though attention is paid to migration-related issues, it is necessary to provide a brief comprehensive summary of these types of responses, as migration aspirations might only be understood through these in many cases. In general, several people were arguing to have already imagined this situation, whereas others claimed they had never thought about this, at least in a mentionable account. Arguments can be grouped as follows:

- **Nothing; would not need:** Some participants claimed they would not need that much money, but the reasonings differ. Some, especially elderly people, argued they do not have anything to ask for in life anymore, whereas others reported that this amount of money would change their lives to an unnecessary extent, or expressed fears regarding the responsibilities this amount of money would bring into their lives. In general, the first reaction of many was the claim that winning the lottery would not change their lives or their worldview—the way they are thinking about different aspects of life.

- **Security and modern values:** A large share of participants have dealt with general life security. These included modernistic values such as buying a stable and convenient house for living, an ordinary car for commuting, the payback of loans, and, more commonly, putting the (rest of the) money securely in a bank without having to take it out while it would be possible to live from the interests.

- **Family and friends:** Several people claimed they would distribute their money, or at least a share of it, among their acquaintances. Besides community-related purposes, this category included altruistic values; however, these two should be regarded separately. Distribution among family members and friends appeared in the third of all lottery-related narratives, and arguments often included specific aims of helping those acquaintances who are in the need of specific goods or who are generally in need.

- **Community and social support:** Both local communities, national, and religious communities, as well as religion in general played an important role in the lottery narratives. To develop the local communities either in an infrastructural or cultural aspect was a very often mentioned potential aim, almost as popular as helping family members and friends. This obviously can originate from a bias caused by our special interest in the localities during the interviews, however, even this bias would not explain the spread of such responses. Besides this specific aim of developing the local economy, infrastructure, and culture, answers have dealt altruistically with social issues, namely, helping out strangers in need (local dwellers or others).

- **Hedonistic values and hobbies:** Participants were not shy to share their hedonistic plans either when the lottery question was raised. Altogether a third of interviewees mentioned such plans, including those describing in-

vestment-demanding hobbies. Most often described goals were to travel, buy sports cars, and party.

- **Career and entrepreneurship:** As the latter quotes imply, too, there were some who were thinking of investing their lottery money in the realization of their enterprise ideas. Altogether 14 narratives are provided out of the 90 that reflect self-actualization goals of this kind, and such responses are provided partially by those already owning smaller enterprises (such as a pub, small restaurants and hostels, lands and agricultural enterprises, and a car repair shop).

- **Migration and keeping/leaving the job:** The dilemma of keeping or leaving one's job also appeared in the lottery narratives, however, these sometimes were regarded as natural consequences or logical prerequisites of mentioned aims of another sort (for instance, claiming one would invest in local development means one would stay locally; whereas moving to Miami would require one leaving their former job).

General Migration Narratives: Pro-Move and Pro-Stay Arguments

To understand acquiescent immobility, narratives provided for the lottery question are analyzed in parallel with the provided general 'substantive' arguments about whether to move. These latter arguments are divided into pro-move and pro-stay arguments, with the latter being split into 'negative' and 'positive' forms. While it is not viable to introduce these narratives in detail here, a general vision of these mobility arguments is necessary for taking further steps in the analysis. Typical narratives are categorized as 'pro-move,' 'negative pro-stay,' and 'positive pro-stay' factors as follows.

Pro-Move

- Moving is developing: Personal development and advancement are often a synonym for migration, especially among the youngest generations.
- Commuting problems: Questions and problems caused by the complicatedness of commuting are one of the most characteristic factors of outward mobility.
- Lack of nearby jobs: The lack of good-paying local or nearby jobs is, surprisingly, not the most often mentioned factor of migration aspirations.
- Vivid social and cultural life in urban areas: Communities and community life in some interviews are connected to rural areas, but for others, it is rather the cities that are reported as being open and integrative.
- Everyday tasks: Some participants provide reflections about maintaining a house causing much more work for them than for those living in city blockhouses.

Negative Pro-Stay

- Family attachment: Family, in several cases, appears as a negative (i.e., restrictive) factor for staying, as a force forestalling people from moving.
- Getting stuck/used to it: In several narratives, the psychological cost of moving appears as a distinctive negative, restrictive factor for staying.

Positive Pro-Stay

- The local (rural) idyll: Narratives about the idyllic rural are not solely the argument of urban out-migrants seeking a quiet place to stay

but also of rural dwellers, who emphasize the advantages of staying.

