Introduction

Although migration has been a human phenomenon from time immemorial, the creation of a system of states, usually dated from the Treaty of Westphalia (1648), has posed the issue of individuals crossing state boundaries, encompassed in the concept of state sovereignty. The decline of transportation and communication costs has increased human mobility over time, with international travel expanding exponentially since the Second World War. Remarkably, the proportion of the global population living outside their country of origin has remained relatively stable over the past seven decades, running around 3 percent of the global population. The fact that international migration remains the exception rather than the rule in an increasingly globalized world is an important observation. International migrants travel in all directions, with at least half moving within the Global South. However, the distribution of international migrants is not uniform; typically migrants move from poorer, more unstable states to wealthier, more stable states. And international migration has become a salient political issue virtually everywhere: in receiving societies, in sending societies, and even in transit societies. So a bibliographical article on the various dimensions of international migration is timely. International migration is a multidisciplinary research arena. Economists evaluate the impact of migration on the economy, on the state, and on different groups in the society, in both home and host societies. Sociologists examine the processes of immigrant incorporation, seconded by psychologists and anthropologists; sociologists are also attentive to the ties that migrants maintain to their home society, even while becoming members of the host society. Political scientists explore the determinants of immigration control policies and policies that govern resident foreigners upon arrival, as well as the determinants of state policies toward emigrants, such as remittance policies. And virtually all of these disciplines, enlarged by geographers, have weighed in on the processes that fuel the movement of individuals across international boundaries. Migration is usually divided into two categories, “forced” and “voluntary.” This is a useful dividing line, even though it is widely acknowledged that migrants have multiple reasons for moving and that there is often no clear dividing line to distinguish “forced” versus “voluntary” migrants. Due to the breadth and multidisciplinarity of the literature, this bibliography covers only voluntary international migration, both short and long term. It does not cover the research on forced migration flows (refugees and asylum seekers) as defined in the United Nations Convention and Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees (1951 and 1967). Subsequent to the overview of international migration and migration processes, the literature is organized around four themes. Immigration control focuses on state choices to admit a specific number and type of migrant; various categories of migrants, workers, family members, students, etc., are included in this section. Immigrant incorporation addresses issues of immigrant treatment upon arrival in the host state, immigrants’ willingness and capacity to adapt to the host society, and the maintenance of ties to their home state and society. Migration governance deals with the degree to which states are willing and able to cooperate with their counterparts in the international system to achieve their interests. Migrant rights are a central component of this section. Finally, the last section deals with linkages between international migration and other international issues, such as security, trade, aid, and development. This article reflects the bulk of the scholarship on international migration that has been produced in the Global North and/or published in globally prominent scholarly journals. There are additional resources, in regional or
General Overviews

The research on international migration is so broad and interdisciplinary that there are few books providing a general overview of the field. In the Textbook section, three suggested readings are given. The Resources section lists edited volumes that bring together scholars from the various disciplines that have migration as a central research issue to discuss both the problems and prospects for interdisciplinary research. We also include a compendium of international legal instruments dealing with migration.

Textbooks

Because migration is an interdisciplinary topic, there are few textbooks that cover issues of international migration from various perspectives and include a global overview of migration systems: that is, a description of the patterns of migration around the globe. Douglas Massey is one of the seminal scholars on migration; Massey, et al. 1998 gathers prominent scholars from around the globe to discuss regional migration systems at the beginning of the 21st century. Castles, et al. 2014 also provides a broad overview of regional migration systems as well as synthesizes research on a wide array of migration related topics. It is updated regularly so has become the standard text in the field. Messina and Lahav 2005 provides seminal research in various disciplines but has not been updated to reflect new research since 2005.


  This has now become a standard text on international migration, providing an empirical overview of various regions of the world. It also addresses the determinants of migration and the issues migration raises in both sending and receiving states. It is updated regularly to take into account new research.


  This volume provides an overview of migration systems geographically by region: North America, South America, Europe, the Gulf, Asia, and the Pacific. It incorporates an overview of issues of national development and community development.


  This edited volume collects seminal research in the migration literature on various dimensions of migration, including immigration control and immigrant integration, as well as historical and normative dimensions of immigration research.

Resources

Listed here are reference books on international migration research and international law on migration. More specific reference volumes are found by subject area. Bommes and Morawska 2005 confronts the epistemological underpinnings of migration research in various disciplines and attempts to provide methods for productive interdisciplinary research. Brettell and Hollifield 2015 allows scholars from each discipline to
address migration research from their disciplinary perspective. Perruchoud and Tömölövá 2007 gathers international legal instruments dealing with migration.


Migration research encompasses many social science disciplines and most scholars acknowledge that the research is informed by interdisciplinarity. This volume reveals the different epistemological underpinnings of each discipline as well as political contexts in which research is conducted. The authors raise these challenges so that migration researchers can acknowledge and overcome them.


This edited volume argues that “social scientists do not approach the study of immigration from a shared paradigm, but from a variety of competing theoretical viewpoints” (p. 2). The volume attempts to rectify these shortcomings by juxtaposing the research of the various social science disciplines.


This compendium brings together a wide assortment of international law affecting migration and migrants, starting with human rights conventions. The breadth of the compendium is substantial, covering international labor protections, refugee protections, minorities, detainees, statelessness, smuggling and trafficking, and so forth.

### Data for Migration Research

If one seeks to answer migration-related questions, there are different methodological choices available to scholars to evaluate their arguments empirically. Until fairly recently scholars have used case studies to generate and evaluate hypotheses. But we cannot effectively evaluate many of these hypotheses with case studies. Scholars are now trying to grasp how to measure concepts we are interested in. Indices are being created to measure different components of migration, migration policy, and migration outcomes. Some of these databases are generated in the interest of providing scholars with empirical evidence to test hypotheses across the broad area of migration. Other databases are created to test specific hypotheses of concern to the authors of the data. Despite the growing trend in the use of quantitative data, there remains a paucity of databases in the area of migration, and the few that exist tend to deal disproportionately with more industrialized states.

### Open Databases on Migration

The following data sets provide examples of current indices available for the migration-related scholarship. Huddleston, et al. 2011 provides useful tools to analyze eight dimensions of integration policy in thirty-one countries (wealthy Western democracies). The EUDO Citizenship Indicators contains four separate data banks with information on legal and administrative procedures for citizenship acquisition. The United Nations Population Division: International Migration Statistics provides international migration statistics on migration stock at the aggregate level and disaggregated by migrant characteristics (age and gender). Immigration Policies in Comparison makes available data on the immigration policies of OECD countries. To evaluate hypotheses related to immigration integration, the Multiculturalism Policy Index provides data on the cultural characteristics of migrant groups. Indicators of Citizenship Rights for Immigrants ranks countries on the degree to which fundamental human rights are granted to immigrant groups. Goodman 2012 measures policies of European states that require cultural education programs for incoming migrants. Beine, et al. 2007 provides data


  Provides data on age of entry of skilled migrants, which is necessary to estimate brain drain, as entry before the age of twenty-five is an indicator that education and training are provided by the receiving state rather than the sending state.


  Representing nearly half a million data points, the GRMD estimates the global migrant population (stock) by origin, destination, and religious affiliation.


  Measures the mobility of skilled workers for 170 countries in 1990 and 190 countries in 2000, including both developing and developed economies. The data cover a large geographical range and include 92.7% of OECD immigration stock.

- **EUDO Citizenship Indicators.**

  Provides data for the analysis of legal provisions, administrative procedures, statistical developments, and integration effects of citizenship acquisition. It includes four unique databases: Citizenship and Law Indicators; Implication Indicators; Acquisition Indicators; and Integration Indicators.


  Measures the extent to which European countries provide (or demand) acculturation programs for immigrants, such as language training and civic education.


  Provides tools to analyze and compare integration policy. The MIPEX includes thirty-one countries in order to provide a view of integration policies across a broad range of differing environments in wealthy Western democracies.

- **Immigration Policies in Comparison.**

  Focusing on thirty-three OECD countries from 1980–2010, the IMPIC database allows researchers to tackle a broad range of research questions on the causes and effects of immigration policies. All
countries are relatively rich, politically stable, and can be considered liberal democracies in which immigration policies are the output of democratic decision-making processes.


  The data set ranks countries on the degree to which fundamental human rights, such as family reunification, freedom of religion, nondiscrimination in employment, are granted to immigrant groups. These indicators measure immigrant group recognition and a country’s understanding of citizenship.

- **Multiculturalism Policy Index.**

  This data set for immigrant groups focuses on policies that give recognition to the cultural practices of immigrant groups and affirmative support that allows them to maintain those practices in their host societies.


  This database provides data on the international bilateral migration stock for 226 countries and territories. It includes data on migrants defined by country of birth and foreign nationality.

- **United Nations Population Division: International Migration Statistics.**

  The UN presents empirical data concerning the stock of international migrants both in its aggregated form and by sub-characteristics such as sex and age. There are several unique databases accessible to evaluate migration-related hypotheses.

- **World Bank: Global Matrices of Bilateral Migrant Stocks 1960–2000.**

  This database employs national censuses to present bilateral migrant stocks from 1960 to 2000, disaggregated by gender.

- **World Bank: Migration and Remittances Factbook.**

  This database presents inward and outward remittance flows from 1970 to 2014, although data are primarily from 2000 to current. There are also bilateral remittance matrices from 2010–2014.

### Databases Generated for Individual Projects

Although the databases created to test hypotheses relevant to the author(s) are oftentimes specific in the coverage of cases and variables, these help to provide data for the testing of other arguments and generating hypotheses. Below are articles employing original databases created for individual projects. *Singer 2010* provides cross-national data on remittances to developing countries from 1982 to 2006. *Hopkins 2010* collects data on the location of immigrants along with survey data on natives’ responses to migrant populations. The articles are linked to the original databases.

Data from several sources, including twelve geocoded surveys from 1992–2009. Provides data on the location of immigrants, along with survey data on residents’ response to the migrant population.

  
  Time-series cross-sectional data set of remittances with annual observations on up to seventy-four developing countries from 1982 to 2006.

### Methodological Reviews of Migration Data

There are a number of literature reviews on the state of migration scholarship in terms of empirical evidence and its availability. Below are some of the more recent methodological reviews. First, Black and Skeldon 2009 reviews the availability of data on studies concerned with the link between migration and development. Focusing on the United States, Massey 2010 reviews the state of current data related to immigration. Dancygier and Laitin 2014 reviews the methodological state of the literature as well as proposes new directions for future research. Bjerre, et al. 2015 reviews and critiques existing indices relating to international migration before discussing how these data may affect the research questions being addressed.


