

Richard Wright and Mark Ellis

Geography has a tradition of diverse scholarship and its subfield of migration studies is no exception. This enthusiasm for new conceptualizations and approaches was on display in Spring 2009 when scholars convened in Brighton, U.K. to participate in a conference entitled *Re-Making Migration Theory*. Most, but not all, attendees were population geographers. Some of the papers from the conference formed the core of a special issue of the journal of population geography – *Population, Space, and Place*. Russell King's paper looked back on geography's contributions to migration theory, examined current trends, and then identified future opportunities for migration research in geography. The subtitle of the *Population, Space, and Place* special issue, Transitions, Intersections, and Cross-Fertilizations, signaled both changing times and Geography's theoretical, methodological, and topical eclecticism; aspects of the discipline we will accent in this chapter. It also indicated that migration itself is particularly suited to interdisciplinary study. Indeed, many conferees made exactly this point; the interdisciplinarity of both

migration studies and geography make them a good match.

This chapter builds expressly on some of the outcomes of that conference and the associated journal issue, paying special attention to Russell King's synopsis of the state of play in migration studies in geography (2012). We use those commentaries as this chapter's foundation and add our own views on migration theory in Geography, identify current trends in the discipline, and show where Geographers can continue to make vital contributions to migration studies in the near future. We frame our remarks using some much older commentary on Geography and migration.

Some surveys of migration theory in Geography start with the work of Ernst Georg Ravenstein¹; in particular two papers he published in the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* (1885, 1889).² Few migration scholars in Geography before 1980, for example, paid any attention to gender in their analyses or used an innovative method of depicting migration flows, but Ravenstein's work had both. Instead of starting with Ravenstein then moving on, however, we use his laws to structure our chapter.

R. Wright (✉)

Department of Geography, Dartmouth College, USA
e-mail: richard.a.wright@dartmouth.edu

M. Ellis

Department of Geography and Center for Studies in
Demography and Ecology, University of Washington,
USA
e-mail: ellism@u.washington.edu

¹ As do some other fields.

² This is where Russell King begins his retrospective but it is also, for example, the starting point for Michael Samers' own assessment of migration theory. It is also the place where graduate seminars on migration began in the department where we both earned our PhDs (taught by Dennis Conway at Indiana University).

Scholars can be ungenerous about Ravenstein's "laws of migration" – laws and social science research rarely mix perfectly – and his model of migration is individualistic and a historical (e.g., Castles and Miller 1993; Samers 2010). For us, and King (2012), his work still reaches across the decades and touches significant portions of the migration research in Geography and related areas. By arranging our remarks around a set of these principles, we do not mean to suggest that his basic laws of migration apply unaltered or unfiltered to contemporary migration research in Geography. Instead, we accent the prescience of Ravenstein's observations by using them as entry points into a set of conversations about migration theory and scholarship in Geography.

This chapter has six main subsections built on Ravenstein's ideas. We acknowledge this is not a comprehensive list of his laws; Grigg (1977), for example, highlighted 11 and Samers (2010) chose to cite 7. We use these six empirical regularities that Ravenstein observed as prompts for broader discussions about migration theory in Geography, with occasional references to work in areas such as Regional Science. Furthermore, in each section we identify exciting research questions associated with these broad subfields. In this, we often draw directly on our own research experience, our own perspective as North American scholars interested in migration within and to-and-from the United States. Any literature review necessarily brings a point of view, and we want to be up front about ours.

We begin with a section entitled the Intensity of Migration. Ravenstein observed that short distance moves outnumber long distance moves and we leverage this observation to examine the ideas of distance decay and the gravity model in migration research. We note that although short moves internal to countries continue to dominate, migration research in Geography is increasingly interested in longer-distance/international migrations and their effects. While migrations have many causes, we next consider the specific role that economic forces play in migration and use this section to reflect on "the decision to migrate", occupational migration, and the

migration effects of the Great Recession. The next section considers the relationship between migration and development, the Age of Migration (Castles and Miller 2009) and the so-called "mobilities turn" in Geography. A discussion of circulation and transnational migration (also very much a part of global flows) follows, which leads to a discussion of scholarship on gender and migration. Last, we comment on channelization and networked flows and the implications for understanding immigrant's settlement patterns, neighborhood segregation, and metropolitan divisions of labor.

We are attracted to the breadth and depth of migration research in Geography. The discipline's methodological and epistemological diversity has fertilized innovative perspectives on migration and the subfield is healthy. Our enthusiasm for migration studies in Geography, however, is tempered by what we see as closures and blind spots, especially with regard to graduate student training within the discipline in this subfield. We thus conclude our review with a few cautionary remarks about what we fear is a shift away from an open-mindedness that we have enjoyed so much in our professional lives as migration scholars.

The Intensity of Migration: Distance Decay and the Gravity Model

Ravenstein was among the first scholars to consider distance decay in migration. Distance decay is a fundamental principal in spatial interaction of any kind and here is Ravenstein hypothesizing that migration (interaction) declines with distance:

"The more distance from the fountainhead which feeds them, the less swiftly do these currents flow" (1885: 191), and "...the great body of our migrants only proceed a short distance" (1885: 198) and "...migrants enumerated in a ... center of absorption will ... grow less with the distance proportionally". (1885: 199)

Waldo Tobler's proclamation that the "first law of Geography" is: "everything is related to everything else but near things are more related than

distant things” (1970 236) generalizes Ravenstein’s empirical observations to any realm of spatial interaction. In terms of migration, short moves generally still predominate, but of course there are exceptions to the rule.

Not only did Ravenstein observe that distance mattered, he also found that migration was related to both the size of the origin and destination:

In forming an estimate of displacements we must take into account the number of natives of each county which furnishes the migrants, as also the population of the . . . districts which absorb them (1885: 198)

Ravenstein was the discipline’s first gravity modeler, a theoretical approach to spatial interaction that now is a key element of trade theory, transportation planning, and migration modeling (Stewart 1942; Zipf 1946). Within Geography, spatial interaction models have been part and parcel of the work on migration since quantitative methods made serious inroads into the discipline in the 1950s and 1960s (e.g., Hägerstrand 1957; Tobler 1970; Curry 1972; Wilson 1975; Fotheringham 1983). For example, Torsten Hägerstrand (1957), in modeling migration to and from a Swedish village, showed not only the relationship between migration and distance but also how individuals perceived distance logarithmically – so that a place ten times as far away as another was perceived as only twice as far. This line of thought helped Hägerstrand subsequently develop the concept of an information field, which he used mainly for theorizing innovation diffusion, but which applies to migration – it’s direction, channelization, and sorting by class, occupation, and gender. These considerations echo this and other Ravensteinian laws and remain key areas for investigation in migration research in Geography.

Geographers recognize that migration is a time-space process and Hägerstrand pioneered work in this area of time geography (King 2012). Time geography is principally concerned with the mappings of movement over the course of a day, week, month, year, or lifetime and the intersections of an individual’s path with others. Hägerstrand developed innovative methods of

CURRENTS OF MIGRATION.



Fig. 2.1 Ravenstein’s currents of migration

visualizing such time-space paths. Time-space measures, routes, and visualization are today, with the advent of new Geographic Information System (GIS) techniques and data, back at the forefront of work in Geography (e.g., Kwan 1998). Ravenstein, as a trained cartographer, was also concerned with what we now call visualization. It fell to Tobler (1995) to bring scholarly attention to this remarkable aspect of Ravenstein’s contributions by highlighting a map entitled “Currents of Migration” (1885 183). We agree with Tobler that it is an extraordinary map (reproduced here as Fig. 2.1) for, as Tobler notes, Ravenstein makes absolutely no reference to it in his text. We do not even know what data Ravenstein used or how each flow came to be rendered. We can say, though, that like many of the principles Ravenstein detailed in his pair of papers, this map drives home the point

that flows are channelized and networked. It also clarifies why a spatial perspective, and even just mapping, stimulates thinking about spatial processes and can produce new insights into migration patterns, processes, and theory.

Returning to the basic notion of distance decay, given that most migrants move short distances, international moves remain in the minority and 97 % of the world's population resides in their country of birth (United Nations 2006). But we also live in an Age of Migration (Castles and Miller 2009), where rates of international movements have increased and certain countries, especially those in the Global North and certain oil-rich nations, host large foreign-born populations. Such flows and other international movements and connectivities have captured the attention of Geographers doing migration work.