- Integration: A second dimension of recognizing the advantages of staying include the sense of community, involvement, and integration.
- Finding one's account (local career): The best way to phrase the third dimension for 'positive' narratives on staying is that people report they were able to "find their account" in staying.

Participants were grouped considering which of the above-introduced forms of narratives they provided considering lottery narratives. By contrasting general migration narratives (what pro-stay and pro-move arguments they provided) with migration narratives under the lottery scenario, it can be evaluated whether the received general pro-stay arguments might be only due to the lack of personal opportunities to migrate, or, conversely, are, indeed, a result of strong 'positive' personal aspirations to stay. Analysis of these two arguments will be introduced in the next subchapter.

Migration in Lottery Responses

Out of the 90 interviews including the lottery question, 39 narratives included explicit migration aspiration narratives. Around two-thirds of these respondents claimed they would not emigrate if they were to win the lottery (n=27), and the third explicitly claimed they would (n=12). The group of participants providing both answers to the lottery question and 'pro-move,' 'positive pro-stay' or 'negative pro-stay' arguments is 13, 22, and 20, respectively, who, on the other hand, serve as an adequate sample for analyzing the questions of acquiescent immobility. The idea for approaching this question comes from emerging contrasts between the 'current' migration aspiration narratives and when the lottery scenario is framed. The number of respondents is shown in Table 1 by their provided answers, with respect to the three possible forms of migration arguments.

Table 1. Respondents' crosstabulation by migration arguments and lottery responses

		pro-move argument		positive pro-stay argument		negative pro-stay argument		Total per category
		no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	
Would move if winning the lottery	no	20	7	11	16	15	12	27
	yes	6	6	6	6	4	8	12
	N/A	103	21	95	29	110	14	124
Total		129	34	112	51	129	34	163

Note: Highlighted cells represent 'unexpected' interactions/anomalies.

Source: Self-elaboration.

As can be seen in the table, 'anomalies' of different kinds occur when trying to match general migration arguments with those provided for the lottery scenario. The anomalies are constituted by three types of respondents: 1) those providing pro-move arguments, but claiming to consider staying as lottery winners (n=7), 2) those providing negative pro-stay arguments, but claiming as well to stay in the fortunate scenario (n=12), and finally, and most interestingly, 3) those providing positive pro-stay arguments, but regardless of this, claiming it is likely they would emigrate after winning the lottery (n=6).

People belonging to the **first category** are those who, either voluntarily mobile or involuntarily immobile, try to flee due to the lack of economic opportunities, and would stay once these limits are no longer decisive. A middle-aged, skilled laborer, communal worker and a mother of one spontaneously addressed the lottery question. After having moved out from the micro region's center town where she has been living for a decade, she now lives in a renewed house in the village, but explicitly mentioned her desire to move out, motivated by community fragmentation and rivalry. Local economic opportunities are described as being limited, and she, as a communal worker, although having the opportunity to engage in creative work in the locality otherwise described as being developing, receives low wages. Furthermore, she describes urban life as being more convenient and comfortable. However, when the topic of winning the lottery emerges, the community-related negative aspects of rural life seem to disappear from the narrative and are replaced by local personal careers, as well as independent entrepreneurial opportunities:

> I'd move away, but I have no clue where... maybe not too far. But, it's also possible that if there'd be a chance of winning the lottery or something, maybe I wouldn't even move, but instead build a bigger house or go and buy some things like machines, a tractor, et cetera, with which one could work. This is an agrarian village, this way one could live better. Or renew the rooftop [of my house], change the windows, or something, you know. If there'd be a tractor, one won't have to be hacking with a rototiller, I'd buy a small tractor, and there'd be an opportunity to work for myself, not for others. [Respondent 4122, 58-year-old female, communal worker]

One might argue that this shift can be explained by the original argument about the bad neighborhood masking a more crucial reason for aspiring to move, namely, the lack of opportunity to stay with the parallel aspiration to do so. Therefore, these participants might be categorized as the involuntary mobile group, as de Haas (2014) labels them.