  The authors review existing indices measuring immigration policies by critically comparing and discussing them. They also discuss methodological strengths and weaknesses of the indices, how these affect the research questions that can be answered, and propose the next steps in index building within the field of immigration policy.


  Reviews the availability of data sources for studies on the link between migration and development. The authors assess these data and discuss role for empirical studies in the future.


  The authors review the methodological state of literature on migration and propose new directions for future research.


  Massey examines the state of current data on immigration in the United States.

### Types of International Migratory Flows

Individuals, families, and groups move across international borders for various reasons; however, until recently, these flows were treated as more or less homogeneous. Some individuals move to improve their economic prospects, education, or personal freedom. Others flee persecution, natural disaster, and/or violence. In the 20th century, international law was developed to account for some of the different reasons for international
migration. The concept of “refugee” was noted in international law as early as the 1920s and 1930s when the League of Nations facilitated the movement of some refugee groups. However, the Nazi atrocities during the Second World War, following the refusal of most nations to accept Jewish immigrants during the interwar period, led the international community to adopt a formal definition of “refugee,” to create the obligation of non-refoulement, and to define refugee rights in the host state. This was accomplished by the adoption of the United Nations Convention relating to the status of refugees in 1951 (supplemented by the 1967 Protocol). This international document, which has been widely ratified by states in the international system, clearly divides international migration flows into two types: “forced” and “voluntary.” The UN Convention definition of “refugee” is narrow in scope, referring to an individual with a “well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, [who] is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.” Karatani 2005 traces the evolution of the refugee system and how it became distinguished from the broader flow of migrants by dividing a previously homogeneous group of international migrants into “voluntary” and “forced” migrants. United Nations High Commissioner of Refugees 2012 provides annual reports on peoples qualifying under the refugee status. However, this international legal definition is hotly contested. Betts 2013 argues for a broader understanding of “refugee” that considers those whose survival is threatened. More recently, a third type of individual who crosses international borders has been recognized: short term travelers, such as students, business people, and family members who come to certain countries for short visits. This recognition has divided international migratory flows into three types: refugee, international travel, and labor migration (see Koslowski 2011). The boundaries between these groups are often blurred but nevertheless help researchers distinguish among types of migrants. The research referenced below traces these distinctions and the contestation of these boundaries. However, the article, as noted above, focuses on “voluntary” international migrants, both short and long term.


  Disputes the narrow definition of “refugee” based on persecution linked to a specific status. Individuals flee in many circumstances, both natural and human disasters, in order to save their lives. The author argues that the refugee system needs to be revised to incorporate a broader understanding of migration for survival.


  Provides a detailed history of the division of international migrants into two types, “forced” and “voluntary,” and describes the institutionalization of both regimes in the international system.


  Koslowski separates the movement of individuals across international borders into three types: refugee, international travel, and labor migration. This has been an important innovation in recognizing the different dimensions of international mobility.


  An annual report and periodic overviews of the categories of individuals falling under the commissioner’s purview. The organization has expanded its operational capacities to include internally
displaced persons: that is, individuals who would qualify for refugee status if they crossed an international border but are unable to do so.

Migration Processes

Regardless of the specific area of inquiry into dimensions of international migration, it is useful to have a background that explains why international migration arises in the first place. This work builds upon the innovative research in Ravenstein 1885, who exploited the 1871 and 1881 censuses in the United Kingdom to trace internal and international migration and to develop “laws” of migration. Passaris 1989 represents one contemporary strand of economic models that explore the “push factors” that cause individuals to leave their country of origin and “pull factors” that attract migrants to a particular destination. A more specific neoclassical economic model, elaborated in Borjas 1989, points to labor markets as the central component of international migration: individuals respond to the demand for labor across international boundaries, moving to the location with the highest return. Stark 1978 challenged this description of a migrant making individually rational decisions and presented a model of the family as the primary unit of analysis. Families seek to reduce the risk of income variation through multilocational households: rural, urban and international. Stark and Taylor 1989 incorporates the concept of relative (rather than absolute) deprivation as a motivator of international migration. Piore 1979 sees migrants as target earners, filling dirty, dangerous, and difficult jobs in the segmented labor markets in industrial societies, planning on returning home once income goals are met. On the other hand, Castles and Kosack 1973 points to the international capitalist system and capital penetration of poor countries in search of cheap and disposable labor to explain the phenomenon of international migration. Kritz, et al. 1992 describes how patterns of migratory flows are conditioned by the presence of other international economic flows: international trade, information flows, foreign direct investment, etc., can stimulate migration across international boundaries. Massey, et al. 1987 develops the concept of migrant networks as a mechanism for explaining the continuation of migration when initial conditions that induced the migration may have evaporated. Massey 1990 also proposes the notion of cumulative causation, which suggests that migration itself induces social and economic changes that make migration more likely in the future. Mayda 2010 presents evidence that all of these theories help explain different aspects of international migration flows.


  Neoclassical migration theory posits that individuals move across international boundaries in response to the supply and demand for labor, in order to obtain the highest return; this theory was developed to explain rural to urban migration. Borjas applies these concepts to international migration.


  These authors take a historical-structuralist approach and explain migration as a function of the capitalist system and the inequality in power that results. International migration serves to provide capitalists with cheap and disposable labor.


  These scholars adapt the framework of the geographer, Mabogunje, to international migration. The idea is that one form of exchange, such as trade, can engender other forms of exchange, such as international migration.

Massey presents the case for the cumulative causation of migration: that is, that migration induces changes in social and economic structures that increase the probability of future migration.


Massey and his colleagues observed the impact of social networks on reinforcing migration patterns, describing a process of “chain migration” or migration networks.


Much of the work on migration processes involves detailed work on households and specific cases of migration. This paper widens the investigation by exploring the determinants of migration flows into fourteen OECD countries by country of origin between 1980 and 1995.


Economic models of migration processes focus on the factors that “push” migrants to leave their country of origin (e.g., population density, lack of economic opportunity, political repression) and the factors that “pull” migrants to a particular destination (e.g., demand for labor, access to resources, political freedom).


Building on the New Economics of Labor Migration, Piore posits segmented labor markets as a cause of international migration. Migrant workers have target income goals to help meet needs in their home society and intend temporary stays. They fill dirty, difficult, and dangerous jobs in the host society because their status depends on their status at home rather than in the host country.


Based on a comparison of UK censuses in the late 19th century, Ravenstein developed seven “laws” of migration, some of which are still widely accepted today, such as “most migrants only proceed a short distance.”


Stark initiated the field of “New Economics of Labor Migration.” He turned the unit of analysis away from the individual to the family and argued that families employ migration as a strategy to handle risk associated with variability in income. Migrants may move even without wage differentials in order to provide an alternative source of income.

Extends the literature on the process of migration by pointing out that absolute gains may not be the only or most important motivating factor for migration. Rather, relative deprivation may motivate international migration.

**Immigration Control**

Since the advent of the state system, the control of borders has been a central element of national sovereignty. National sovereignty defines states’ ability to choose the number and characteristics of individuals allowed to enter the territory as well as their treatment upon arrival (see section on *Immigrant Incorporation*). These policies have changed over time and distinctive flows have been recognized and incorporated into national laws. This section begins with the generic theories of immigration control, which could apply to any specific flow. Thereafter, distinctive types of flows are recognized, skilled migration, temporary migration, family migration, women’s migration, environmental migration and new forms of migration. The final section presents research on undocumented entry and the actors that facilitate illegal flows across international boundaries.

**Theories of Immigration Control**

The literature on immigration control has focused on the determinants of immigration control policy at the national level. This research has a long history in the United States, with one of the earliest examples presented by Higham 1955. The interest in immigration control policy blossomed in Europe at the end of the period of economic growth following the Second World War that had drawn in guest workers and permanent migrants from European peripheries and colonial empires. Why, this literature asks, are some states more open to immigration than other states? And why have policy preferences changed over time? Much of the literature focuses on domestic political actors, employers, workers, taxpayers, and immigrants themselves, placed within the context of domestic political institutions. Hollifield 1992 argues that employers and courts create a “rights-market” coalition that promotes relatively open immigration policies in wealthy Western democracies. Freeman 1995 provides the classical political economy explanation of immigration policy based on concentrated benefits and diffuse costs. Money 1999 points out that because immigrants are geographically concentrated, the costs of migration may be concentrated as well, allowing anti-immigrant groups to organize politically; national political institutions determine how successful these anti-immigrant groups will be. Joppke 1998 is a highly cited article that combines and popularizes Hollifield’s and Freeman’s arguments. Meyers 2004 provides an overview of these theories as well as theoretical strands that run the gamut from a statist concept of “national interest” to class-based Marxist and world systems theories, to constructivist theories that suggest the importance of globalization and post-national norms. Doomernick and Jandl 2008 presents an empirical overview of the national control policies that allows scholars to evaluate some of the hypotheses described above. Goodman 2011 describes yet another method of immigration control, running through nationality policy. This initial literature developed hypotheses about the determinants of policy choice at the national level, predominantly in wealthy Western democracies. In subsequent sections, we follow the literature from a focus on national level politics to a more disaggregated approach that explores the various dimensions of enforcement (border, interior, and exterior) and the location of enforcement (national and sub-national; public and private).


This volume presents an empirical analysis of immigration control in Europe, distinguishing among external control, externalized control, and internal controls. This provides an excellent overview of the mechanisms of control in modern Europe.

Goodman points to a new policy tool that European states have employed to limit immigration, in particular, family migration, an arena that has been subject to the most stringent judicial constraints.


Freeman’s widely cited article suggests that immigration politics are client based: that is, the benefits of immigration policy are concentrated while the costs of immigration policy are diffuse. This facilitates the political organization of proponents of more open immigration policies while the opponents experience problems of collective action in the political arena.


This is one of the earliest books examining the determinants of nativism in the United States. Nativism is defined as “an intense opposition to an internal minority on the ground of its foreign connections” (p. 4). The rise and fall of nativism in the United States is attributed primarily to economic causes.


Hollifield argues that the relative openness to immigration in European countries after the Second World War is a reflection of a “rights-market” coalition. Employers need immigrants to provide flexibility in tight labor markets and courts enforce human rights for immigrants, constraining states from disposing of immigrant labor when it was no longer needed or wanted.


Joppke borrows from both Hollifield and Freeman to argue that states “self-limit” their sovereignty through client politics and through constraints created by the judiciary in liberal democracies.