For example, in fall 2011, the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* put out a call for abstracts for a planned Special Issue on the topic of Migration. Annual meetings of the association now attract as many as 10,000 participants and the *Annals* is not only the flagship journal of the US discipline but also commands a global audience. Not surprisingly, the call for abstracts attracted applications from all over the world. In all, 142 authors (or teams) submitted proposals for papers (from which 33 were asked to submit a full paper for publication consideration). Of the 142 original submissions, the proportion seeking to submit a manuscript on a topic relating to international migration outnumbered those proposing an essay on internal migration by over three to one. An analysis of papers given at the 2012 annual meeting of the Association of American Geographers shows that presentations on international migration topics outnumbered internal migration topics by roughly 5–1. These samples typify patterns we find in journals and at other geography conferences. Migration research in Geography has trended away from studies of internal migration toward studies of international migration. Indeed, one no longer need specify *immigration* or *international* migration. The simple term *migration* usually suffices. Michael

Samers' recent book (2010), by that title, serves as exhibit A. If near things are still more related than far things as Tobler's law suggests, then many scholars are more concerned with movements between places that are most distant, and most unrelated.

Geography, of course, is not alone in this tendency. At a recent conference in Seattle that focused on internal migration across the social sciences, co-organizer and historian James Gregory, analyzed trends in published work on migration across major U.S. social science journals. His research made clear the decline in papers on internal migration and the rise in immigration/international migration scholarship over the last two or decades. Another frame of reference, Brettell and Hollifield's synthetic text *Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines* (2000, 2008), failed to include a chapter on Geography and Migration in the first edition and while the second edition did have such a contribution, Susan Hardwick's otherwise highly useful chapter, sidestepped internal migration and privileged international migration to the U.S. (Hardwick 2008; cf. King 2012).

What has happened to research on migration internal to countries?³ U.S. internal migration studies have faded within Geography though the related sub-discipline of regional science still has a vibrant tradition of research on this topic (e.g., Newbold 2011). Within Geography, the fraction of migration studies that is internally focused has shifted to national contexts outside the Global North. A significant portion of the research at the 2012 AAG meetings, for example, was on internal migration studies patterns in China. China's scale and rate of industrialization has been astonishing and has involved a massive relocation of people from rural areas to rapidly

³ Following tradition in geographic scholarship on spatial mobility, our definition of internal migration excludes short distance intra-urban moves that better fit within the realm of residential mobility research. Internal migration moves people well beyond the range of their previous daily time-space geography whereas most local residential adjustments retain some overlap with this prior daily field of activity.

changing urban centers. Not surprisingly, this transformation has captured the attention of scholars across the social sciences including Geography (e.g., Chan and Zhang 1999; Sun and Fan 2011).

The decline in geographical scholarship on internal migration in the U.S. is a little puzzling when one considers the scale of internal flows relative to immigration. The U.S. foreign-born population is approximately 40 million but the number of U.S.-born residents who live outside their state of birth is more than double this number. The relative lack of interest in internal migration is not associated with the volume of flows but with rates. Immigration to the U.S. occurs still at a relatively high rate whereas the internal mobility rate has been on a 40-year decline (a trend we explore in more detail later). Perhaps it is also associated with the notion that internal movers do not face the same challenges nor generate the same differences in destinations as immigrants. We also live in different times. Conditions three decades ago, for instance, vaulted issues of space-economy restructuring, employment, and internal migration to the top of the agenda for many economic geographers. The absence of great economic upheaval, the diminishing mobility of the US workforce, and the rise of international migration and globalization drew scholarly attention to other sets of problems. The Great Recession might change this as one effect of the downturn was to depress rates of inter state and inter county migration (Cooke 2011). It seems to us that analysis of recent U.S. migration tendencies must be grounded in comparisons with what transpired in previous recessions as well as linking internal migration to direct migration from abroad.

It is foolish to argue that the smaller fraction of migrants that are international are less consequential for US social, economic, and political life than the larger fraction that are internal. Yet these internal movements have significant consequences for movers and places. To ignore them is to sideline a very important component of the socio-spatial dynamics of the US population. We therefore swim against the tide of

research on international movement and reassert an interest in internal migration (Ellis 2012).

The Causes of Migration: Economics as the Main Driving Force

Ravenstein's claim, that the economy – in his time industrialization twinned with urbanization – is a driving force in migration, is hard to dispute. Conceptualizing how this force operates through locations and is contingent on individual characteristics has had a long and rich tradition in geographic research over the last 50 years. An early formulation of the decision to migrate articulated the concept of place utility in which the benefits of staying or moving depend on the relative utility of the current location vs. alternatives (Wolpert 1965; Brown and Moore 1970). When utility in alternative locations exceeds that in the current location by a critical threshold, people migrate. A key component of this utility is, of course, labor market conditions. Lowry's (1966) migration model asserted the idea that relative levels of employment and wage conditions directed migration; people move from places with low wages and high unemployment to places where the inverse of these conditions exists. These research ideas generated a stream of studies testing whether migrants respond to labor markets in ways consistent with these differentials (e.g., Greenwood et al. 1991; Greenwood, Chap. 3, this volume). Strands of this work explore the differential response of population subgroup, differentiated by education, age, and other key sociodemographic markers, to these conditions (e.g. Clark and Ballard 1981). In so doing, migration research in Geography started to graft insights from human capital theory onto their initial concern with place-specific conditions.

An alternative framing of place or location views it as a type of capital that constrains mobility or, if migration occurs, limits where people can go (Da Vanzo 1981). People build up ties in locations – social networks – that they lose if they move. Such location-specific human and social capital matters most for those whose employment is predicated on

a local client pool, built up over years of business. Moving sacrifices these local resources nurtured through years of reputation building through local networks (Ladinsky 1967a, b). Location specific licensing adds to the constraint on migration limiting the mobility of people in specific occupations to places with licensing reciprocity agreements (Pashigian 1979). Migration is thus conditioned not only by local labor markets and individual human capital but also by the locationally specific ties of particular occupations. A small stream of research investigates the intersection of occupation and migration through the prism of these locationally specific connections (e.g., Barff and Ellis 1991; Ellis et al. 1993). Migration researchers in Geography have not vigorously pursued ideas of locational specificity or fixity in recent years. Economic geographers, however, have warmed to a similar idea through the notion of untraded interdependencies, which refers to the interrelations between clusters of production in specific regional locations that prevents individual sectors within the cluster from relocating (Storper 1997).

While economic forces remain central in most theoretical framings of migration there has been a shift toward consideration of other objectives for moving (King 2012). In these formulations, place utility is expanded to encapsulate a wide range of cultural, environmental, and other factors that influence where people want to live. These “amenities” condition migration such that when people have economic opportunities in a variety of potential destinations they go to places where these amenities are abundant rather than scarce (Graves 1979; Nelson and Nelson 2011). For example, Morrison and Clark (2011: 1948) find that “Rather than being motivated by having their employment enhanced by internal migration, the majority of internal migrants of working age appear to be motivated by other goals. Employment remains important, but in most cases only insofar as the new destination enables its continuity.”

Florida’s (2002) idea of the creative class takes this amenity-led migration idea to another level by suggesting that talented people choose where to live primarily on the basis of these amenities. The subsequent clustering of talent

in these locations attracts capital and generates innovation and thus promotes regional growth. Florida’s notion is that skilled worker migration is, to borrow from Muth’s (1971) metaphoric title, the chicken and not the egg (i.e., the driver of regional growth and not the response to it). Florida’s supply-side conceptualization has not gone unchallenged. Scott (2010), for example, finds that engineers move in response to the spatial dynamics of engineering jobs rather than the specific set of amenities that Florida contends attract creative class types. There is a history of studies favoring demand side interpretations of migration *vis a vis* regional labor market conditions (i.e., migration as egg rather than chicken) (e.g. Greenwood and Hunt 1989).