Participants of the **second group**, in contrast, regardless of recognizing negative retaining factors concerning migration, would not move, also in the lottery scenario. The group consists mostly of the two major forms of involuntary immobile: those having strong social connections to the localities and those who are incapable of moving due to financial reasons. What can be seen is that a part of those with 'too' strong connections (negative social capital), since then becoming older, would now not move regardless of the assets, and this is a reason we find them in this category. In contrast, some of those who were unable to move due to financial reasons can be found in this group as well. The reason is that while winning the lottery would increase their opportunities to move, the very same would reduce the necessity (thus, the aspirations) of emigrating. Thus, they 'instantly' turn into voluntarily immobile. Such an argument is present

in the narrative of a self-employed man, who, once the lottery scenario was set, got rid of all the doubts about his desire to stay:

> Well, then [if winning the lottery], it's certain [that I won't move]. One hundred percent certain, that then I'd stay. I wouldn't even think of not staying. This is certain. This is for sure. First, my heart belongs here. This is my favorite place, I grew up here, and I lived here, too, so I very much... Here's an old cemetery...my ancestors are here, everybody is here. [Respondent 6122, middle-aged male, self-employed]

The **third group**, those who are 'seemingly' voluntarily immobile by reporting positive reasons for their stay, but who provide strong claims about willingness to migrate once winning the lottery, are those that can be regarded as 'true' acquiescent immobile people. In this group, even by imagining the scenario of having the opportunity, among other activities, for migration, a shift is seen from seeing the positive aspects of staying to wishing to move away. This can signify the psychological phenomenon of "adaptive preferences," "post hoc rationalization," "cognitive dissonance reduction," or, to use a more informal term, the "sour-grape effect" that both Schewel (2015) and Carling and Schewel (2018) refer to. It is important to note that respondents of this group might be characterized by a lower level of general place attachment. Furthermore, participants vary based on where they would move once having won the lottery (even smaller settlements, farms, to a town, city, or abroad), and one person claimed to think of moving precisely because of the money—so that other dwellers would not gossip about him. Nevertheless, these sudden changes of mind can be witnessed generally among the members of this group, for instance, in the narrative of the following retired woman, already having a history of relocations:

> I lived in [the county capital city] for 2 years, then came back here...just to be with the elderly ones if anything would happen with them, and then it wasn't that good, and so we moved again...to [a farm], we received a house from the enterprise...] and then [we] came back home once again anyway. So I...really have moved a few times, so that it'd be for the good of me, and yet we ended up here anyway [laughs]. We live peacefully here and won't move anywhere for certain...But, who knows, we might win the lottery and then fly away in that instant, like birds. [Respondent 1104, female retiree]

Another representation of this group's mindset change is provided by a middle-aged odd-job worker woman, who, instead of expressing her desire to move to a city, claims to be thinking about changing for an even smaller settlement as a home place once the lottery scenario is presented:

> [After moving from the county capital city back home to this village] I never wanted to move to [the neighboring village], I don't know, I liked [that one], too, but I always loved [this] better. They knew me here. Knew who my grandfather was, my mother, and my father—they were respected people…It's not good when one has too much money. That's not good either. Ten million would be enough so that I can attain my husband's dream of moving to a farmstead: stock-raising, a beautiful log house, and that's it. I wouldn't even need a car; a motorbike would be enough. I don't desire such things. [Respondent 3122, 44-year-old female, odd-job worker]

Acquiescent immobility is characterized by narratives of general satisfaction with the otherwise

less-to-offer socioeconomic circumstances. Members of the group are similar to involuntarily immobile respondents in the sense that they do not usually report any positive changes in external circumstances. However, they seem to make comparisons less likely, too, or, if they do, these comparisons are rather neutral ("it's not good here, but other places wouldn't be either"). Such "other" places might be cities within a reachable distance. For one who is generally attracted to the countryside, moving to cities is not a real option due to this attraction; accessible alternatives seem beyond their capabilities—do not occur as real options. Also, there is a relative satisfaction with the circumstances to be found in, especially in comparison with other places that are in sight and reachable, and in comparison also with the respondents' past living circumstances: a sense of personal development in life might lead to a reduced level of aspirations even though by migration, the circumstances could further be developed.

These would suggest that acquiescent immobility is sometimes a provincialist version of voluntary immobility: voluntary in the sense that, among the reachable options, respondents consider their place of living as the best. However, the scope of what constitutes reachable options might vary greatly, ranging from the next micro-region located seemingly far in the personal scope of space, to exotic overseas places. A local-born retired male respondent with a high level of education, who is highly integrated with the local society on many levels, argued that the village had suffered greatly after the post-socialist transition, considering its economic opportunities. He also reported a fragmentation of the local society and a great level of intranational, as well as international emigration among those who are capable to move, but he referred to himself as someone deeply involved in the community, as well as the cultural life. Nevertheless, as the father of two teenagers, he expects his children to leave the locality. He described his goal to be ensuring his children's education and success by using two different expressions of mobility: "to send them out on their ways" and to "mount them with wings." Further, he claimed in the main narrative not to consider moving, nevertheless, as a response to the lottery question, his attitudes suddenly seem to reverse. He describes his desire to move, partially by a fear that news about his sudden wealth would spread within the community and create envy, but, generally, he claims he would move to more idyllic places, thus maximizing the reported positive aspects of his current local life:

> **Participant:** I'm not very much attracted to moving. Maybe if I were still younger, I might emigrate to Austria. But, everything bonds me here, I lived my life here, and I don't miss that. My partner had a flat in [the micro-regional center town], but everything bonds me here...Here, I can just sit on the stairs, sit in the garden, and sometimes make a barbecue. Go to my garden, and prune the vine in the autumn. I can entertain myself. And, as I just mentioned, I'm an animated person: I come and go a lot, and do what I must. I don't miss the city.
>
> **Researcher:** This is our final question: What would you do if you were to win the lottery?
>
> **Participant:** Well, I'd remain silent and maybe move away where the sun shines [laughs], I mean, somewhere I'd feel good. These things come to light anyway…It's very likely that I won't stay. [Respondent 4114, 67-year-old male, retiree]

Among the acquiescent immobile group, development programs do not appear similar to those found in the voluntary immobile group

(hence, those having similarly low levels of aspirations). Instead, members of the acquiescent immobile group concern change in a similar way to the voluntary mobile: that is, with significant undervaluation of its effects and positive aspects that, on the one hand, might have developed personal welfare but also failed to provide crucial life opportunities. Not surprisingly, by the lottery question being introduced, and thus, a greater scope of opportunities proposed, the range of space opened, too, and by comparison with further places, mobility suddenly became an option to concern seriously. A middle-aged public servant, who was already introduced earlier as somebody who likes to be local, provided the following clear-cut answer:

> **Researcher:** What would you do if you were to win the lottery?
> **Participant:** [Chuckles] [short pause] I'd go. [pause]
> **Researcher:** And where'd you go?
> **Participant:** I don't know yet, well... not too far away. About 20 kilometers [to Austria], that's it. And that's how you get to know me, that I have an answer for this in a second. Because... 'cause... 'cause, after all... this is not perfect, living here. Not a perfect life. So that is what I already told you... this country is capable only of this, but yet, no one is an enemy of oneself. [Respondent 7114, middle-aged male, public servant, manager]

International and internal migration aspirations both appear in lottery narratives of this third group, though a detailed analysis of mobility directions would exceed the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, it is important to note that claims about potential international movements can be aligned with hedonistic values and careers, whereas those respondents rather staying on more 'secure' grounds (by expressing security-related and modern values) prefer to think about shorter moving distances, even considering international mobility. Hence, besides international movements, inter-regional moving desires are presented among this subgroup as well. A young mother, for instance, who loves the rural idyll, according to her claims, would not think to move towards great cities once being a lottery winner. Instead, she claims she would move to a somewhat larger town in a more idyllic region of Hungary, maximizing the idyll and making a compromise between vivid city life and the peaceful rural:

> Well, I'd move away, for certain. I'd move away from here. I'd move away. Somewhere to Transdanubia. Transdanubia. Bringing my family with me, buying a small flat for everyone, and then moving away… rather to a town. Rather to a small, calm, nice town… That's a nice area. And hilly. I like to travel there; this place is boring. And then, there are more opportunities there, at least that's what I think. [Respondent 8112, 32-year-old female, medical worker]

Discussion

Analyses presented in this paper dealt with personal aspirations and opportunities for outward mobility from peripheral, rural settlements of Hungary. One might argue that the group of acquiescent immobile people is composed of two subgroups: first, those for whom perceived opportunity structures are irrelevant in their (lack of) aspiration to migrate because other factors compensate for this lack of capacities. This might very well be understood from a rational choice perspective, too—here, rational calculations are meant in their widest sense, that is, including all non-economic factors as well, such as local identity and patriotism. Considering the phenomenon in its dynamism: after changes in opportunity structures, by all other 'push' and

'pull,' as well as 'retaining' and 'repelling' factors further compensating this change, it would remain only an analytical problem that former acquiescent immobile people be labeled voluntary immobile ones. This subgroup of virtually acquiescent respondents is arguably "voluntary immobile" in essence, and their labeling as acquiescent immobile is only a methodological bias, as their lack of opportunities masks them and conceals them from the eyes of the observer. This problem will not arise concerning other forms of mobility, as those are identified through verbally expressed personal perceptions of aspirations and capabilities.