Meyers provides a nice overview of the various theoretical approaches to understanding immigration control. The main explanatory variables include domestic political preferences and actors (detailed above); national interest; world systems theory; and forces emanating from the international system.


Money points out the political consequences of a well-known demographic fact: immigrants are geographically concentrated within host states, allowing anti-immigrant political forces to organize. However, since immigration policy is made at the national level, the state’s political institutions shape which local anti- (or pro) political forces are catapulted to the national level.

---

**Immigration Enforcement and Enforcement Actors**
In the absence of agreed empirical referents for immigration policy, the possibilities of theory building and theory testing on the politics of immigration control at the national level were exhausted. The research then turned to the immigration enforcement mechanisms themselves, controls at the border, interior control mechanisms, and exterior border controls (see under Immigration Enforcement). The research also examines the various actors that implement enforcement measures: supranational agencies, national bureaucracies, state and local governments, as well as private actors such as transportation companies. As part of this research, scholars ask about the ability of the state to control migration: Is national sovereignty compromised? If so, what constraints does the state experience? These questions are addressed in State Sovereignty and Immigration Control.

State Sovereignty and Immigration Control

As researchers turned to examine the actual implementation of immigration control policy, Cornelius, et al. 2014 presented the controversial “gap hypothesis” that suggests that wealthy Western democracies are unable to achieve the level of immigration control desired by citizens in migrant-receiving states. The initial and classical response by Freeman 1994 argues that state capacity to control migration is significant, as states adapt their policies and enforcement mechanisms to deal with new challenges. Guiraudon and Lahav 2000 elaborate on state adaptation by pointing out that states were able to delegate to international institutions, non-state actors, and local authorities. This article facilitated the shift from examining immigration policy at the national level to a more local focus.

  Presents chapters on the state of immigration and immigration control in wealthy Western democracies in Europe, North America, and the Pacific. In the initial volume, the “gap hypothesis” was introduced, which suggested a gap between what states and publics wanted in terms of immigration control and the flows that they received (originally published in 1994).

  This early article disaggregates immigration control by legal immigration, illegal immigration, temporary worker programs and asylum seekers and refugees. Freeman argues that although there are numerous policy failures, states respond by adapting policies and that state capacity to control migration is growing rather than declining.

  The authors argue that in response to rising immigration pressures, states have shifted the institutional locations for policymaking and enforcement up to international institutions, out to non-state actors, and down to local authorities. Thus states have adapted to and retain indirect control over migration.

Immigration Enforcement

Although states clearly have preferences over the level of immigration, there are varying degrees to which these preferences actually have an impact over outcomes. Andreas 2009 turns to the question of how migrants evade state border controls through the use of smugglers and illustrates the interdependence of border enforcement and smuggler strategies. Van der Leun 2006 points to the local enforcement of national policy that allows undocumented migrants to remain in the Netherlands. Ellermann 2009 points to the tension between sending and receiving states when receiving states attempt to repatriate undocumented migrants, using Germany and the
United States for empirical evidence. Vigneswaran 2008 argues that immigration control in post-apartheid South Africa is determined in large part by the existing institutional structure created under apartheid. Wong 2012 provides a quantitative analysis of state cooperation with national immigration enforcement in the United States.


  Focuses on the political economy of smuggling, including but not limited to human smuggling and trafficking. Andreas points out the interdependence of smuggling and the state and argues that the escalation of border enforcement on the US-Mexican border is a function of policy feedback effects and the need for politicians to manage the image of the border for constituent support (originally published in 2000).


  Ellermann focuses on the implementation of immigration control through deportation of undocumented aliens, with a comparison of Germany and the United States. She notes that interstate cooperation is required to deport aliens and, absent that cooperation, states have limited efficacy in controlling immigration.


  Points out that although immigration policy is determined at the national level, it is often implemented at the local level. Excluding undocumented immigrant access to state services has been difficult in the Netherlands because of the norms of professional social workers who implement policy.


  Vigneswaran takes a historical institutionalist approach to the implementation of immigration control and points out how the policing and immigration enforcement bureaucracies originating under apartheid constrained the ability of the South African state to implement “community enforcement,” an internal immigration control policy adopted post-apartheid.


  Explores which counties in the United States have cooperated with national enforcement agencies. A quantitative analysis reveals that the partisan composition of the local government, the influx of immigrants, and the local political power of the Hispanic/Latino community explain which counties actively cooperate with national immigration officials.

### Skilled Migration Policies

The research on high-skilled migration comes in at least two waves. The initial wave reflected the concerns of developing states at the loss of many of their professionals to high salaries and better living conditions in wealthy countries. Much of this research comes under the label of “the brain drain” clearly designating the
negative perspective on highly skilled migration. Bhagwati 1979 is representative of this literature; in this article, the author assumes that the impact is negative and discusses a number of taxation schemes to compensate poor countries for their loss. However, skilled migration was a relatively small part of the flow after the Second World War when many wealthy Western democracies employed predominantly low-skilled migrant labor to help rebuild their war-torn economies. The oil crisis of 1973–1974 shattered the patterns of high economic growth and led these countries to close their doors to labor migrants, if they had not already done so. However, the information and communications innovations of the 1990s triggered a new demand for migrants: only this time for highly skilled, rather than low-skilled, migrants. This demand caught immigration researchers by surprise and triggered a new generation of research on immigration control policies for the highly skilled. The research focuses primarily on the demand side of the equation. First, scholars ask how “skill” is defined and parse the distinctions states make in their definitions. Second, researchers evaluate how states select skilled migrants: through supply-driven systems that define a specific set of desirable characteristics (a “points” program) or via employer selection? Third, do programs allow for temporary or permanent migration and, in the case of temporary programs, is there a bridge between temporary and permanent status? Fourth, what are the outcomes for the skilled migrants themselves and the host society? There is also attention to the determinants of state choices on skilled migration policy, including a focus on domestic political institutions as well as specific political actors. A distinctive dimension of the literature is mentioned here only briefly: that is, the impact of skilled migration on developing countries. This issue is addressed more fully in the Development and Migration section.

Highly Skilled Flows, Causes, and Consequences

As noted above, Bhagwati 1979 takes the developing country perspective that highly skilled migration produces negative consequences for those left behind and proposes different types of taxes aimed at compensating the developing country for its losses. He is but one of many scholars who take this perspective. Salt 1997 provides one of the first overviews of the new flow of highly skilled workers, beginning in the 1990s, to the club of wealthy nations, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Koser and Salt 1997 points out that the openness to skilled migration is combined with policies that seek to reduce flows of low-skilled migrants. Cornelius, et al. 2001 examines empirically highly skilled flows in the United States, focusing on the evolution of policy in the United States and evaluating the impact of these flows on countries of origin. Bhagwati and Hanson 2009 provides an overview of policies in wealthy Western democracies, extending the coverage beyond the United States. Boeri, et al. 2012 presents a detailed and quantitative analysis of the impact of highly skilled migration flows on countries of origin as well as host countries. Boucher and Cerna 2014 summarizes the issues that scholars of highly skilled migration confront in a special edition of International Migration.


  Bhagwati assumes that the loss of highly skilled migrants is detrimental to poor, developing states and discusses a number of taxation schemes that would compensate these countries for their losses.


  This is one of several edited volumes on contemporary skilled migration that have been published in the early 21st century. As is the case with most of these volumes, the focus is predominantly on the United States with comparative chapters on other wealthy Western democracies.

This volume provides the latest research on highly skilled migration from the perspective of both host and home countries, written by the most prominent economists in the field. It is informed by significant empirical analysis and also suggests policy implications of the empirical findings.


This introduction to a special issue on highly skilled migration provides a primer of the research questions in this field and the proposed answers.


This volume focuses primarily on highly skilled migration to the United States; it provides an overview of the US evolution of policy toward highly skilled migration and the political debates surrounding policy. The volume also includes three chapters on the home-country consequences of the “brain drain” to the United States.


This is one of the first articles to point out the new openness of wealthy Western democracies to immigration but of a particular type (highly skilled), while maintaining a closed door to low-skilled migration. The article provides an overview of the research to date and sets a research agenda for the field.


Salt was one of the first scholars to recognize the distinctiveness of a new flow of migrants in a 1992 article. This pamphlet summarizes the state of knowledge for the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development, the club of wealthy nations that were all beginning to recruit highly skilled migrants.

**Determinants of Highly Skilled Immigration Policy**

Most of the research on highly skilled immigration is descriptive and focuses on the outcomes for the migrants, the host country, and the country of origin. This research assumes that the evolution of the global economy has created a demand for highly skilled migrants rather than exploring the variation among countries in their immigration policies. Duncan 2012 points to the diffusion of policies based on economic interdependence. Cerna 2014 describes greater variation in policy, which she attributes to varying coalitions of national actors, highly skilled labor, low-skilled labor, and employers.


Cerna examines the determinants of states’ skilled immigration policy choices. She points to shifting coalitions between the native highly skilled workforce, the native low-skilled workforce and employers as the primary determinants of policy choice. Evidence comes from France, Germany, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.
Temporarily Migration

The duration of voluntary international migration varies; thus, distinctions are made between permanent migration and temporary migration. The arbitrary but widely adopted definition of temporary migration is migration for less than one year. Temporary migrants are almost invariably viewed as labor migrants: that is, as members of the labor force. As noncitizens, temporary migrants have been viewed as vulnerable populations. In constructing a model of post-national citizenship, Soysal 1994 argues that international norms of human rights provide noncitizens with protections. Turning toward migrant incentives within the host country, Galor and Stark 1991 argues that migrants tend to outperform native laborers when the probability of return migration increases. Dustmann 1999 examines the economic motivations for temporary migrants to invest in human capital of the host country through language acquisition. The author develops a theoretical model and tests the hypotheses looking at adult males who migrated to Germany between 1955 and 1973. Paul 2013 argues that temporary migrants are socialized in the host country so that norms acquired abroad may lead returning migrants toward bottom-up changes in the home state.


Dustmann investigates the economic incentives of temporary migrants to invest in human capital of the host country, namely language acquisition. Differentiating between contract and voluntary return migrants, language accumulation is found to be negatively correlated with the amount of time a migrant intends to stay in the host country.


The authors investigate differentials in work performance between migrants and native workers even in the midst of unequal wages. Authors argue such differences arise not from worker characteristics but from economic incentives. They find that when there is a positive probability of return migration, immigrants tend to outperform their native counterparts.


The author develops a theory of “political remittances” whereby temporary migrants undergo political socialization through their interactions with various networks both within and between their receiving and sending states. Political socialization abroad can overwrite perspectives and behaviors acquired in the primary socialization phase.