Taking the Economy More Seriously

Although there is enduring interest in the interrelationships between migration and economic forces within Geography, it is undeniable that much of the attention of migration scholars within the discipline shifted in recent decades to topics on culture, identity, security, etc. The economy seems rarely to be the center of attention. But what better time to take the economy seriously than the present moment! The evidence so far on the economic downturn that has gripped much of the global north since the mid 2000s carries several implications for migration. Recessions dampen both internal and international migration. In the United States, immigration has diminished and may remain reduced if economic conditions in the US do not improve for a long period of time.

The wrenching industrial restructuring of the 1970s and 1980s precipitated the last major transformation in the US space-economy. Looking back at the mobility responses to that crisis has value for the present day. Displaced workers in rustbelt regions faced a stark choice: either adapt in place to the shrinking pool of high-wage manufacturing jobs or migrate to more economically vibrant areas of the country in the South, South-West, and West. Many moved and, unsurprisingly, research on these

migrations flourished during this era. From our perspective, the most relevant work of that time answered questions about relationships between regional economic restructuring, the outmigration responsiveness of workers in depressed regions and the ability of these same workers to discern efficiently and correctly labor market signals about potential destinations (Clark and Ballard 1981; Ballard and Clark 1981). These sorts of questions about workers and their locational adjustments to the current transformations of the US space-economy precipitated by the continuing recession should be front and center of social science research.

Recessions have particular geographical signatures. Rustbelt deindustrialization hit the old industrial regions especially hard (Bluestone and Harrison 1982). Defense spending in the 1980s favored particular regions, spurring certain high-technology regions into prominence (Markusen et al. 1991). The 1991–1992 recession was generally “coastal”, notably affecting high wage service sectors like finance insurance and real estate; the 2007-present recession is different: this downturn and subsequent slow-growth recovery is not just a perturbation like the recessions of the past 20 years. The current crisis represents an opportunity to refocus that attention on contemporary transformations of the US space-economy and how they might be affecting geographies of employment and migration. The theoretical and methodological insights offered by previous research on recessions present an important guide for any contemporary project on these issues. The recent crisis and its aftermath are different, however, and this may limit the transferability of prior knowledge. The recession of the late 2000s was deeper than almost any earlier depression and it did not have a clear geographical epicenter. A few places escaped relatively unscathed (e.g., the upper Great Plains and its rapidly expanding extractive industries), but most did not. In some respects, we are now in uncharted territory, with unknown space-economy transformations ahead. The events that started to unfold in late 2007 may represent the start of potentially transformative shifts in the US space-economy that could yield a

new geography of regional haves and have-nots (Florida 2009).

This recession and its aftermath have hit immigrants especially hard. Many immigrants, because they worked disproportionately in sectors contracting the fastest, such as construction, have lost work. Yet it would be premature to conclude that immigrants cannot hold their own – or even make employment gains – in such a poor labor market. For example, our own work shows how immigrants can continue to make headway in regional labor markets that are stagnant or declining. Immigrants came to New York and garnered larger shares of jobs there in the 1970s despite the area’s poor economic performance. The key to this situation was the aging and outmigration of the city’s US-born population, creating openings for younger workers from abroad (Wright and Ellis 1996, 1997). This replacement effect could continue in the current slowdown, possibly accelerated by the retirement of baby-boomers. It may be geographically uneven, however. New immigrant destinations tend to have younger US-born labor forces than in traditional gateways, especially among whites. The spatial distribution of replacement labor demand and the spatial pattern of growth that emerges from this recession will be crucial determinants of the settlement geography of immigrants, both as new arrivals and internal foreign-born movers, in the coming decade. Local and state anti-immigrant policies may condition these developments as immigrants seek out places which are more welcoming of difference (Parrado 2012).

Linking Internal and International Migration

Rising immigration raised questions about the economic impact of immigrants on destination labor markets. As this lies at the heart of the question of the employment and wage effects of immigrants on the native born, economists have paid close scrutiny to this issue. So have Geographers. Under the assumption that immigrants operate in the same labor market

segments as the native born and therefore compete for the same jobs, there should be downward pressure on native-born wages and employment. Native-born workers can respond to these pressures by migrating from sites of immigrant settlement leading to a suggestion that internal and international migration streams are linked through competition in the labor market. Complementary migration streams are also a possibility with highly skilled professional migrants moving to the same locations as relatively unskilled immigrants; the latter providing service labor for the former (Nelson et al. 2009; Nelson and Nelson 2011). The evidence on these linkages is disputed with some studies finding more support (Borjas 2001) than others (Walker et al. 1992; Wright et al. 1997).

The idea of internal-international migration linkage in the U.S. predates the current debates about the economic impact of contemporary immigration. It also extends beyond the U.S. to a range of regional and national contexts (e.g., Skeldon 2005; King and Skeldon 2010). Evidence from Australia and Canada suggests that high house prices not labor market competition has been the key factor in promoting native-born out-migration out of immigrant gateways (Ley 2007). In the U.S., the recession-led declines in immigration that started in 2008 raise questions about whether and how internal migration systems will adjust in response. After the last great surge of immigration in the early twentieth century waned, internal migration from the south to northern cities by African Americans and whites accelerated to substitute for the lost supply of new immigrant labor. Conditions now are not as extreme as conditions then by any means, but if the current stall in migration from Mexico to the US persists (Passell et al. 2012) it may be sufficient to generate a series of internal labor and production adjustments in specific parts of the country.

The Direction of Migration: “Development” and Mass Migration

While Ravenstein built his theories inductively, based on detailed observation of migration

patterns from various censuses, other theorists have adopted deductive approaches. Ravenstein framed his laws from observing migration in late nineteenth century Europe and that migration, of course, was heavily rural to urban as new centers of industry emerged and older settlements industrialized. An obvious question about these flows is to place them in a broader context. That is, to wonder how they evolved and what the future would hold for societies undergoing rapid urbanization and population growth. One of the simplest ways of explaining population growth for places that are rapidly developing is to turn to the demographic transition model. In the early 1970s, Wilbur Zelinsky (1971) expanded on the particular moment when Ravenstein made his observations. Zelinsky generalized migration patterns and development in a “mobility transition” model. He thus extended the implicit rural to urban component of the demographic transition approach to consider how development engenders rural to rural flows, urban to urban movement, as well as new international mobilities.

Zelinsky made the general point that types of migration vary systematically over time (King 2012; Skeldon 2012: 157). Put differently, the demographic transition was concerned principally with changes in mortality and fertility, two of the mainstays of demography, to which Zelinsky added the other – migration. Building explicitly on Ravenstein’s laws of migration, Zelinsky was intrigued with what he called “the fusion of the spatial with the temporal perspective” (1971: 220). Accordingly, he attached a mobility transition to each of the five stages of the demographic transition:

Phase 1: Pre modern Society: high fertility and mortality associated with low rates of mobility.

Phase 2: Early Transitional Society: declining mortality and population growth associated with rural to urban migration, emigration to certain places, growth in circular migration, and movement to frontiers.

Phase 3: Late Transitional Society: lowered rates of natural increase associated with declines in

fertility and a slackening decline in mortality was linked to continued, but slowed, rural to urban migration, declines in emigration, and increases in circular migration.

Phase 4: Advanced Society: Stable population associated with continued rural to urban migration, but at much lower relative levels, high rates of urban to urban migration, high rates of residential mobility, the emergence of mass immigration to “developed” countries from “less-developed” ones, and further increased circulation (e.g., tourism, business).

Phase 5: Future Super Advanced Society: Mortality further reduced: decreases in migration as new means of communications introduced; nearly all international migration will be intra- or interurban; immigration of some unskilled workers to “developed” countries possible; strict political control of internal as well as international movements possible; both a deceleration of certain forms of movement and an acceleration of others as well as the inceptions of new forms of mobility.