The lottery question (*What would you do if you were to win the lottery?*), despite its standardized and somewhat unnatural character, seemed useful as a final question, as a tension relief, and as a means of transitioning the interview into an off-record, more informal talk. The reasons for the adequacy of this question are based on the following:

A. Based on the responses, migration aspirations might be analyzed in a general life aspiration setting: Interviewees were not specifically asked about their migration intentions. Instead, the field is provided for these ideas to inductively unfold, just as Schewel (2019:28) proposes: "Research on migration aspirations needs to be expanded even further to include the broader life aspirations, hopes, and motivations that contribute to the particular aspiration to migrate or stay." However, though no one is forced to have an opinion about migration, by not inquiring specifically about moving, the share of unobserved potential migrants will be higher. On the other hand, the group of those who do express their will to migrate creates a good ground for a valid analysis of the various forms of mobility.

B. Hypothetical, but easily imaginable, situation and focused treatment: Though winning the lottery is a hypothetical and entirely unlikely scenario, the situation is very easy to be internalized by respondents and thus, valid answers are to be expected regarding one's current life aspirations, including the aspirations to migrate. Furthermore, winning the lottery is a narrow-scope and concrete scenario, which requires no changes in other aspects of life, let alone an all-inclusive shift in one's life. [As, for instance, other questions would suggest, such as if interviewers were interested in what respondents would do if having 'all the opportunities' or just 'being rich.' These would be much harder to internalize.] Hypothetical questions are widely used by various market and public policy research (Fitzsimons and Shiv 2001). However, several analysts are concerned about the validity of such questions (Meyerhoff 2006). For instance, Chang, Lusk, and Norwood (2009) test various survey and modeling tools in an experimental setting to find hypothetical situations worse in predicting actual shopping behavior than non-hypothetical choice cases. Formerly, a similar argument was framed by Samuelson and Zeckhauser (1988) who argue that when hypothetical questions are asked, respondents might be more willing for change than in real-life situations, when a bias towards the status quo is to be seen. As Meyerhoff (2006) summarizes the related debate, general attitudes are regarded as weak and attitudes towards concrete targets as unreliable predictors of further behavior, while it is agreed that attitudes are prerequisites of certain behaviors and therefore, a good predictor of general tendencies to act in a given way. Consequently, "the intention to perform the behavior is indeed the strongest predictor of the stated behavior" (Meyerhoff 2006:223).

Nevertheless, some qualitative researchers also suggest that hypothetical questions be used to receive even more valid data on actual (rather than potential) social phenomena (Chase 2003; Moore, Lapan, and Quartaroli 2013). Based on these claims, it can be argued that hypothetical scenarios are seriously considered by respondents, raising the validity of replies on their actual attitudes, even though their potential future behavior might differ.

C. Fitness to differentiate between opportunities and aspirations: As de Haas (2014:23) argues, migration is defined by aspirations and capabilities, where "migration aspirations are a function of people's general life aspirations and perceived spatial opportunity structures." Therefore, migration aspirations, by being embedded in general life aspirations, are fit to be analyzed as a part of it (instead of addressed directly with migration-related questions), and, in particular, even if this might be influenced by 'objective' capabilities. What the lottery question provides is the hypothetical elimination of most (if not all) economic opportunity boundaries to get a more detailed view of general attitudes, aspirations, and personal beliefs about mobility.

Conclusion

Based on findings from a series of qualitative fieldwork conducted in peripheral Hungarian rural settlements, this paper demonstrated the lottery question as being a useful tool in exploring the general life aspirations of respondents. The hypothetical and, to an extent, standardized interview question enabled addressing general life goals under a hypothetical setting without external constraints, by the question also providing a simple and clear-cut scenario for reaching maximum-validity responses.

The applicability of the question was demonstrated through an analysis of migration aspirations. As was shown in this narrower research topic, the question was not only useful in grasping the general life aspirations but also in making it possible to assess how migration attitudes are embedded in them. By providing a tool for the focused analysis of attitudes without disturbing the presence of structural factors such as economic opportunities, and in general, the instrumental forms of freedom, the internal coherence of the agency elements of geographical mobility could thus be evaluated. It was shown that both mobility and immobility (internal and international) might, in essence, be a self-defining life goal for many, characterized by the complex cultural meaning of migration. Furthermore, it was also shown that the question was eligible in differentiating between and addressing the different forms of mobility. The findings suggest that the voluntarism of migration provided in general in narratives is often shifted or reversed once the structural constraints are, at least hypothetically, eliminated. For instance, among those aspiring to move out from the locality, but unable to do so, the hypothetical lottery win brings up modernistic values and, as a part of them, empowered aspirations. Those looking forward to moving, provide either hedonistic or career-oriented responses, and aspirations are further facilitated. Mobility aspirations of those being happy with staying seem not to be influenced by the lottery question, and, among these people, entrepreneurial and community-oriented values play a major role. Nevertheless, attitudes towards moving were reversed, in some cases, among those with both high and low general migration aspirations.