Soysal argues that international norms of human rights are blurring the lines between citizen and noncitizen in host countries. Comparing incorporation regimes across western European countries, the author suggests a model of post-national citizenship that considers universal personhood rather than national memberships. The onus thus shifts from the nation-state to the international community to expand and protect migrant rights.

Family Migration

The research on family migration overlaps with the literature on women and migration but is distinctive because of its focus on the family unit, rather than on individuals within the family. It also overlaps with the integration literature but, again, focuses on the family unit rather than on individual migrants. Eleonore Kofman 2004 provides a nice overview of the questions addressed in the literature. She presents several categories of family migration starting with family reunification, where a family travels to the host country to join the original migrant. She lists many types of marriage migration: citizens who marry foreigners; migrants who import marriage partners from their home country; “mail order brides,” or women who are imported specifically to fill the marriage needs of the host country population, often in rural, depopulated areas; “forced marriages” where the individual (usually the woman) is forced to marry an individual from the home country or is forcibly imported to marry a migrant in the host country; and finally “sham marriages,” where the objective is to obtain a residence permit in the host state rather than consummate a life partnership. International adoptions comprise yet another category of family migration. Finally, families sometimes move together to a host country. To backtrack to earlier research, Dumont 1976 specifies three dimensions implicated by family migration: the legal, economic, and social dimensions. This early research is important for understanding the changing perspective, from family reunification as a solution to integration in the host society to family reunification as a constraint on integration into the host society. Lahav 1997 makes the case that states retain considerable sovereignty over family migration despite recognition of family unity as a human right. Lahav’s empirical evidence points to the narrow definition of family in the European context: a single spouse and dependent, unmarried children under the age of eighteen (or sixteen). Leinaweaver 2014 argues that international adoption should be seen as a form of family migration and, adopting an anthropological approach, suggests that the experience of the migrants (international adoptees) is “better understood as racialization.” Sabbe, et al. 2014 raises the issue of “forced marriage,” describes the policy response in host states as one of criminalization that discourages victims from coming forward, and petitions for a service-based approach to help migrants confront these problems. Abrego 2014 and Bonjour and Kraler 2015 represent research that specifically examines the role of family migration on integration. Abrego focuses on the Salvadoran community in the United States and the children left behind in El Salvador. Bonjour and Kraler summarize the findings of recent research and introduce a special issue on family migration on family integration in European countries. The most recent work normalizes family migration as one of many types of migrant streams, with its own internal and external dynamics. Bonjour and Schrover 2015 examines the role of media on family migration policy. When the media depict events as a “crisis” for the host society, public opinion is negative. When media depict events as “drama” and a personal tragedy for the individual migrant, public opinion is positive.


   Abrego provides detailed ethnographic studies of Salvadoran families in the United States and the impact of that migration on the children left behind. Ironically, parents leave to provide a better education for their children, but their children see few incentives to remain in school, leading to disappointment on both sides.

The authors survey the recent literature on family migration, pointing out the shift in perspectives on family migration as a mechanism for integration to family migration as a constraint on integration into European societies. In introducing new research in this area, the paucity of empirical data on these relationships is emphasized.


  Bonjour and Schrover tie family migration to the broader research agenda on the determinants of public policy, through an examination of public opinion. Contrary to the received wisdom, they provide evidence that public opinion, at least as reflected in the media, is not necessarily negative. The main driver is the depiction of the event as a “crisis” in the host society, or as a “drama,” a tragedy for the individual migrant.


  The author briefly describes efforts to establish family reunification rights at least since the end of the Second World War. He organizes his presentation to address the availability of data and the legal, economic, and social dimensions of family reunification. He provides a brief but comprehensive survey of the knowledge to date.


  Kofman argues that family migration has been ignored in the migration literature because of an emphasis on the individual migrant as primary actor. However, in wealthy Western democracies, family migration should not be overlooked, as it is the largest component of migratory flows in the contemporary period.


  Lahav points out the tension between human rights that recognize the centrality of family unity and state sovereignty over admissions. She argues that international instruments reinforce state sovereignty and provides empirical evidence on the definition of the family in “Western” nuclear family terms as an example of states’ continuing ability to control immigration flows.


  Leinaweaver draws on demography as well as anthropology to frame the research on international adoption. International adoption became more visible after the Korean War, when efforts were made to adopt biracial children of US servicemen and Korean women. Since then, the ethnic or racial dimension has become pronounced and generates issues for adoptees and their families.


  Forced marriage has risen on the policy agenda in Europe as migrants have chosen marriage partners for their offspring from the home country. The usual victim is perceived as the daughter of migrants raised
in the host country. States have passed various legislation, including the twenty-one-year rule, to reduce the incidence of forced marriage.

Women’s Migration

While migration in general is a research topic amenable to interdisciplinary approaches, gender differentiation within migration has uniquely benefited from interdisciplinary collaboration. Research in sociology, anthropology, psychology, economics, and political science has contributed to developing an understanding of how gender is a determinant of migration flows as well as outcome of inequitable treatment by states and citizens. Policies are not uniform toward immigrant groups. The gendered approach toward migration policy differentiates immigration processes in host states according to the implementation of policy toward men compared to women migrants.

Gender Determinants of Migration

The determinants of migration and the effects of migration upon individuals, societies, and states are not uniform across categories of migrants. Differentiating migration by gender allows for a more nuanced approach to explaining what motivates individuals to migrate, the effects of migration for women as compared to men, and the effects of gendered migration for others. Scholarship on gendered migration has largely been situated in feminist studies, but gender has recently been incorporated into the research on the causes and consequences of migration. This section begins with a review of the unique determinants for gender-specific migration. We then move to present research on migration policy differentiated by gender and the interdisciplinary work on gender-based migration. Finally, we review the role of gender in the relationship between migration security and discourse. Where early research treated men and women similarly in their migration decision making, gender has become an important component in explaining the determinants of migration. Neoclassical approaches focus on the economic determinants of engendered migration. Behrman and Wolfe 1982 provides an early differentiation between men and women about the decision to migrate based upon the availability of marriage partners. Within an economic framework, Morokvasic 1984 highlights the distinctive costs and benefits for would-be women migrants. Behavioral approaches acknowledge the relationships between men and women in marriage, households, and the economy but also emphasize gender segregation in labor markets and gender norms that influence mobility. De Jong 2000 examines migration in Thailand to argue that women’s responsibilities for dependent care decrease the probability of migration. Boyle, et al. 2001 provides evidence that family migration decisions tend to benefit the male’s wage-earning potential while hurting that of female partners. The household strategies approach focuses upon the importance of reproduction (i.e., the processes involved in reproducing the labor force) in guiding gender-differentiated migration. Truong 1996 presents an early investigation into the role of female migrants as reproductive laborers in the trans-border transfer of labor. Maher 2004 contends that female “reproductive” migrants take the household work so that women in the host country may better access social rights and political engagement.


  The authors use spatial economic variables common to neoclassical models to explain migration behavior and differentiate between men and women through the inclusion of the availability of marriage partners. The treatment for women as migrants is the addition of an independent variable to traditional economic arguments.

Using evidence from the United Kingdom and United States, the authors find that family migration patterns tend to benefit the male while hurting the female’s wage-earning potential. Instead of comparing migrant males and females to non-migrant males and females independently, this study assesses couples migrating together.


Evaluating the intentions of Thai individuals to migrate for employment, the author finds that family responsibilities such as dependent care decrease the willingness for women to migrate in comparison to male migrants.


The “trade in domestic workers” involves massive flows of female migrants from less developed states to more developed states and a new “international division of reproductive labor”. Migrant reproductive women take the “dirty work” so that the First World women they replace may access social rights and political engagement.


Within an economic framework, the author highlights the distinctive costs and benefits for would-be women migrants. Women may be further exploited as a consequence of migration in the form of low wages and lack of political rights, but women can gain independence, respect, and awareness that their conditions are not fated.


The author develops an analytical framework to understand female migration as reproductive laborers in a cross-national transfer of labor. The case study of Japan is employed to demonstrate that globalized markets lead to the “social dumping” of unwanted work in reproduction to women from low-income countries.

**Interdisciplinary Approaches**

Research across disciplines in the social sciences has contributed toward explaining the relationship between gender and migration. Pedraza 1991 provides a review of the literature on the role of women in migration through examining various strands across disciplines. Boyd and Grieco 2003 incorporates gender into theories of migration and provides a review of scholarship on the topic. Curran, et al. 2006 is a review of the sociology literature on gender and migration. In surveying the interdisciplinary literature, Piper 2006 critiques the lack of theoretical explanation on gender and migration. Boucher 2007 raises questions of policy implications when examining the impact of preferences for skilled migration upon would-be female migrants.


With a focus upon Australian and Canadian policies, the author discusses the gender equality concerns raised by the policy shift toward skilled immigration and away from family immigration.

The authors are among those who seek to incorporate gender into theories of international migration at all levels. They provide an overview of the scholarship to date.


The authors review the sociological literature over three decades on the ways in which gender fundamentally organizes the social relations and structures, influencing the causes and consequences of migration. Scholarship began to incorporate power asymmetries within the household and the role of gender in migrant networks, enclave economies, etc.


Pedraza reviews the literature on the “neglected role of women in migration.” The author examines various strands across disciplines such as gender and the decision to migrate, patterns of labor market participation and industry concentration, and the relationship of work roles upon the family structure for migrant women.


Piper critiques the current migration literature for its lack of attention to gender in migration. She examines gender occupations such as domestic care, sex work/mail-order brides, and health care. The role of gender and the state is examined as well as global governance.

**Gender and Security**

Gender not only drives migration flows and patterns but also is subject to identity discourse and security in receiving states. Such discourses create strong identities that often serve to hinder immigration and assimilation policies among states and citizens. Furthermore, the insecurity of women is even more acute when considered in light of the negative discourse and lack of rights that too often accompany migrant populations in receiving states. In exploring the power of dialogue and security, Hansen 2000 argues the so-called Copenhagen school has woefully ignored the lack of voice in female migrants compared to that of men. Kofman, et al. 2013 contends that female migrants have moved from the periphery to the center of discourse, but not always in a positive light as perceived by natives.


Hansen criticizes the Copenhagen school of security for ignoring the lack of voice in female migrants. Even if speech were an instrument of security, such a focus presupposes that speech is possible but women may be unable to voice their insecurity.