Reading Zelinsky one can’t help but have two very different reactions. One is that as a stage model concerned with modernization and development with distinct echoes of Rostow, Zelinsky’s model was very much a “child of its time” (Woods 1993; Skeldon 2012). And like the demographic transition model, the evolution of migration and mobility was produced from the standpoint of events in countries in the Global North. To Zelinsky’s enormous credit, within a few years he amended his theory (1983), acknowledging that what he described applied but narrowly to a select set of countries. Processes in what we now think of as the Global South may be fundamentally different and often depend on decisions by governments and corporations made elsewhere. Such critiques also expose the narrow determinism and the lack of spatial thinking embedded in stage models. Rather than an apology, one can also read this as a modification of his theory, joining patterns and predictions associated with the Global North to the evolving “dependency” theories at the time he was writing. Even on

this score, it would be foolish to throw the baby out with the bath water. Contemporary research in Geography recognizes that the relationship between migration and development is critical. For example, many studies of remittances, skilled migration, and brain drain/brain circulation (Skeldon 2008) link migration to the socio-economic standing of communities, regions, and nations. For some communities, and even some countries, remittances provide a mainstay of the local economy. For other places, returning migrants inject vital human, social, and actual capital into the local economies stimulating economic growth.

The other reaction to Zelinsky is more generous. This geographer anticipated the impacts of telecommunications on migration and mobility. Zelinsky outlined a *mobility* as opposed to a *migration* transition, anticipating the advent of the “mobilities” paradigm more than two decades later (King 2012). He also predicted not only the evolution of mass migration to the Global North but also the political reactions to those movements in the form of greater control at both the national local levels. We briefly comment on each in turn from the vantage point of the US.

Telecommunications and Migration

The decline in migration rates stands as one of the most interesting and tantalizing recent trends in migration in the United States, and one has to wonder if the revolutions in telecommunications are part of the explanation. Mobility and migration are deeply engrained in US national culture. For many, the US stands not only as a nation of immigrants but also as a country of migrants. Immigration has recently begun to decline; in the short term, the recent recession has reduced the demand for labor and immigration has moderated. In the long term, changing demographics in Mexico, the primary country of origin, will likely lead to lower rates of migration from Mexico to the US. With regard to internal migration, the great recession has

depressed inter-state and inter-county mobility (recessions always do). A few geographers, noticeably Thomas Cooke, have begun to take a longer-term view and unpack the declines in migration rates that have occurred over the last few decades. Internal migration rates in the United States are now at historic lows. During year in the 1960s, over 3 % of the population moved between states and over 6 % moved between counties. In 2009, however, approximately 1.6 % of the population moved between states while only 3.7 % moved between counties (Cooke 2011 193). Moreover, the gradual decline since the late 1960s has accelerated in the last decade or so. Decomposing the change in migration rates between 1999 and 2009, Cooke attributes about 60 % of the decline to the erosion of economic fortunes in the period and about 20 to changing demographics such as population aging. Cooke assigned the remaining portion of this change to what he calls secular rootedness – a change in migration behavior that transcends standard demographic categories.

The Scaling of Migration Control

In almost every country of immigration, the control of flows of the foreign born is an important issue. The era of mass migration has produced new flow directions and, as Zelinsky predicted, increasing controls over who enters and where they can settle at both the national and local levels (Leitner and Preston 2012; Varsanyi et al. 2012). These new controls are often associated with an increased intolerance for newcomers, but not all statutes are unwelcoming. In the “variegated landscape” (Walker and Leitner 2011) of local immigration policies in the United States, hundreds of towns, cities, and counties have implemented local policies in the absence of what many see as an abdication of national-level initiative on the part of federal authorities. These policies can be either welcoming or unwelcoming. Walker and Leitner (2011) identified a clear geography to these policies. Places with limited histories of immigration (especially those in the U.S. South and outside central cities) and with high foreign-born population growth rates

were more likely to enact exclusionary policies. Immigrant “gateways”, however, places with long histories of immigration (Singer 2004; Singer et al. 2008), were more likely to declare themselves sanctuary cities and enact laws tolerant of immigrants. Many of these statutes target people in the country without authorization but in effect, tend to be scattershot such that many foreigners and Latinos feel their sting. In 2012 the Supreme Court reasserted federal authority over immigration in a few key areas. They blocked certain components of a 2010 Arizona law that criminalized individuals in the US without authorization who sought work. They left intact a provision requiring state law enforcement officials to ascertain the immigration status of anyone they stop or arrest if they have reason to suspect that an individual might be in the country without authorization. Accordingly, the opportunity for state and local authorities to assert themselves in immigration enforcement remains the law of the land.

The 287(g) program is one of the main weapons used by local authorities in the attempt to regulate the presence of unauthorized immigrants. This federal program, operated by the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, sanctions local law enforcement officers to arrest and detain people who are in the country without authorization. While the U.S. “border” no longer simply references the boundary separating the US from Mexico and Canada (Coleman 2007, 2009), scholars continue to acknowledge enduring federal authority via the examination of migration and citizenship, incarceration, and militarism (e.g., Nevins 2010).

While the theorization and interest in the spatial scale of immigration enforcement draws attention to geographical variation in immigration policing within a country, another aspect of immigrant detention is the geographical extension of the nation-state, extra-territorially. In a globally scaled project, Alison Mountz (e.g., 2011) highlights the ways offshore detention and immigration enforcement is dialectically related to “inshore” practices, internal to countries. Mountz invokes Ong’s (2006) “graduated zones of sovereignty” to scale her analysis of sites that produce ambiguous legal

standings for asylum seekers and migrants. She argues that islands have become “key sites” in many systems of migration control and territorial struggle. Islands, as part of an “archipelago of enforcement” are used to “deter, detain, and deflect migrants from the shores of sovereign territory” (118). Her Island Detention Project shows that border enforcement has in certain places been reimagined and repositioned away from the perimeter of countries to an even more marginal location – offshore.

The Mobilities Paradigm

Mobility is much broader than migration. It concerns moving, and mobility studies seek to connect “forms of movement across scales and with research fields that often been held apart” (Cresswell 2011: 551). Tim Cresswell, one of the main proponents of mobility studies in Geography, goes on to observe that “increased levels of mobility, new forms of mobility where bodies combine with information and different patterns of mobility, for instance – combine with ways of thinking and theorizing that foreground mobility (of people, of ideas, of things) as a geographical fact that lies at the center of constellations of power, the creation of identities and the micro-geographies of everyday life” (2011: 551). Power, identity, and the everyday constitute prime research areas in Geography today. In addition to that, Cresswell points out that the mobility turn links research in the sciences and social sciences with the humanities (playing into the openness of Geography and links across scales of moving (a core concept in the discipline). As King (2012) also notes, it plays into themes that have long been of interests to Geographers – movements of bodies, goods and other things as migration, transport, trade, and tourism (144). Zelinsky’s key insight was to suggest that new forms of movement – new mobilities – would accompany declines in older forms of movement.

The impact of new technologies of communication and movement attracts attention from researchers working in several subfields. Studies

of transnationalism certainly feature the impacts on daily life of a newly connected global world. Cresswell warns about an uncritical focus on high-tech hyper mobility offered, for example, by air travel or the internet/new personal communication devices. He also points out that “transport geography, migration research and tourism studies, for instance, have all been vital parts of the longer history of the discipline that have informed and been informed by the recent turn to mobilities research. More recently the flowering of work on hybridity and diaspora and, specifically, studies of transnationalism and translocalism have necessarily involved serious consideration of the role of mobility in the constitution of identities that transcend a particular place of nation” (2011 553–4). These latter topics are the one to which we now turn.

The Variety of Migration: Circulation and Transnationalism

Another highlight of Ravenstein’s pair of papers is that he observed that for every migration stream, a counter stream formed:

Each main current of migration produces a compensating counter current (1885: 199)

We find here, then, the conceptual roots associated with migration fields (e.g., Hägerstrand 1957), circulatory migration (e.g., Ellis et al. 1996), sojourning or temporary migration (Hugo 2006), returning (Conway and Potter 2009), and the burgeoning literature on transnationalism. King (2012 144) suggests that the transnational turn “has been the dominant paradigm in migration research” since the early 1990s (see also Brettell, Chap. 4, this volume). The assertion of this approach is another of the reasons for the decline in interest in internal migration.

Reintroduced into the literature by anthropologists such as Rouse (1991) and Glick-Schiller et al. (1992), transnationalism has roots as deep as Ravenstein’s observation about stream and counterstream. A proportion of newcomers to the United States have always

moved to and forth between the place of the birth and the US (Bourne 1916). Mountz and Wright (1996) note that the “historical record is replete with examples of such connectivity.” Nineteenth century circular migration between the US and Europe involved the disaffected and disenfranchised, sojourners who returned, sometimes periodically, with savings accumulated in the United States to buy land in their place of birth or establish businesses. Returnees also carried religious and political ideas, skills, and know-how (Wyman 1996). Mountz and Wright go on to drily observe that “Bourne’s article, now closing in on its centenary, entitled ‘Trans-national America’, also shows that some of the terms deployed to understand our changed reality are not new either.”