Among these respondents, we might recognize the involuntary mobile (de Haas 2014) and acquiescent immobile (Schewel 2015) subgroups, respectively, which otherwise might be challenging to identify. It can be hypothesized that structural constraints, forcing people to move, masked general agency attitudes to stay among the former, and structural, restraining-constraints masked attitudes to move among the latter group.

Although not presented in this paper in a detailed way, besides approaching specific theoretical issues such as migration, the lottery question was applicable in approaching the various classes of general life aspirations, ranging from living a quiet life, to being of service to others, to engaging in religious actions, to getting new experiences, living a thrilling life, and so forth. Instead of making predictions, the question was able to grasp the current cultural values of respondents, which could serve as a basis for further investigations in various fields. Furthermore, based on the fieldwork experiences, the inclusion of this question at the end of the interview guide might also serve as a good way of relieving tension and setting up a transition into an off-record, informal talk with respondents.

References

Baldwin, Claudia, Tanzi Smith, and Chris Jacobson. 2017. "Love of the Land: Social-Ecological Connectivity of Rural Landholders." *Journal of Rural Studies* 51:37-52. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.01.012.

Barcus, Holly R. and Stanley D. Brunn. 2009. "Towards a Typology of Mobility and Place Attachment in Rural America." *Journal of Appalachian Studies* 15(1/2):26-48.

Berlin, Isaiah. 1969. *Four Essays on Liberty*. London, New York: Oxford University Press.

Bjarnason, Thoroddur and Thorolfur Thorlindsson. 2006. "Should I Stay or Should I Go? Migration Expectations among Youth in Icelandic Fishing and Farming Communities." *Journal of Rural Studies* 22 (3):290-300. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2005.09.004.

Carling, Jørgen. 2002. "Migration in the Age of Involuntary Immobility: Theoretical Reflections and Cape Verdean Experiences." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 28(1):5-42. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830120103912.

Carling, Jørgen and Kerilyn Schewel. 2018. "Revisiting Aspiration and Ability in International Migration." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44(6):945-963. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1384146.

Chang, Jae Bong, Jayson L. Lusk, and F. Bailey Norwood. 2009. "How Closely Do Hypothetical Surveys and Laboratory Experiments Predict Field Behavior?" *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 91(2):518-534. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8276.2008.01242.x.

Chase, Susan E. 2003. "Learning to Listen: Narrative Principles in a Qualitative Research Methods Course." Pp. 79-99 in *Up Close and Personal: The Teaching and Learning of Narrative Research*, edited by R. Josselson, A. Lieblich, and D. P. McAdams. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Corbett, Michael. 2005. "Rural Education and Out-Migration: The Case of a Coastal Community." *Canadian Journal of Education* 28(1-2):52-72.

Corbett, Michael. 2013. "I'm Going to Make Sure I'm Ready Before I Leave: The Complexity of Educational and Mobility Decision-Making in a Canadian Coastal Community." *Journal of Rural Studies* 32:275-282. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2013.07.006.

Coulter, Rory and Jacqueline Scott. 2015. "What Motivates Residential Mobility? Re-Examining Self-Reported Reasons for Desiring and Making Residential Moves." *Population, Space and Place* 21(4):354-371. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.1863.

Csatári, Bálint, Jenő Zsolt Farkas, and József Lennert. 2019. "Agrarian and Rural Development in Hungary After 1989." Pp. 21-54 in *Three Decades of Transformation in the East-Central European Countryside*, edited by J. Bański. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Csite, András and Imre Kovách. 2002. "Vidéki történet [Country Story]." Pp. 219-308 in *Hatalom és társadalmi változás: A posztszocializmus vége* [*Power and Social Change: The End of Post-Socialism*], edited by I. Kovách. Budapest: Napvilág.