Examines the discourse of immigration and gender in European states. Female migrants have moved from the periphery to the center of discourse but not necessarily in a positive light. Women have often been perceived as uneducated and backward migrants victimized by patriarchal societies.

**Environmental Migration**

Environmental migration has been placed by some scholars in the “forced” category of migration, and the term “environmental refugee” has been employed to alert policymakers and the public to the severity of the issue. However, this position is controversial. The research in this area explores the environmental reasons for migration and proposes various definitions of environmental migration that take into account varying degrees of choice in the migratory decision. The research also explores the degree to which states are able to cooperate on environmental migration. Finally, international relations scholars explore how climate induced migration may contribute to conflict within and between states.

**Environmental Reasons for Migration**

Environmental change and degradation imposes costs upon vulnerable populations. Early work using the environment as a determinant of migration focused upon fixed environmental features such as temperature and precipitation; and it treated decision making as an economic cost-benefit analysis. The literature expanded with the rising salience of climate change and the dynamic nature of environmental change became a focus for explaining global migration patterns. Recent developments in the literature focus upon the consequences of climate-induced migration and the reactions by states and international organizations to the increasing trend of voluntary and forced environmental migrants. This section features a review on the environment as a determinant for migration before presenting literature that attempts to classify environment-based migration. Then there is a perspective of international interdependence and a study of cooperation among states on environmental migration and the effects of such migration upon security. Early work examining the effects of environmental variation upon human migration was rooted in internal migration and treated the migrant as an economic agent whereby the environment was one of many inputs in a cost-benefit economic decision-making model. Such work focused on how fixed attributes of climate such as temperature and precipitation drive the spatial allocation of productive resources, namely labor. More recent work, however, focuses upon the dynamic nature of the environment as a determinant of migration flows. Specifically, the increasing rate of climate change has garnered attention for explaining a new pattern of global migration. Findley 1994 differentiates between temporary and permanent international migration and finds that drought induces temporary flows but not permanent resettlement. Reuveny and Moore 2009 conducts a cross-national analysis and find that adverse climate change is a determinant of migration to developed countries. Instrumenting environmental degradation through decreases in crop yields, Feng, et al. 2010 finds emigration is positively correlated with changes to the domestic climate. Gemenne 2011 provides a more sober tone to this research area through surveying quantitative work; the author indicates that no consensus exists of the impact of climate change on international migration.


The authors instrument climate change through annual crop yields to assess the relationship between changes in the environment and climate-induced migration. They find that a 10 percent decrease in crop yield is predicted to increase Mexican migration to the US by 2 percent. This suggests that international migration would increase with environmental degradation.

This case study investigates drought-induced migration in Mali to other African cities in the region and to cities in France. The author finds that permanent migration did not increase with the 1983–1985 drought nor was there any significant change in migration among men. But circular migration increased.


While confirming that environmental changes induce migration, the author reviews the estimates of current and future migration arising from climate change. The author demonstrates the absence of a consensual estimate. The author suggests avenues to improve accuracy of the estimates of environmental migrants.


The authors conduct a large-N statistical analysis of the emigration to fifteen developed countries between 1990 and 2000 due to climate change. Empirical results suggest that environmental degradation plays a statistically significant role in out-migration, pushing individuals to move to other countries.

### Definitions of Environmental Migration

The extent to which the environment pressures individuals to seek opportunities outside of their home regions challenges the voluntary nature of migration. Myers 2002 simply refers to all migrants with acute vulnerability to changes in the environment as “environmental refugees” while Bates 2002 proposes a classification of environment-induced migrations as forced versus voluntary. Biermann and Boas 2010 demonstrates the dangers of incorrectly defining migrants due to environmental degradation. One must note this classification discourse raises normative debates within the literature on climate-induced migration.


Bates places environmental refugees between “forced” and “voluntary” migrants. She classifies *environmental refugees* as those who react to a sudden and severe degradation of their environment, *environmental emigrants* who are compelled to leave their homes, and *environmental migrants* who have choice because of slow environmental degradation.


The authors summarize the disagreement over definitions for climate-induced migration among the academic community and argue against expanding the definition of refugees (under the 1951 Geneva Convention on Refugees). The authors instead call for a new legal instrument tailored to the needs of environment-induced migration.


Provides a description of the problem of “environmental refugees” and is cited for its attention to a growing trend of migration induced by environmental degradation. Compared to traditional refugees who flee their homes for political reasons, environmental refugees totaled nearly half of all annual refugee flows in 1995.
International Cooperation on Environmental Migration

As migration arising from climate change increases in the 21st century, more attention is devoted to the response by states and institutions and the prospects for international cooperation. If the asymmetric effects of climate change are most felt by the poor and less developed as argued by Tacoli 2009, there is need for preventative measures by the international community. Work in this area provides a normative discourse that promotes reforms in international regimes and petitions for more egalitarian policies to mitigate the effects of climate change. Hartmann 2010 suggests that because discourse on climate-induced migration increasingly revolves around securitization, international cooperation is more difficult. Bettini 2013 argues that moving the discourse of environmental migrating toward security and toward dire consequences will only erode avenues for international cooperation.


Bettini argues that the discourse over climate change drives the politics of global governance and cooperation in the issue area. The moves toward a security- or apocalyptic-based dialogue over climate change look toward a post-political discursive configuration that will adversely affect environmental migrants.


Hartmann argues that the discourse and language of climate change is moving toward securitization. This poses a direct threat/problem for the peaceful international cooperation needed to equitably and effectively mitigate the consequences of climate change upon those more susceptible to climate migration.


The predicted flows of environment migrants are directly related to mobility. Because mobility is not uniformly distributed across space, the trend of environmentally induced migration should be more acute for short distance and short term. The ability to move will be related to the flow of environmental migration.

Climate-induced Migration and Security

Climate-induced migration poses questions of security for would-be receiving and transit states. Reuveny 2007 shows that the pressure from migrants escaping the adverse effects of climate change increases the probability of conflict in receiving states. White 2011 meanwhile contends that inflows of environmental migration may also change policy toward the securitization of receiving states. Salehyan 2008 critiques the research on environmental degradation and violence; the author argues that the relationship is conditional on both social and political variables.


Individuals and households in areas affected by environmental degradation have three responses: (1) stay and do nothing, (2) stay and mitigate the effects of climate change, or (3) leave affected area. Individuals in less-developed regions are more apt to migrate, and these flows increase the propensity for conflict in the receiving states.
Taking a non-determinist approach to climate change and political violence, the author argues that the link between climate-induced migration and violence is contingent upon a number of political and social variables. Environmental degradation and the increasing scarcity for resources by itself is not a sufficient condition for political violence within a state.

The author investigates the security impact of climate-induced migration upon receiving states in the North Atlantic. The author differentiates between the continuum of environment migrants (involuntary through voluntary) to examine how such migration affects the electorates and policymakers in receiving states.

New Forms of Migration

As the research lens has focused more closely on migration flows, the heterogeneity of the flows is being recognized. In addition to “high”- and “low”-skilled migration, temporary migration and family migration, scholars have recognized other specific flows, such as international students and “lifestyle migration” and “retirement migration.” Featured in this section is research on international student migration. A second strand of research on new forms of migration examines those regions that have adopted “freedom of movement,” allowing citizens within the region to work and to live in any country of the region, regardless of citizenship. These migration patterns may be distinctive because of the fact of free movement. However, this research is limited by the paucity of actual empirical cases: the European Union is almost the only region that has actually implemented freedom of movement.

International Student Migration

Like the research on broader migration flows, the research on student migration examines the “pull” and “push” factors generating this flow. While paying attention to students’ demand for educational opportunities, Findlay 2011 posits that institutions of higher education act as a supply-side determinant for student migration. In presenting an overview, Van Mol 2014 places international student migration into the broader area of voluntary migration through examining the determinants and effects of student mobility. Raghuram 2013 is among the first to differentiate between student and labor migrants through creating a spatially based argument of institutions of higher education as strategic brokers of knowledge. A second dimension of the literature focuses on student mobility in the European Union. Using large survey analyses, King and Ruiz-Gelices 2003 finds support for their hypotheses that international student migration promotes broad identity and increases individuals’ proclivity to move abroad in their future career paths. Van Mol 2013 uses a mixed-methods approach to test the extent to which intra-European student migration promotes a common European identity.

Using the UK as a case study, Findlay examines the characteristics of international student migration and develops theories explaining student mobility based upon the demand for Western education by a global middle class as well as the supply side of universities’ global recruitment of students. He argues that supply-side theories of student mobility are central to the growth in international students.

The authors argue that intra-European international student migration promotes European identity and increases tendency for individuals to pursue their career path across Continental European nation-states. These hypotheses are tested and supported by comparing students who had spent a year abroad to domestic university students and to students who were about to study abroad.


Raghuram addresses the blurred lines of student-versus-labor migration through focusing upon the spatiality of knowledge. Such an approach considers the role of higher education institutions, in maintaining their role as knowledge brokers, as determinants of student migration.


Van Mol tests the relationship of intra-European student migration upon a European identity using quantitative and qualitative methods. He argues that the experience-based nature of student migration promotes internal and external European identity through socialization, although regional variations are still visible.


Van Mol employs a comparative analysis of student migration in Europe to demonstrate the micro- and macro-level impact of international student mobility. He treats student migration similar to other international migration flows in investigating causes and impact of student flows on future migration aspirations and European normative transformations.

**Freedom of Movement**

While freedom of movement is central to member states of the European Union, its effects are felt both within and outside of Europe. The role of intra-European migration to promote regional identity is the focus of scholarship. Favell 2009 examines the effects of migration on developing a European identity through comparing migration coming from beyond Europe and migration between European states. Making use of in-depth interviews, Favell 2008 explores freedom of movement’s effects both on the individual and the nation-state. Assessing the effect of freedom of movement on labor unions, Thomas 2015 argues migrants have inclusive rights to trade unions but are often informally obstructed from leadership and defining union policy. In their overview of European migration, Boswell and Geddes 2010 discusses the complex role of citizenship and intra-European mobility wrought by the freedom of movement.


Examines the practice and political debate regarding EU mobility policy with an emphasis upon the distinction between migration and mobility at both the national and supranational level. The controversy concerning free movement and EU enlargement is also explored.

Makes use of qualitative in-depth interviews to examine intra–European Union migration in western European cities. Implications wrought by the freedom of movement are investigated at the micro level, such as lifestyle and career opportunities, and at the macro level such as challenges to the welfare state.


Examines the historical development of a European identity based upon migration. Three flows of migration are analyzed: immigration of non-Europeans into European states, small flows of intra-European elite migration, and flows of East-West intra-European migration.