Transnationalism resonates for Geographers for many reasons and is much richer than simple stream/counterstream. Early transnational research in Geography accented the daily lives of transnational migrants and how they organized their lives in two places at once. Births, marriages, celebrations, divorces, bereavements, and mourning all could be transnational. This extended beyond the social to political and economic realms and added interesting scalar dimensions to “international” migration (Mountz and Wright 1996; Conway and Cohen 1998). This type of research necessitated ethnographic methods and brought the spotlight to bear on issues of culture and identity and community and belonging. Transnationalism therefore also offered exciting theoretical possibilities. “A transnational critique of international migration . . . revolves around the way that positivist epistemology relies upon categories of analysis that are fixed, unable to take account of the co-mingling of economic and cultural processes, and unhelpful in integrating insights from different scales of enquiry” (Bailey 2001: 416). Transnationalism thus aligns well with the post-positivist epistemological trends in Geography. For example, Adrian Bailey concludes that from a transnational perspective, migration and mobility are conceived in ways that do “not rely on assumptions of fixity for the concepts of nation-state and territory so accounts of

transnationalism can jointly theorize the roles of migration, community, territoriality, national borders, space, and so forth” (Bailey 2001: 425).

Gender and Migration

While Ravenstein made the point that economics is the main driving force behind most migrations, Samers notes (2010: 55) he was also careful to differentiate among different types of migrants, such as short distance, stage, long-journey, and temporary migrants. Ravenstein also differentiated migrants by gender:

Females predominate among those migrants who go only short distances (1889: 249)

Ravenstein, who also noted that men comprise the majority of those who move internationally, did not explore these spatial relationships in any depth. In the last 30 years or so, however, geographers certainly have, albeit from a set of different theoretical and methodological entry points. More precisely, they link differences in migration and mobility to geographies of power, spatial scale, home-work relationships, and the links between place and identity (e.g., Chant and Radcliffe 1992; Silvey 2004, 2006; see also Brettell, Chap. 4, this volume). In other words, including gender in migration analysis is not simply about differentiating between male migrants and female migrants as Ravenstein did. Gender is now both a variable and a key concept for understanding migration. In other words, an overarching question is how our understanding of migration changes by accounting for gender. Gendered relations and inequalities within families, labor markets, and in all sorts of other institutions, have become a guiding framework for a large body of migration scholarship.

Ravenstein’s empirical observations on gendered selectivity of migration by distance, with long-distance internal and international migrants being disproportionately men found general support through much of the twentieth century. This bias stemmed largely from the labor market transformations of the

industrialization era which brought women into the industrialized workforce and men disproportionately engaged in more long-distance moves, such as international sojourning. The growing feminization of migration flows has again been a striking feature of the last few decades (e.g. Morokvasic 1984). Increasing women's labor-force participation, increases in women's formal education and job skills, and gendered employment segmentation processes all play into this growth of female migration. As women have approached half of the formal labor force, and as their educational qualifications have risen to men's levels, women have become more likely to undertake long-distance migration to find jobs that match their labor market expectations.

In the last decade, geographers have become interested in skilled female international migration. This research erodes the notion that skilled movers are all men, and connects gender segmentation in employment to that of migration in the upper strata of labor markets (e.g. Kofman and Raghuran 2005). A larger body of work focuses on this interlinkage in the labor market for less skilled workers. Internal migrations within poor countries by "distress migrants", or international migrations from poor to rich destinations for basic service work, has distinctive gendered components wherein poor and marginalized women movers come to fill particular types of service jobs, often informal and casualized (e.g. Roy 2002; Dyer et al. 2009). A substantial component of these international migrations encompasses care workers, including nurses, home-care workers, nannies, and domestics (e.g. England and Stiell 1997; Dyer et al. 2008; Kofman 2012). The sourcing of these migrants from specific countries – and their encounters and experiences in work and life in particular destination countries – is strongly featured in this work, with Filipino/as getting much attention for their disproportionate representation in the international flows of care workers (Tyner 2007; Pratt 2012). The broader ideas surrounding geographies of responsibility and care, which serve to highlight the global webs of connections between peoples, provides an organizing framework for making sense of

care migrations and their gendered dimensions (Massey 2004; Lawson 2007).

Care features in migration in other ways. Elderly parents and their adult children may come together to provide care for the former (e.g., Rogerson et al. 1997; Rogerson and Kim 2005) or for the latter (Ellis and Muschkin 1996). The gendered dimensions of this process are unclear; empirical work on the US suggests there is little measurable gender bias in locational readjustments of families to support the elderly. The process of migration to form families is gendered, however. Marriage migration selectively draws women to join men in particular locations through internal and international moves (e.g., Fan and Huang 1998; Heikkila and Yeoh 2010). This does not mean men do not move for marriage; they do, but their marriage migration fields do not necessarily overlap with women's (e.g. Niedomysl et al. 2010). Migration does not only lead to marriage. It also is bound up in union dissolution, with moving either raising the probability of separation or occurring after a separation (Boyle et al. 2008).

Family migration studies go beyond questions of family formation, break-up, and spatial mobility to examine the nature of migration decision-making when more than one person's interests are at stake. How dual earner households make decisions to move, and where to move to, when two jobs or careers are at stake, is a central issue in this line of research (e.g. Hardill 2002; Cooke 2008). A key question is whether these decisions yield differential monetary returns to migration by gender, measured through employment and wages. Some researchers find negative effects on women within families, suggesting that migration-decision making favors men in heterosexual families (e.g. Boyle et al. 2001). Others counter by showing that family migration may be producing fewer formal labor market returns for women than men because of moves to less expensive housing markets, which do not require two-earner households to sustain quality of life (Withers and Clark (2006). But even in the latter case the outcome is gendered because presumably such moves are disproportionately made to release women from formal employment so they

have more time to perform traditional gender roles within the home, particularly in regard to raising children.

The Channelization of Migration: Migration Fields and Networked Flows

A final core theme we highlight from Ravenstein is the channelization of migration flows:

Migratory currents flow along certain well defined geographical channels (1889: 284)

The ideas of beaten path effects (e.g., Massey et al. 1993) and networked migrations are now commonplace in this area of research. Much of the discursive framing Ravenstein deployed remains present in much contemporary research. We may not invoke Ravenstein's fountainheads in our analyses too many times, but the hydrological images of flows, streams, currents, and so on, remain the principal metaphors scholars use to this day. And Geographers are very interested in both methods and metaphors to describe these channelizations. For example, the spatial focus of a migration field describes the degree to which migration flows from an origin are evenly spread across destinations. Alternatively, spatial focus can be assessed for inflows to a destination. Low focus refers to the situation in which outflows from an origin (or inflows to a destination) are evenly spread over the relevant destination or origin possibilities. A degree of spatial focus occurs when outflows concentrate on a limited number of destinations, or in the case of inflows, come from a limited set of origins (Plane and Mulligan 1997; Rogers and Sweeney 1998).

A related assessment concerns the redistribution potential of locations through *migration efficiency*. This is the ratio of net migration to gross migration; a measure of the imbalance between stream and counterstream (Flowerdew and Salt 1979). A location with a large ratio (positive or negative) is an important node in the redistribution of the population – absorbing population when the ratio is positive, shedding population when it is negative. Effectiveness allows the analyst to

compare migration loss and gain across states and groups of different sizes – something net migration cannot (Rogers 1990; Stillwell et al. 2000). Identifying “migration effective” locations for different groups and arrival cohorts through time illuminates the roles of different places in the mobility system of migrants.