Csurgó, Bernadett. 2013. *Vidéken lakni és vidéken élni. A városból vidékre költözők hatása a vidék átalakulására: a város környéki vidék* [*Living in the Countryside. The Effect of People Moving from the City to the Countryside on the Transformation of the Countryside: The Countryside around the City*]. Budapest: Argumentum - MTA TK SZI.

Dabasi-Halász, Zsuzsanna, Katalin Lipták, and Klaudia Horváth. 2017. "'Különlegesnek lenni.' Középiskolások tanulási célú mobilitását meghatározó attitűdök, motivációk ['To Be Special.' Attitudes and Motivations Determining the Learning Mobility of Secondary School Students]." *Tér és társadalom* 4:53-75. doi: https://doi.org/10.17649/TET.31.4.2893.

de Haas, Hein. 2014. *Migration Theory—Quo Vadis? IMI Working Papers*: International Migration Institute. Retrieved December 11, 2022 (https://www.migrationinstitute.org/publications/wp-100-14).

Enyedi, György. 2011. "A városnövekedés szakaszai - újragondolva [Stages of Urban Growth— Reconsidered]." *Tér és Társadalom* 25(1):5-19.

Etzo, Ivan. 2008. "Internal Migration: A Review of the Literature." *MRPA Paper*. Retrieved December 11, 2022 (http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/8783/1/MPRA_paper_8783.pdf).

Fielding, Anthony. 1992. "Migration and Culture." Pp. 201-212 in *Migration Processes and Patterns*, edited by A. Champion and A. Fielding. London: Belhaven.

Findlay, A. M., and F. L. N. Li. 1997. "An Auto-Biographical Approach to Understanding Migration: The Case of Hong Kong Emigrants." *Area* 29(1):34-44.

Fitzsimons, Gavan J. and Baba Shiv. 2001. "Nonconscious and Contaminative Effects of Hypothetical Questions on Subsequent Decision Making." *Journal of Consumer Research* 28(2):224-238. doi: https://doi.org/10.1086/322899.

Garasky, Steven. 2002. "Where Are They Going? A Comparison of Urban and Rural Youths' Locational Choices after Leaving the Parental Home." *Social Science Research* 31(3):409-431. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-089X(02)00007-8.

Halfacree, Keith H. and Paul J. Boyle. 1993. "The Challenge Facing Migration Research: The Case for a Biographical Approach." *Progress in Human Geography* 17(3):333-348.

Heleniak, Timothy E. 2009. "The Role of Attachment to Place in Migration Decisions of the Population of the Russian North." *Polar Geography* 32(1-2):31-60.

Hodge, Ian D. 1985. "Employment Expectations and the Costs of Migration." *Journal of Rural Studies* 1(1):45-57.

Juhász, Pál. 2006. "Rurális problémák: A falusi terek gazdasági, társadalmi és politikai gondjairól [Rural Problems: On the Economic, Social, and Political Problems of Rural Areas]." Pp. 573-594 in *Emberek és intézmények. Két zsákutca az agráriumban* [*People and Institutions. Two Dead Ends in the Farm*], edited by P. Juhász. Budapest: Új Mandátum.

Kovách, Imre. 2012. *A vidék az ezredfordulón* [*The Countryside at the Turn of the Millennium*]. Budapest: Argumentum.

Kovách, Imre. 2016. *Földek és emberek. Földhasználók és földhasználati módok Magyarországon* [*Lands and People. Land Users and Land Use Methods in Hungary*]. Budapest: Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó.

Kovách, Imre, Luca Kristóf, and Boldizsár Megyesi. 2006. "Hungary." Pp. 111-137 in *Rural Areas under Urban Pressure—Case Studies of Rural-Urban Relationships across Europe*, edited by G. Overbeek and I. Terluin. The Hague: LEI Wageningen UI.

Kovács, Katalin. 2008. "Kistelepülések lépéskényszerben [Small Settlers Forced to Move]." Pp. 7-28 in *Kistelepülések lépéskényszerben* [*Small Settlers Forced to Move*], edited by M. M. Váradi. Budapest: Új Mandátum.

Lokocz, Elizabeth, Robert L. Ryan, and Anna Jarita Sadler. 2011. "Motivations for Land Protection and Stewardship: Exploring Place Attachment and Rural Landscape Character in Massachusetts." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 99(2):65-76. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2010.08.015.

Meyerhoff, Jürgen. 2006. "Stated Willingness to Pay as Hypothetical Behaviour: Can Attitudes Tell Us More?" *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* 49(2):209-226.

Milbourne, Paul and Lawrence Kitchen. 2014. "Rural Mobilities: Connecting Movement and Fixity in Rural Places."