Investigates the incorporation of migrant workers in the participation and leadership of trade unions arising from the freedom of movement. Using Luxembourg as a case study, the author finds migrant workers have formal inclusive rights to unions but may be informally excluded from participating in the definition and implementation of union policies.

**Illegal Entry–Immigrant Smuggling**

States adopt policies that govern the level of openness and implement those policies via interior, border, and exterior enforcement. When the supply of migrants exceeds the demand as reflected in state policy, migrants seek to evade these control mechanisms by crossing borders outside of ports of entry or by breaking the terms of their entry documents. These immigrants are variously labeled “undocumented,” “illegal,” and “irregular.” However, as states enhance their control capacities, crossing international borders begins to require the help of intermediaries. When the migrant requests and receives the service free of coercion, this is labeled “smuggling.” When the migrant is coerced, the transaction is labeled “trafficking.” Both activities are now subject to United Nations conventions, the “Palermo Protocols” to the United Nations Convention on Transnational Organized Crime: the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children and the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air. The research focuses on understanding the conditions under which these illegal migration flows would arise, the incentive structures of the intermediaries, how they affect migrant human rights, and the level of international cooperation.

**Smuggling and Trafficking as Illicit Businesses**

As many wealthy Western democracies chose smaller immigration intakes beginning in the 1970s, migrants looked for alternative ways to cross international borders. Salt and Stein 1997 observes the rise of smuggling and trafficking and places it in the economic context of providing services to migrants who are unable to cross more highly enforced borders on their own. Because this is an illicit business, Salt 2000 argues that additional empirical research is needed. Bilger, et al. 2006 takes up the idea of smuggling as an illicit business, in the empirical context of Austria. Aronowitz 2009 provides additional empirical evidence to demonstrate that sex trafficking is only one component of a larger arena of smuggling and trafficking. Koser 2010 points out that enforcement is only one of several means of dealing with undocumented migration; regularization programs that turn undocumented migrants into documented migrants is one such policy that is implemented frequently in Europe and the United States. Van Liempt 2011 provides a gendered perspective on smuggling and trafficking, pointing out that understanding women’s decisions to migrate illegally requires understanding the conditions
they are seeking to leave behind. Kyle and Koslowski 2011 brings together numerous authors with case studies of smuggling and trafficking around the globe, including a historical perspective. Gallagher 2001 addresses trafficking and smuggling from the perspective of migrant rights and argues that the UN Conventions on smuggling and trafficking are oriented toward crime rather than rights.


  The research points to countries of origin as the initial locus of exploitation of migrants; trafficking includes men, as well as women and children, so that sexual exploitation should not be the primary lens with which to view trafficking.


  The authors present human smuggling as a transnational service industry that links service providers with their clients. Issues of incomplete information are critical to understanding the market and make human smuggling distinctive from other types of criminal activities.


  Provides a detailed review of the United Nations protocols on trafficking and smuggling. Gallagher argues that the protocols emphasize the criminal nature of the activity and provide limited protection of migrant rights.


  Provides an overview of dimensions of irregular migration, including how statistics on irregular migration are created and distinctions among smuggling, trafficking, and asylum. The article also provides an overview of regularization programs, the causes of irregular migration, and the consequences of irregular migration.


  This edited volume updates the original research (2001) on both smuggling and trafficking. The volume includes an important historical dimension as well as country case studies that illuminate the various dimensions of trafficking and smuggling. Finally, the authors address issues of international cooperation on trafficking and smuggling.


  Argues that the facts of human trafficking and smuggling have outrun the actual empirical research on the issue. The article delineates what we currently know and outlines research priorities.

The authors describe international migration as a global business with both legal and illegal components. As wealthy Western democracies increase border controls and enforcement, entrepreneurs arise to move individuals across international borders by evading border controls.


The author relies on research involving fifty-six interviews involving women in “assisted” migration. She points out the gendered dimension of the discourse on smuggling and trafficking that overlooks the risks of remaining at home by focusing only on the risks of assisted migration. Women are not merely victims but agents in the migration process.

**Immigrant Incorporation**

International migration has always been a multidisciplinary research arena, and this is especially evident in the area of immigrant incorporation. Immigrant incorporation explores how immigrants are treated once they have arrived in a host country and how they and the host society adapt to their presence. This section begins with an overview of the research on immigrant assimilation developed predominantly in the United States, which forms the backdrop to contemporary research. Then comes the research that identifies immigrant incorporation as a policy issue, followed by definitions of the dimensions of incorporation. Finally, this section also examines the individual perspective on immigrant incorporation as well as the politics of incorporation policies.

**Theories of Immigrant Incorporation**

The long history of immigration to the United States has generated an equally long research agenda on immigrant incorporation into the United States. The assimilation of European migrants in the 19th and early 20th centuries was often taken for granted by researchers, in part because immigration legislation in the early 1920s heavily restricted new inflows of migrants. The Chicago school posited that immigrants adopted the mores of the native population, assimilating in language, education, culture, employment, and income (i.e., “straight line convergence”). This theory has been labeled “classical assimilation” theory. Gordon 1964 built on this theory and developed a staged process of assimilation, beginning with close social relations (structural assimilation), followed by intermarriage, ethnic identification, and the decline of prejudice and discrimination. This positive perspective was criticized by Glazer and Moynihan 1963, which pointed out racial and/or ethnic discrimination that prevented certain groups from assimilating, thus creating an underclass of immigrants. Society has institutional and cultural barriers that prevent even those who have adopted the local mores and language from full participation in the society. Borjas 1990 provides detailed empirical evidence on the wage and educational profiles of immigrants as compared with the native population. Portes and Zhou 1993 focuses on the children of immigrants arriving in the large waves of immigration subsequent to the 1965 US immigration reform bill. They provide a model of segmented assimilation that suggests that some migrant groups come to resemble the host population while other migrant groups fail to achieve integration or assimilation. Some immigrants faced barriers to assimilation, such as poor educational opportunities, local pockets of unemployment, etc., that prevent assimilation. Ethnic or racial discrimination adds to the burden of some immigrant groups. As a result, some immigrant groups are able to assimilate whereas other immigrant groups are not (i.e., segmented assimilation). This theory is distinct from but similar to the “new assimilationist theory” proposed by Alba and Nee 2003. Alba and Nee’s focus on institutional opportunities and barriers (such as the Civil Rights Act of 1965) also promised to explain varying trajectories of assimilation among individuals and immigrant groups. Brown and Bean 2006 nicely summarizes the debate before offering a new perspective, which suggests that there are different types of identification with the home and host cultures that facilitate distinctive assimilation paths. Waters and Jiménez 2005 argues that assimilation is different in the contemporary period because immigrants are more geographically dispersed, and new immigrant arrivals
continuously change the established immigrant community. Portes, et al. 2009 updates the initial Portes study and provides empirical evidence of “downward assimilation” of some immigrant groups.


Authors of the “new assimilation theory” posit that straight-line assimilation is either facilitated or hindered by societal institutions. Assimilation is a two-sided coin whereby the immigrant changes but so, too, does the host society.


Although the focus of this book is the impact of immigrants on the US economy, a significant portion of the book examines the degree to which immigrants come to resemble US citizens in terms of education and earnings, which are key indicators in immigrant assimilation.


Provides a short but clear overview of the theories of assimilation developed in the United States, starting with the Chicago school in the 1920s through the contemporary era. They outline classic and new assimilation theory, the racial/ethnic disadvantage model, and the segmented assimilation model before offering a model of “changing identificational assimilation.”


The authors study the various immigrant groups in New York and draw broader conclusions about the processes of assimilation to American society. Ethnic and racial discrimination prevent contemporary groups from assimilating in a similar fashion to the European migrants of earlier decades. This perspective has been labeled the “racial/ethnic disadvantage” model.


Building on the Chicago school of immigrant assimilation or convergence with the American society, Gordon proposes seven stages of assimilation that migrants follow to become full members of the host society.


Updates the initial Portes and Zhou research with a more nuanced model of segmented assimilation and shares the results of the fourth wave of data generated on the children of US immigrants over a fifteen-year time frame. They demonstrate that a significant portion of specific nationality groups experience downward assimilation.

Portes and coauthors explore the integration of the children of immigrants in the United States. They develop a theory of segmented assimilation that describes different paths, given the parents’ starting point. Both the traits of the immigrants and the context in which they join the host society matter for the type of assimilation that awaits.


Evaluates empirically the status of immigrants in terms of socioeconomic status, spatial concentration, language assimilation, and marriage. The empirical evidence is from the United States and two new factors are important: the geographic dispersion of immigrants to new gateways and the continual replenishment of immigrant groups.

**Immigration Integration, Transnationalism, and Return (non–United States)**

Research and theory building in the United States have shaped research on immigrant incorporation in Europe and elsewhere. Drawing on US theories, researchers point out that experience elsewhere is not necessarily identical to the type of assimilation or incorporation experienced in the United States. Most of the research compares European countries, occasionally using the United States as an additional data point. The research has also incorporated the concept of transnationalism. Transnationalism is defined by the maintenance of social ties in more than one state. The degree of immigrant transnationalism may affect the degree of incorporation. Finally, research has begun to examine the issues immigrants face upon return to their country of origin (e.g., issues of “reincorporation”). An edited volume by Eckstein and Najam 2013 is one of the first to examine the economic impact of migrants, generally viewed as positive, and contrast that to “social remittances,” that are more often negative (also see Social Remittances).

**Immigrant Incorporation Outside the United States**

Faist 2000 proposes that the degree of migrant transnationalism affects the degree of incorporation into the host society. Crul and Vermeulen 2003 attempts to ascertain whether the segmented assimilation model proposed by Portes explains outcomes of second-generation migrants in Europe. Empirical evidence on Turkish second-generation migrants suggests that the US model is not applicable in Europe. Van Tibergen, et al. 2004 evaluates the degree of immigrant incorporation using quantitative evidence from eighteen wealthy Western democracies. Koopmans 2010 posits that host country policy has a significant impact on immigrant incorporation: a strong welfare state and a policy of multiculturalism allow immigrants to segregate themselves, with poor results for incorporation into the host society. Wright and Bloemraad 2012 disputes the negative role of multicultural policies on incorporation and provides evidence from eighteen wealthy Western democracies that supports their contentions. Adida 2011 explores immigrant incorporation in Africa and suggests that theories explaining immigrant incorporation in Western democracies, such as cultural similarity, work in the opposite direction in Africa. Galandini 2014 provides a survey of recent literature on the political integration of immigrants.