Not all migration metaphors used in Geography are fluvial. For example, Fielding (1992) coined the term *escalator region* to describe places that disproportionately attracted upwardly mobile young adults via migration because of superior opportunities in these places. These opportunities provide for relatively rapid upward social mobility. During the later stages of their working lives or at/near retirement, a significant proportion of those who achieve these higher levels of status and pay, then “step off” the escalator via outmigration. Fielding's work is significant as it showcased the strong association between spatial and social mobility – a central issue in some areas of social science research, including migration. In a related vein, Roseman and McHugh (1982) introduced the idea of regional redistributor regions. They studied the metropolitan turnaround in which certain non-metropolitan areas began to attract migrants at higher rates than some metropolitan regions. They hypothesized that metropolitan outmigration will be less focused than metro in-migration patterns. It follows that metropolitan areas can become geographical *redistributors* of populations because of the asymmetry of their in- and out-migration patterns. This occurs because while rural to urban migrations traditionally depend on kith- and kin-based ties, the reverse streams draw on a set of information derived from a broader base, including not only family and friends, but also those gained via tourism and other travel experience as well as previous residential experiences in nonmetropolitan places.

These lines of inquiry play into a broader social science discussion social networks about the flow of information that leads to the decision to migrate. More specifically, this links Geography to both Sociology and Economics especially, in that networks convey information and lower the cost of obtaining that information. As a

general model, pioneers (the risk takers) establish bridgeheads, and then later migrants arrive in a chain like fashion (and likely face lower risks and costs of migration). The initial migration is demand driven but later migration is supply driven in a cumulative causative fashion. Research interest in migrant networks built on information fields and flows are common themes in migration studies in Geography (see, for example, Mattingly 1999). These networks may be gendered (e.g., Wright and Ellis 2000; Parks 2004). They may also help produce and reproduce ethnic concentrations in neighborhoods and lines of work (e.g., Ellis et al. 2007; Wright et al. 2010). Recent work in Geography mirrors that in allied social sciences as it examines the role of migration in racial segregation and mixing in different locations, including the new U.S. South (e.g., Winders 2005), but also comparatively (e.g., Johnston et al. 2006; Holloway et al. 2012). The increasing attention paid to the role immigration plays in changing patterns of urban segregation and diversity parallels the trend to focus on the study of immigration over internal migration mentioned earlier.

Networked patterns then play out in space in several ways, producing particular routes and particular destinations. Some interesting research questions in this area center on how migration flows reinforce divisions of labor in destination communities, how intermediaries shape these patterns, and how these patterns shift over time and generation. Attention on intermediaries is growing as the behavior of states as well as private or non-profit intermediaries comes under scrutiny (e.g., Goss and Lindquist 1995; Ashutosh and Mountz 2011). The question of how these patterns change also includes older issues such as the metropolitan-nonmetropolitan turnaround, as well as the related phenomenon of counter-urbanization – the socio-spatial processes of people moving from urban to rural areas in certain contexts. Another, more recent, example is the emergence of so-called new immigrant destinations in the United States. These places signal the geographical diversification of U.S. immigrant flows to destinations away from the Southwest, West, and Chicago to

the Plains, the South, and East Coast as well as into suburban areas. Some states recorded doubling of populations (Singer 2004); certain counties grew at even higher rates. These spectacular changes in local economies and cultures have drawn the attention of scholars. Many of the studies depict the cultural, political, and economic transformations immigrants have wrought in communities that previously had experienced little immigration (e.g., Smith and Furuseth 2006; Schleef and Cavalcanti 2009). Portions of this research, however, are prone to lapse into “a kind of geographic fetishism,” emphasizing that the emergent patterns of immigration represent something profoundly new by dint of their spatial distribution alone (De Genova 2007: 1273). De Genova calls for “complex comparisons” across spaces of settlement that views the whole rather than particular spaces and places. A few investigations are system wide. Hempstead (2007), for example, found that between 1995 and 2000, gateway states were not “losing their hold”. Scholarship exploring the reasons for this dispersion of immigrants now exists but this literature is quite sparse. Some scholars point to unwelcoming attitudes and poor market conditions in gateway regions, including the hostile context of reception in particular places. Other research highlights the pull of market conditions and nascent enclaves in non-traditional destinations (e.g. Card and Lewis 2007).

Conclusions

Human migration involves the movement of people from one place to another. It is a geographical process. Not only does migration form one of the intellectual pillars of Population Geography, one can use it as a prism through which to view discipline’s epistemological shifts. Leveraging Ravenstein’s ideas to frame our remarks identified key entry points into the literature on migration in Geography. It also meant that our remarks necessarily favor certain themes over others. For example, we spend no time relating migration theory to the environment. The essay’s

structure does have one other advantage, however. Ravenstein mapped and described migration and that type of nomothetic approach set the stage for scholars such as Hägerstrand who helped make migration central to the Quantitative Revolution in the 1950s and 1960s. Migration was also very much part of Behavioral Geography in the 1960s and 1970s, as gravity modeling, migration decision-making, and related perspectives on place utility came to dominate. Migration analysis in Geography is also featured in the more recent Structuralist, Structurationist, Post-structural, and Post-Colonial theoretical trends.

These evolutions reflect the openness of Geography to new theory and lines of inquiry as well as method, and accompany a drift from quantitative to qualitative methodologies. This movement has now gone so far that many current geography graduate students are poorly or even untrained in quantitative methods. Some are even skeptical of their deployment in research on migration and other subjects. (For example, see the collection of articles on the place of quantitative methods in “critical” geography in *The Professional Geographer* 2009 Volume 61, Number 3.) Geography’s eclecticism should prompt scholars to read broadly within the discipline and beyond and to appreciate and value rather than dismiss epistemological or methodological difference. Our review is designed in part to remind ourselves of the deep and rich history of migration studies in Geography. Theoretical or methodological narrowness closes down that history, mutes potentially mutually beneficial exchanges among scholars, and impoverishes what Geographers have to offer to the field of migration studies within the discipline and beyond.

References

- Ashutosh, A., & Mountz, A. (2011). Managing migration for the benefit of whom? Interrogating the work of the International Organization for Migration. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(1), 21–38.
- Bailey, A. J. (2001). Turning transnational: Notes on the theorisation of international migration. *International Journal of Population Geography*, 7(6), 413–428.
- Ballard, K. P., & Clark, G. L. (1981). The short-run dynamics of inter-state migration: A space-time economic adjustment model of in-migration to fast growing states. *Regional Studies*, 15(3), 213–228.
- Barff, R., & Ellis, M. (1991). The operation of regional labor markets for highly trained manufacturing workers in the United States. *Urban Geography*, 12(4), 339–362.
- Bluestone, B., & Harrison, B. (1982). *The deindustrialization of America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Borjas, G. J. (2001). *Heaven’s door*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bourne, R. (1916). Trans-national America. *Atlantic Monthly*, 118, 86–97.
- Boyle, P., Cooke, T., Halfacree, K., & Smith, D. (2001). A cross-national comparison of the impact of family migration on women’s employment status. *Demography*, 38(2), 201–213.
- Boyle, P. J., Kulu, H., Cooke, T., Gayle, V., & Mulder, C. H. (2008). Moving and union dissolution. *Demography*, 45(1), 209–222.
- Brettell, C. B., & Hollifield, J. F. (Eds.). (2000). *Migration theory: Talking across disciplines*. New York: Routledge.
- Brettell, C. B., & Hollifield, J. F. (Eds.). (2008). *Migration theory: Talking across disciplines* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Brown, L. A., & Moore, E. G. (1970). The intra-urban migration process: A perspective. *Geografiska Annaler Series B, Human Geography*, 52(1), 1–13.
- Card, D., & Lewis, E. G. (2007). The diffusion of Mexican immigrants during the 1990s: Explanations and impacts. In G. J. Borjas (Ed.), *Mexican immigration to the United States* (pp. 193–227). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Castles, S., & Miller, M. J. (1993). *The age of migration*. New York: Guilford.
- Castles, S., & Miller, M. J. (2009). *The age of migration* (4th ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chan, K. W., & Zhang, L. (1999). The hukou system and rural-urban migration in China: Processes and changes. *The China Quarterly*, 160, 818–855.
- Chant, S., & Radcliffe, S. (1992). Migration and development: The importance of gender. In S. Chant (Ed.), *Gender and migration in developing countries* (pp. 1–29). London: Bellhaven Press.
- Clark, G. L., & Ballard, K. P. (1981). The demand and supply of labor and interstate relative wages: An empirical analysis. *Economic Geography*, 57(2), 95–112.
- Coleman, M. (2007). Immigration geopolitics beyond the Mexico-US border. *Antipode*, 39(1), 54–76.
- Coleman, M. (2009). What counts as the politics and practice of security, and where? Devolution and immigrant insecurity after 9/11. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 99(5), 904–913.
- Conway, D., & Cohen, J. H. (1998). Consequences of migration and remittances for Mexican transnational communities. *Economic Geography*, 74, 26–44.