Journal of Rural Studies 34:326-336. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2014.01.004.

Moore, Tricia S., Stephen D. Lapan, and MaryLynn T. Quartaroli. 2013. "Case Study Research." Pp. 243-270 in *Qualitative Research. An Introduction to Methods and Designs*, edited by S. D. Lapan, ML T. Quartaroli, and F. J. Riemer. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Morse, Cheryl and Jill Mudgett. 2017. "Longing for Landscape: Homesickness and Place Attachment among Rural Out-Migrants in the 19th and 21st Centuries." *Journal of Rural Studies* 50:95-103. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.01.002.

Ní Laoire, Caitríona. 2000. "Conceptualising Irish Rural Youth Migration: A Biographical Approach." *International Journal of Population Geography* 6(3):229-243.

Nugin, Raili. 2014. "'I Think That They Should Go. Let Them See Something.' The Context of Rural Youth's Out-Migration in Post-Socialist Estonia." *Journal of Rural Studies* 34:51-64. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2014.01.003.

Raymond, Christopher M., Gregory Brown, and Delene Weber. 2010. "The Measurement of Place Attachment: Personal, Community, and Environmental Connections." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 30(4):422-434. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2010.08.002.

Samuelson, William and Richard Zeckhauser. 1988. "Status Quo Bias in Decision Making." *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 1(1):7-59.

Schäfer, Nadine. 2010. "The Spatial Dimension of Risk: Young People's Perceptions of the Risks and Uncertainties of Growing Up in Rural East Germany." *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 11(1). doi: https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-11.1.1439.

Schewel, Kerilyn. 2015. "Understanding the Aspiration to Stay: A Case Study of Young Adults in Senegal." *IMI Working Papers*. Retrieved December 11, 2022 (https://www.migrationinstitute.org/publications/wp-107-15).

Schewel, Kerilyn. 2019. "Understanding Immobility: Moving Beyond the Mobility Bias in Migration Studies." *International Migration Review* 54(2):1-28. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0197918319831952.

Sen, Amartya. 2001. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stockdale, Aileen. 2002. "Out-Migration from Rural Scotland: The Importance of Family and Social Networks." *Sociologia Ruralis* 42(1):41-64.

Stockdale, Aileen. 2014. "Unravelling the Migration Decision-Making Process: English Early Retirees Moving to Rural Mid-Wales." *Journal of Rural Studies* 34:161-171. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2014.01.010.

Thissen, Frans et al. 2010. "Migration Intentions of Rural Youth in the Westhoek, Flanders, Belgium and the Veenkoloniën, The Netherlands." *Journal of Rural Studies* 26(4):428-436. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2010.05.001.

Valuch, Tibor. 2015. *A jelenkori magyar társadalom* [*Contemporary Hungarian Society*]. Budapest: Osiris.

Van Mol, Christof. 2016. "Migration Aspirations of European Youth in Times of Crisis." *Journal of Youth Studies* 19(10):1303-1320.

Váradi, Monika Mária. 2013. "Migrációs történetek, döntések és narratív identitás. A tanulmányi célú migrációról – másként [Migration Stories, Decisions, and Narrative Identity. About Studying Migration]." *Tér és Társadalom* 27(2):96-117.

Váradi, Monika Mária. 2015. "A túlélés és a társadalmi betagozódás között: szegénység, kirekesztettség és kapcsolatrendszerek [Between Survival and Social Integration: Poverty, Exclusion, and Relational Systems]." Pp. 45-68 in *Törésvonalak. Szegénység és etnicitás vidéki terekben* [*Break Lines. Poverty and Ethnicity in Rural Spaces*], edited by T. Virág. Budapest: Argumentum.

Virág, Tünde. 2010. *Kirekesztve. Falusi gettók az ország szélén* [*Excluded. Village Ghettos on the Edge of the Country*]. Budapest: Akadémiai.

Wiborg, Agnete. 2004. "Place, Nature and Migration: Students' Attachment to Their Rural Home Places." *Sociologia Ruralis* 44(4):416-432.

Citation

Horzsa, Gergely. 2023. "'What Would You Do If You Were to Win the Lottery?' A Qualitative Tool for Overcoming Agency-Structure Issues in Migration Research." *Qualitative Sociology Review* 19(2):92-112. Retrieved Month, Year (http://www.qualitativesociologyreview.org/ENG/archive_eng.php). DOI: https://doi.org/10.18778/1733-8077.19.2.05