Examines immigrant incorporation in non-Western countries, specifically west African countries. The research overturns the usual relationship between cultural similarities between the host and home populations in wealthy Western democracies that enhance the likelihood of incorporation.

Crul and Vermeulen examine the outcomes of children of immigrants born in Europe (Turkish second-generation immigrants in six European nations) and educational and employment outcomes. They conclude “that the segmented assimilation model is not supported by our empirical findings” (p. 974) in Europe.


  Brings transnationalism into the debate about immigrant incorporation. In the contemporary period, migrants often maintain close ties and networks with home countries. These transnational ties may affect the type of immigrant incorporation that takes place.


  Provides a recent review of scholarly work on a specific dimension of immigrant integration: that is, integration into the political sphere.


  Koopmans argues that the combination of generous welfare policies and multiculturalism allow immigrants to segregate themselves from the host society, generating low levels of labor market participation, housing segregation, and overrepresentation in incarceration. These are deemed poor incorporation outcomes. Evidence from eight European states supports these contentions.


  Focuses on economic incorporation of migrants in terms of labor market participation and unemployment. They examine immigrants in eighteen Western countries from 1980 to 2001, exploring the impact of origin country traits (origin effect), host country traits (destination effect), and relations between origin and destination (community effects).


  Responding to the debate on the negative effects of multicultural policies on immigrant incorporation, Wright and Bloemaard marshal survey evidence from immigrants in sixteen European countries as well as the United States and Canada from 2000–2008. They find that multicultural policies do not diminish sociopolitical incorporation.

**Return Migration**

More recently, scholars attempted to evaluate the impact of return migration on the home society. Some of the research is described below in Development and Migration. Constant and Massey 2002 evaluates the determinants of return migration, finding that income maximization (from neo-classical economics) is the main determinant of return behavior, although aspects of the new economics of labor migration model are confirmed
as well. Eckstein and Najam 2013 provides articles examining the various economic and social repercussions of return migration. In the volume, David Fitzgerald coins the term “dissimilation” to suggest that return migrants should be distinguished from those they left behind. The specific negative social remittances detailed in the volume include gangs, death by disease (HIV/AIDS), and the breakdown of the family.


  The authors employ a data set of more than three thousand migrant workers in Germany to assess the determinants of return. They conclude that migrants have heterogeneous strategies.


  Provides one example of the research on immigrant reincorporation upon return to the home society. Although the economic impacts are generally painted as positive and include remittances, investment, and access to new technologies, social remittances are more often seen as negative.

**Transnationalism**

Migrants maintain ties with their home countries in a variety of ways. In earlier centuries, the ability to maintain ties was constrained by high transportation and communications costs, although return migration was frequent. With cheaper means of transportation and communication, international migrants can more easily maintain ties with their home countries. This phenomenon has been labeled “transnationalism” and a research agenda has been constructed to study the conditions under which transnational communities will evolve and the impact of these communities on home and host societies. The phrase “social remittances” was coined to describe these activities. Basch, et al. 1994 describes the continuing ties that contemporary migrants maintain between their host and home societies. This phenomenon was seen in opposition to the traditional territorial nation-state. Portes, et al. 1999 and Vertovec 1999 summarize the state of the research on transnationalism. Cohen 1997 differentiates transnational communities from diasporas. Guarnizo, et al. 2003 examines the political dimensions of transnationalism and, based on evidence from three transnational communities, argues that transnational political activity does not compromise the ability of immigrants to integrate into the United States. In a special issue of *International Migration*, Levitt, et al. 2003 updates the research on transnationalism. Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004 critiques the research on transnationalism, arguing that the phenomenon is less significant than the research suggests.


  These authors were among the first to debate the significance of continuing ties between migrants and their home communities, even as they were incorporated into the host society. These systems were initially labeled “deteritorialized nation-states” in light of and in opposition to the contemporary system of nation-states.


  “Diaspora” is a term originating in Greek city-states to describe ties between expatriates and the home community. Cohen provides a list of characteristics that make diasporas distinctive from transnational communities: a shared national memory and ethnic identity are central components.

Guarnizo and his colleagues undertook interviews with three migrant groups in four destination cities in the United States. They argue that the extent of transnational political activity is small and does not undermine political integration into the United States.


Provides an overview of transnationalism in migration: the maintenance of linkages between home and host society that affect both individual migrants and the societies they move between.


Portes and his co-authors provide the standard definition of transnationalism, activities that “take place on a recurrent basis across national borders and that require a regular and significant commitment of time by participants” (p. 464). Globalization, along with decreased transportation and communication costs, allow transnational communities to flourish.


Once the idea of transnationalism was disseminated, researchers began to identify these activities and argued that they were widespread.


The authors critique the research on transnationalism, arguing that migrants and the communities they seek to create are subject to other, especially political, forces.

**Definitions, Dimensions, and Policies of Immigrant Incorporation**

Hammar 1985 popularized the distinction between immigration control and immigrant integration, thereby opening the field of immigrant incorporation more broadly to scholars in all disciplines. However, the different disciplines ask different questions. Psychologists, such as Berry 1997, are interested in individual acculturation, sociologists tend to examine immigrants based on country of origin groups, while political scientists focus on state policies toward immigrants. Bertossi and Duyvendak 2012 provides an overview of the initial research that focused on “national models” of integration. Joppke 2007 argues that distinct national models of immigrant integration are converging. Freeman 2004 suggests that immigrant incorporation takes place across multiple societal dimensions (e.g., work, residence, culture, politics, and so on), requiring a disaggregated approach to immigrant incorporation. Goodman 2010 develops a civic integration index to measure language, country-knowledge, and value-commitment requirements that immigrants must fulfill to stay in the host country. Banting and Kymlicka 2013 addresses the policy of multiculturalism, summarizing the literature and arguing that civic integration is distinctive and layered on top of multiculturalism. Virtually all of the research focuses on immigrant incorporation in wealthy democracies in large part because receiving states elsewhere, especially in Southeast Asia and the Gulf oil states, seek to limit migration to temporary stays and to avoid immigrant incorporation.

Addresses the level of multicultural policies in Europe and argues that MIPEX and CIVIX do not measure multiculturalism. The authors update a Multiculturalism Policy Index at three points in time (1980, 2000, 2010) for wealthy Western democracies. They argue that civic integration has been layered on top of multiculturalism.


Provides an overview of research in cross-cultural psychology that focuses on immigrant acculturation and adaptation. The research outlines four immigrant acculturation strategies based on the weight of cultural maintenance (of the home culture) and contact and participation in the host culture.


Provides an overview of the initial research on immigrant integration, which relied on ideal-typical “national models” of integration. Much of this literature has since been discarded, either by arguing that national models have converged or that national models were never an appropriate mechanism for understanding immigrant incorporation.


Freeman argues that the different dimensions of integration policy mobilize different political actors and, therefore, create different political outcomes. This belies a national models approach and suggests that immigrant incorporation policy must be disaggregated in order to understand national policy choices.


Develops a civic integration index (CIVIX) to measure language, country-knowledge, and value-commitment requirements across fifteen “old” members of the European Union. Goodman suggests that integration policies are dynamic and play a role not only in immigrant integration but also in immigration control.


Hammar popularizes the distinction between “immigrant regulation and aliens control” and “immigrant policy.” The edited volume provides chapters on immigration and immigrant policy in six European countries and a comparative analysis of immigration control policy and immigrant policy.

Joppke argues that distinct national models of immigrant integration are converging on two dimensions, civic integration and anti-discrimination. Civic integration requires individual immigrants to integrate themselves into the host society. Anti-discrimination requires that the host society treat individual immigrants as having the same legal rights without regard to national origin or religion.

**Migration and Public Opinion**

As globalization leads to an increasing flow of migrants, scholars have turned their attention to the role of public opinion. The determinants of individual preferences toward immigration are examined using both micro foundations and country-level characteristics to assess why some people are more favorable to immigration than others. However, the importance of public opinion depends on whether or not it constrains policymakers. In this regard, a second strand of literature on public opinion seeks to assess the linkages between the preferences of mass publics and the implementation of immigration policy. This section begins with reviewing the state of the literature on individual preferences for immigration. We then review the scholarship on country-level determinants of preferences for immigrations. Finally, we present research on the transposition of preferences into policy.

**Individual Preferences for Immigration**

With an emphasis upon industrialized democracies as host states, this strand of the literature focuses upon the determinants of individual preferences for immigration. If the voter-to-policy link is robust, the preferences of individuals toward the number and characteristics of incoming migrants are an important catalyst for state-level migration policies. Competing arguments have been posited whereby economic and noneconomic variables shape the preferences of individuals toward immigration. Scheve and Slaughter 2001, for example, report that less-skilled natives tend to prefer more restrictive immigration policies. Mayda 2006 examines cross-national evidence to conclude that individual immigration preferences are derived from both economic and non-economic determinants. When compared to trade protectionism, Mayda 2008 finds that natives tend to hold stronger pro-trade than pro-immigration preferences. Where earlier work in this area focused more upon economic determinants, the inclusion of identity and symbols with economic micro foundations is prevalent in the current analyses. Sides and Citrin 2007 provides cross-national evidence to demonstrate that non-economic factors such as cultural cohesion are stronger determinants of immigration preferences among natives than economic variables. Hainmueller and Hiscox 2010 employs a survey experiment to argue that economic characteristics do not adequately explain individual preferences for immigration policy. Similarly, Goldstein and Peters 2014 uses a survey experiment during a recession to show that preferences for highly skilled over low-skilled migration vary across individuals and over time. Whereas most of the work on individual immigration preferences has taken place in industrialized economies, more recent scholarship has begun to investigate similar questions in developing economies. Survey evidence from Southeast Asian states, provided by the International Labour Organization 2011, demonstrates that native attitudes toward immigration are similar to those found in wealthy Western democracies.


  The authors employ experimental evidence from the US recessionary period to test individual preferences for immigration. While respondents have a baseline preference for highly skilled over low-skilled migrants, these opinions varied over the recession cycle.

The authors conduct a survey experiment to assess two competing economic explanations for immigrant preferences: labor market competition and fiscal exposure based on welfare state provisions. Neither model is supported in the survey experiment, suggesting that economic micro foundations are not the best determinant of individual preferences toward immigration.

- **International Labour Organization.** *Study on Public Attitudes to Migrant Workers.* ILO, 2011.
  
  The International Labour Organization conducted surveys on individual attitudes toward migrants in four East Asian countries: Malaysia, Republic of Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan. Similar to attitudes toward migrants in wealthy Western democracies, most residents are not favorably disposed toward immigrants.