- Conway, D., & Potter, R. B. (Eds.). (2009). *Return migration of the next generations*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Cooke, T. J. (2008). Migration in a family way. *Population, Space and Place*, 14(4), 255–265.
- Cooke, T. J. (2011). It is not just the economy: Declining migration and the rise of secular rootedness. *Population Space and Place*, 17(3), 193–203.
- Cresswell, T. (2011). Mobilities 1: Catching up. *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(4), 550–558.
- Curry, L. (1972). A spatial analysis of gravity flows. *Regional Studies*, 6(2), 131–147.
- Da Vanzo, J. (1981). Repeat migration, information costs, and location-specific capital. *Population and Environment*, 4(1), 45–73.
- De Genova, N. (2007). Review of new destinations: Mexican immigration in the United States. In V. Zuñiga and R. Hernández-León. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112(4), 1271–1274.
- Dyer, S., McDowell, L., & Batnitzky, A. (2008). Emotional labour/body work: The caring labours of migrants in the UK's National Health Service. *Geoforum*, 39(6), 2030–2038.
- Dyer, S., McDowell, L., & Batnitzky, A. (2009). The impact of migration on the gendering of service work: The case of a west London hotel. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 17(6), 635–657.
- Ellis, M. (2012). Reinventing US internal migration studies in the age of international migration. *Population, Space and Place*, 18(2), 196–208.
- Ellis, M., & Muschkin, C. (1996). Migration of persons with AIDS—A search for support from elderly parents? *Social Science & Medicine*, 43(7), 1109–1118.
- Ellis, M., Barff, R., & Renard, B. (1993). Migration regions and interstate labor flows by occupation in the United States. *Growth and Change*, 24(2), 166–190.
- Ellis, M., Conway, D., & Bailey, A. J. (1996). The circular migration of Puerto Rican women: Towards a gendered explanation. *International Migration*, 34(1), 31–64.
- Ellis, M., Wright, R., & Parks, V. (2007). Geography and the Immigrant Division of Labor in Los Angeles. *Economic Geography*, 83(3), 255–283.
- England, K., & Stiell, B. (1997). “They think you’re as stupid as your English is”: Constructing foreign domestic workers in Toronto. *Environment and Planning A*, 29, 195–216.
- Fan, C. C., & Huang, Y. (1998). Waves of rural brides: Female marriage migration in China. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 88(2), 227–251.
- Fielding, A. J. (1992). Migration and social mobility: South East England as an escalator region. *Regional Studies*, 26(1), 1–15.
- Florida, R. L. (2002). *The rise of the creative class: And how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Florida, R. L. (2009). How the crash will reshape America. *The Atlantic*. <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2009/03/how-the-crash-will-reshape-america/7293/>. Last accessed 11 May 2012.
- Flowerdew, R., & Salt, J. (1979). Migration between labour market areas in Great Britain, 1970–1971. *Regional Studies*, 13, 211–231.
- Fotheringham, A. (1983). A new set of spatial-interaction models – The theory of competing destinations. *Environment and Planning A*, 15(1), 15–36.
- Goss, J., & Lindquist, B. (1995). Conceptualizing international labor migration: A structuration perspective. *International Migration Review*, 29(2), 317–351.
- Graves, P. E. (1979). A life-cycle empirical analysis of migration and climate, by race. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 6(2), 135–147.
- Greenwood, M. J., & Hunt, G. L. (1989). Jobs versus amenities in the analysis of metropolitan migration. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 25(1), 1–16.
- Greenwood, M. J., Mueser, P. R., Plane, D. A., & Schlottmann, A. M. (1991). New directions in migration research. *The Annals of Regional Science*, 25(4), 237–270.
- Grigg, D. B. (1977). E.G. Ravenstein and the ‘laws of migration’. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 3, 41–54.
- Hägerstrand, T. (1957). Migration and area. In D. Hannerberg (Ed.), *Migration in Sweden* (pp. 27–58). Lund: Gleerup.
- Hardill, I. (2002). *Gender, migration and the dual career household*. New York: Routledge.
- Hardwick, S. (2008). Place, space, and pattern: Geographical theories in international migration. In C. B. Brettell & J. F. Hollifield (Eds.), *Migration theory: Talking across disciplines* (2nd ed., pp. 161–182). New York: Routledge.
- Heikkilä, E. K., & Yeoh, B. S. A. (Eds.). (2010). *International marriages in the time of globalization*. Hauppauge: Nova Science Pub.
- Hempstead, K. (2007). Mobility of the foreign-born population in the United States, 1995–2000: The role of gateway states. *International Migration Review*, 41(2), 466–479.
- Holloway, S., Wright, R., & Ellis, M. (2012). The racially fragmented city? Neighborhood racial segregation and diversity jointly considered. *The Professional Geographer*, 63(4), 1–20.
- Hugo, G. (2006). Temporary migration and the labour market in Australia. *Australian Geographer*, 37(2), 211–231.
- Johnston, R. J., Poulsen, M., & Forrest, J. (2006). Ethnic residential segregation and assimilation in British towns and cities: A comparison of those claiming single and dual ethnic identities. *Migration Letters*, 3(1), 11–30.
- King, R. (2012). Geography and migration studies: Retrospect and prospect. *Population, Space and Place*, 18(2), 134–153.

- King, R., & Skeldon, R. (2010). "Mind the Gap!" Integrating approaches to internal and international migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(10), 1619–1646.
- Kofman, E. (2012). Rethinking care through social reproduction: articulating circuits of migration. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*. <http://sp.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2012/01/18/sp.jxr030>. Last accessed 11 May 2012.
- Kofman, E., & Raghuram, P. (2005). Gender and skilled migrants: Into and beyond the work place. *Geoforum*, 36(2), 149–154.
- Kwan, M.-P. (1998). Space-time and integral measures of individual accessibility: A comparative analysis using a point-based framework. *Geographical Analysis*, 30(3), 191–216.
- Ladinsky, J. (1967a). The geographic mobility of professional and technical manpower. *Journal of Human Resources*, 2, 475–494.
- Ladinsky, J. (1967b). Occupational determinants of geographic mobility among professional workers. *American Sociological Review*, 32, 233–264.
- Lawson, V. (2007). Geographies of care and responsibility. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 97(1), 1–11.
- Leitner, H., & Preston, V. (2012). Going local: Canadian and American immigration policy in the new century. In C. Teixeira, W. Li, & A. Kobayashi (Eds.), *Immigrant geographies of North American cities* (pp. 2–21). New York: Oxford.
- Ley, D. (2007). Countervailing immigration and domestic migration in gateway cities: Australian and Canadian variations on an American theme. *Economic Geography*, 83(3), 231–254.
- Lowry, I. S. (1966). *Migration and metropolitan growth: Two analytical models*. San Francisco: Chandler Pub. Co.
- Markusen, A., Hall, P., Campbell, S., & Deitrick, S. (1991). *The rise of the gunbelt: The military remapping of industrial America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Massey, D. (2004). Geographies of responsibility. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 86(1), 5–18.
- Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, J. E. (1993). Theories of international migration – A review and appraisal. *Population and Development Review*, 19(3), 431–466.
- Mattingly, D. (1999). Job search, social networks, and local labor market dynamics: The case of paid household work in San Diego California. *Urban Geography*, 20, 46–74.
- Morokvasic, M. (1984). Birds of passage are also women. *International Migration Review*, 18(4), 886–907.
- Morrison, P. S., & Clark, W. A. V. (2011). Internal migration and employment: Macro flows and micro motives. *Environment and Planning A*, 43(8), 1948–1964.
- Mountz, A. (2011). The enforcement archipelago: Detention, haunting, and asylum on islands. *Political Geography*, 30(1), 118–128.
- Mountz, A., & Wright, R. (1996). Daily life in the transnational migrant community of San Agustín, Oaxaca and Poughkeepsie, New York. *Diaspora*, 6(3), 403–428.
- Muth, R. F. (1971). Migration: Chicken or egg? *Southern Economic Journal*, 37(3), 295–306.
- Nelson, L., & Nelson, P. B. (2011). The global rural: Gentrification and linked migration in the rural USA. *Progress in Human Geography*, 35(4), 441–459.
- Nelson, P. B., Lee, A. W., & Nelson, L. (2009). Linking baby boomer and Hispanic migration streams into rural America – A multi-scaled approach. *Population Space and Place*, 15(3), 277–293.
- Nevels, J. (2010). *Operation gatekeeper and beyond* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Newbold, K. B. (2011). Migration and regional science: Opportunities and challenges in a changing environment. *The Annals of Regional Science*, 48(2), 451–468.
- Niedomysl, T., Östh, J., & van Ham, M. (2010). The globalisation of marriage fields: The Swedish case. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(7), 1119–1138.
- Ong, A. (2006). *Neoliberalism as exception: Mutations in sovereignty and citizenship*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Parks, V. (2004). Access to work: The effects of spatial and social accessibility on unemployment for native-born Black and immigrant women in Los Angeles. *Economic Geography*, 80(2), 141–172.
- Parrado, E. A. (2012). Immigration enforcement policies, the economic recession, and the size of local Mexican immigrant populations. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 641(1), 16–37.
- Pashigian, P. A. (1979). Occupational licensing and the interstate mobility of professionals. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 22, 1–25.
- Passell, J., Cohn, D., & Gonzalez-Barrera, A. (2012). *Net migration from Mexico falls to zero—And perhaps less*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Plane, D., & Mulligan, G. (1997). Measuring spatial focusing in a migration system. *Demography*, 34(2), 251–262.
- Pratt, G. (2012). *Families apart: Migrant mothers and the conflicts of labor and love*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ravenstein, E. G. (1885). The laws of migration – I. *Journal of the Statistical Society*, 48, 167–227.
- Ravenstein, E. G. (1889). The laws of migration – II. *Journal of the Statistical Society*, 52, 214–301.
- Rogers, A. (1990). Requiem for the net migrant. *Geographical Analysis*, 22, 283–300.
- Rogers, A., & Sweeney, S. (1998). Measuring the spatial focus of migration patterns. *Professional Geographer*, 50(2), 232–242.

- Rogerson, P. A., & Kim, D. (2005). Population distribution and redistribution of the baby-boom cohort in the United States: Recent trends and implications. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102(43), 15319–15324.
- Rogerson, P. A., Burr, J. A., & Lin, G. (1997). Changes in geographic proximity between parents and their adult children. *International Journal of Population Geography*, 3(2), 121–136.
- Roseman, C. C., & McHugh, K. E. (1982). Metropolitan areas as redistributors of population. *Urban Geography*, 3(1), 22–33.
- Rouse, R. (1991). Mexican migration and the social space of postmodernism. *Diaspora*, 1, 8–23.
- Roy, A. (2002). *City requiem, Calcutta: Gender and the politics of poverty*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Samers, M. (2010). *Migration*. New York: Routledge.
- Schleef, D. J., & Cavalcanti, H. B. (2009). *Latinos in Dixie: Class and assimilation in Richmond, Virginia*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Scott, A. J. (2010). Jobs or amenities? Destination choices of migrant engineers in the USA. *Papers in Regional Science*, 89(1), 43–63.
- Silvey, R. (2004). Power, difference and mobility: Feminist advances in migration studies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(4), 490–506.
- Silvey, R. (2006). Geographies of gender and migration: Spatializing social difference. *International Migration Review*, 40(1), 64–81.
- Singer, A. (2004). *The rise of new immigrant gateways*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Singer, A., Hardwick, S. W., & Brettell, C. (Eds.). (2008). *Twenty-first century gateways: Immigrant incorporation in suburban America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Skeldon, R. (2005). Interlinkages between internal and international migration and development in the Asian region. *International Journal of Population Geography*, 12(1), 15–30.
- Skeldon, R. (2008). International migration as a tool in development policy: A passing phase? *Population and Development Review*, 34(1), 1–18.
- Skeldon, R. (2012). Migration transitions revisited: Their continued relevance for the development of migration theory. *Population, Space, and Place*, 18, 154–166.
- Smith, H. A., & Furuse, O. J. (Eds.). (2006). *Latinos in the new south: Transformations of place*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Stewart, J. Q. (1942). A measure of the influence of a population at a distance. *Sociometry*, 5, 63–71.
- Stillwell, J., Bell, M., Blake, M., Duke-Williams, O., & Rees, P. (2000). Net migration and migration effectiveness: A comparison between Australia and the United Kingdom, 1976–96 – Part 1: Total migration patterns. *Journal of Population Research*, 17(1), 17–38.
- Storper, M. (1997). *The regional world: Territorial development in a global economy*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Sun, M., & Fan, C. C. (2011). China's permanent and temporary migrants: Differentials and changes, 1990–2000. *Professional Geographer*, 63(1), 92–112.
- Tobler, W. R. (1970). A computer movie simulating urban growth in the Detroit region. *Economic Geography*, 46, 234–240.
- Tobler, W. R. (1995). Migration: Ravenstein, thornthwaite, and beyond. *Urban Geography*, 16(4), 327–343.
- Tyner, J. A. (2007). *Made in the Philippines*. New York: Routledge.
- United Nations (2006). *International migration*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (United Nations Publication, Sales No. E.06.XIII.6). http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/2006Migration_Chart/2006Immig_chart.htm. Last accessed 2 Aug 2012.
- Varsanyi, M. W., et al. (2012). A multilayered jurisdictional patchwork: Immigration federalism in the United States. *Law and Policy*, 34(2), 138–158.
- Walker, K. E., & Leitner, H. (2011). The variegated landscape of local immigration policies in the United States. *Urban Geography*, 32(2), 156–178.
- Walker, R., Ellis, M., & Barff, R. (1992). Linked migration systems: Immigration and internal labor flows in the United States. *Economic Geography*, 68(3), 234–248.
- Wilson, A. (1975). Some new forms of spatial interaction models. *Transportation Research*, 9(2–3), 167–179.
- Winders, J. (2005). Changing politics of race and region: Latino migration to the US South. *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(6), 683–699.
- Withers, S. D., & Clark, W. A. V. (2006). Housing costs and the geography of family migration outcomes. *Population, Space and Place*, 12(4), 273–289.
- Wolpert, J. (1965). Behavioral aspects of the decision to migrate. *Papers in Regional Science*, 15, 159–169.
- Woods, R. (1993). Commentary on Zelinsky's model. *Progress in Human Geography*, 17, 213–215.
- Wright, R., & Ellis, M. (1996). Immigrants and the changing racial/ethnic division of labor in New York City, 1970–1990. *Urban Geography*, 17(4), 317–353.
- Wright, R., & Ellis, M. (1997). Nativity, ethnicity, and the evolution of the intra-urban division of labor in Los Angeles. *Urban Geography*, 18(3), 243–263.
- Wright, R., & Ellis, M. (2000). The ethnic and gender division of labor compared among immigrants to Los Angeles. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24(3), 583–601.
- Wright, R., Ellis, M., & Reibel, M. (1997). The linkage between immigration and internal migration in large metropolitan areas in the United States. *Economic Geography*, 73(2), 234–254.
- Wright, R., Ellis, M., & Parks, V. (2010). Immigrant niches and the intrametropolitan spatial division of labor. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(7), 1033–1059.
- Wyman, M. (1996). *Round trip to America*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Zelinsky, W. (1971). The hypothesis of the mobility transition. *Geographical Review*, 61, 219–249.
- Zelinsky, W. (1983). The impasse in migration theory: A sketch map for potential escapees. In P. Morrison (Ed.), *Population movements: Their forms and functions in urbanization and development* (pp. 19–46). Liège: Ordina.
- Zipf, G. K. (1946). The $P_1 P_2/D$ hypothesis: On the inter-city movement of persons. *American Sociological Review*, 11, 677–686.

International Handbook of Migration and Population
Distribution

White, M.J. (Ed.)

2016, VII, 636 p. 98 illus., 50 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-94-017-7281-5