  
  Using a cross-national survey of individual preferences toward immigration with individual-level and country-level characteristics, the author finds that the economic interests of individuals are the leading determinant of attitudes toward migrants, although noneconomic variables contribute to attitudes as well.

  
  Using cross-national evidence, the author finds that individuals usually tend to be more pro-trade than pro-immigration. The key difference between the two economic flows is the short-run cleavage in trade preferences, absent in immigration, between those working in exporting compared to import-competing sectors.

  
  Using the National Election Studies surveys of US residents, the authors report that less-skilled workers in receiving states tend to prefer policies restricting immigrant inflows; they also find no evidence that the relationship between skills and immigration opinions is stronger in high-immigration communities.

  
  The authors analyze respondents in twenty countries sampled in the European Social Survey (2002–2003). Individuals are generally opposed to immigration based on economic interests, information, and identity. The authors find that symbolic predispositions, such as preferences for cultural unity, have a stronger statistical effect than economic dissatisfaction.

**Country-level Determinants of Attitudes Toward Migration**

In addition to micro foundations influencing individuals’ preferences for more or less migration, country-level characteristics are related to general opinion toward migration. These characteristics have often been incorporated with micro-level variables to explain migration preferences. However, scholarship has also been directed toward the independent effects of state-level determinants of migration attitudes. Crepaz 2008 examines the effect of the welfare state upon conditioning native attitudes toward immigration. Similarly, Crepaz and Damron 2008 evaluates how changes in public expenditure toward welfare programs are related to public attitudes toward migration.

The author compiles cross-national survey data to show that the comprehensive welfare state in European countries established norms of high interpersonal trust. This induces even the most anti-immigrant citizens to continue taking responsibility for the maintenance of the welfare state even if considerable benefits accrue to immigrants.


The authors examine the impact of the programmatic and expenditure dimensions of the welfare state on attitudes of natives across Western democracies, theorizing that nativist resentment and welfare chauvinism should be reduced in more comprehensive welfare systems.

**Transposing Public Opinion into Immigration Policy**

Public opinion in advanced democracies tends to oppose immigration, particularly that of low-skilled migrants. Despite this empirical finding, states vary in the restrictiveness of their immigration policies. Lahav 2004 confirms this gap through examining European survey data to find the public is relatively informed about immigration-related issues. As such, the following literature examines the gap between individual preferences and policy choice. Several arguments are posited; the most prevalent theory suggests problems of collective action. Because those opposed to immigration experience only diffuse costs, as Freeman 1995 argues, it does not pay to mobilize politically, leaving the field open to those who receive the concentrated benefits of immigration. Facchini and Mayda 2008 finds that only a minority of individuals prefer more open immigration policy and point to the power of interest-group dynamics to explain the gap between public opinion and immigration policy. Cerna 2014 contends that shifting coalitions between capital and low- versus highly skilled labor explain oscillations in the restrictiveness of national policy toward immigration. Dancygier and Laitin 2014 provides a review of the extant literature on this topic.


The author argues that despite similar labor market pressures, immigration policy for the highly skilled varies due to shifting coalitions between native highly skilled labor, low-skilled labor, and capital. The varying labor market organization of actors informs differences in coalitions, which results in different highly skilled immigration policies, cross-nationally and over time.


The authors provide a review of the scholarship on the implications of migration for labor-market discrimination and for immigrant-state and immigrant-native violence. The topic of migrant integration and methodological problems in the subfield are also examined.


Analyzes individual preferences for immigration in order to assess migration policy outcomes in liberal democratic states. The authors find that only a small minority of voters favors more open policies. The
authors contend that interest-group dynamics have the potential to explain the gap between mass public preferences and migration policy.


  Freeman argues that benefits of immigration are concentrated and the costs diffused, so organized opinion in liberal democracies tends to support immigration while popular opinion is more restrictive. Immigration policy should be less restrictive in countries that experience their first immigration waves earlier and where pro-immigration interests are better institutionalized.


  The author evaluates public opinion data from Eurobarometer surveys along with demographic trends and EU initiatives. She finds the public more informed about immigration-related issues than traditionally presumed. She concludes that public opinion is better reflected in EU policy than previously believed.

### Migration Governance

The research on international cooperation on migration or, in different terminology, global migration governance, encompasses all types of human movement across international borders. The research began and remains infused with a normative dimension: that states must cooperate on issues of international migration both to achieve their own goals and to protect the rights of those who cross international borders. Many of the articles and books on this topic refer to “managing” migration as the goal of interstate relations. Because all of the research, with only one or two exceptions, gathers together international flows of individuals as refugees, asylum seekers, international travelers, and labor migrants, there exists no consensus on how much interstate cooperation or global governance actually exists at bilateral, regional, and multilateral levels. Much of the work is in edited volumes that bring together experts on different migration flows or with different regional expertise who present descriptive evidence. Below we provide citations that address the normative dimension of the debate, asking what type of global migration governance should be constructed and reference research that proposes institutional change within the United Nations system. We then list the empirical work, primarily in edited volumes, that describes the presence or absence of interstate cooperation by type of flow or by geographic region. Finally, we present a list of scholars who attempt to unravel the theoretical determinants of international cooperation or the lack thereof. Migration governance also includes migrant rights. There, too, the research reflects a normative bent, although empirical research on the determinants of migrant rights is beginning to appear, as well as case studies of mobilization at the local and state level. The last section on migration governance explores the relatively new research on international travel regimes.

### Normative Perspectives

Much of the research on international cooperation is written with an eye on policy recommendations for more cooperation among states. Ghosh 2000 proposes a regime of regulated openness as a method of improving access for migrants while reducing undocumented flows. Straubhaar 2000 takes an economic perspective, focusing on the externalities created by migration in order to shape a recommendation for more global governance. Koser 2010 presents five characteristics of the global migration system that recommend more intensive cooperation. Newland 2010 provides a more empirical overview of the structures of cooperation and reviews alternative recommendations for enhancing migration governance. Martin 2011 focuses more specifically on the wide-ranging activities of the United Nations on international migration and recommends a reorganization of the current institutional structure of migration management.

Ghosh argues for a regime of “regulated openness” to cope with the various pressures for migration and resulting irregular flows of international migrants. He also argues for a regime that encompasses all international migratory flows and rejects the idea of multiple migration regimes.


Koser presents five arguments in support of global governance for migration: international migration is at high levels; states can no longer manage these flows; migrants lack protection; the scale of international migration is increasing; and momentum is developing to improve governance.


Examines the current international institutional structure affecting international migration and proposes an institutional reorganization to help ensure the orderly management of flows and the protection of migrant rights.


Traces the evolution of international cooperation on migration and reviews a series of policy options to manage international migration. These options include but are not limited to creating a new international agency, designating a lead agency, and a World Trade Organization model of cooperation.


Straubhaar argues that international migration creates both positive and negative externalities that can be better managed by global rules.

**Empirical Overviews of Global Governance of International Migration**

The empirical evidence of global migration governance is large. There are bilateral, regional, and multilateral forums, informal and formal, within the structure of the United Nations and outside the structure of the United Nations. The details of global governance are enormous. The method employed to date has been to gather a group of experts, set up a common organizing structure, and have each scholar contribute his or her expertise. The results are published in edited volumes. These volumes are generally high-quality volumes in terms of description, but they reflect a lack of theoretical rigor, the construction of a theory of cooperation, and the evaluation of hypotheses empirically. Nonetheless, they represent a large set of empirical knowledge by experts in the field. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 2004 provides a set of conference papers bringing together experts on bilateral labor agreements. Betts 2011 divides issues of migration governance into separate flows (highly skilled, low-skilled, undocumented, etc.); each flow is described in terms of the types of cooperation and coordination that exist among states. Gamlen and Marsh 2011 divides migration governance into unilateral, bilateral, regional, and multilateral modes and provides extant research that speaks to these dimensions of global governance. Hansen, et al. 2011 focuses on regional cooperation on
migration, among countries of the Global North, between countries of the Global North and the Global South, and among countries of the Global South. Koslowski 2011 divides migration into three regimes: refugee, voluntary, and travel, with associated governance structures. The edited volume speaks mostly to international cooperation on voluntary migration and the travel regime, which is much more densely organized than the voluntary migration regime. Kunz, et al. 2011 focuses on the partnerships that European countries have constructed with migrant-sending countries, using carrots and sticks to manage migration flows.

  Examines the prospects for international cooperation, divided by type of flows: low- and high-skilled migration, irregular migration, international travel, lifestyle migration, environmental migration, refugees, internally displaced persons, human trafficking and smuggling, remittances, and diasporas.

  This volume gathers previously published research on migration and global governance at the state, bilateral, regional, and multilateral levels, including a section on the transnational mode of global governance.

  This volume focuses predominantly on regional cooperation on migration, among countries of the Global North, between countries of the Global North and the Global South, and among countries of the Global South. Both formal and informal institutions of cooperation are examined.

  Koslowski divides mobility regimes into three types, refugee, international travel and labor migration, which provides intellectual clarity on the prospects of international cooperation by type of flow. The volume includes one chapter on refugee regimes but focuses mostly on international travel and labor migration.

  Examines the types of cooperation that states in the European Union have constructed with developing states to manage migration, with issue linkage as the glue of the partnership, which is embedded within the regional institution of the European Union.

  The volume presents country case studies on the role of bilateral labor agreements from the perspective of both receiving states and sending states (the Philippines in particular).

**Determinants of Global Governance of International Migration**

As noted above, much of the research on international cooperation or global governance of international migration is descriptive and normative, pointing out the reasons why managing migration would produce better
results on dimensions that the authors prioritize. Fewer scholars have made the effort to understand how international migration (e.g., labor migration) differs from other international economic flows in terms of potential cooperation among states in the international system. The most explicit research comes from the discipline of political science and the subfield of international relations, which has an established repertoire of theories explaining the conditions under which states cooperate in the international system. Newland and Papadimitriou 1998–1999 argues that receiving states have converging migration practices that are closing the door to both refugees and voluntary migrants. Hollifield 2000 sees migration management as a global public good and argues that suasion is the tool to achieve better migration management. Hatton 2007 focuses on the lack of reciprocal migration flows as a barrier to more substantive international cooperation. Betts 2011 organizes the types of cooperation that occur around the types of externalities that arise from public goods, club goods, and private goods. Rudolph 2011 compares cooperation on migration to cooperation on trade, privileging explanatory variables such as global security threats and international leadership. Hollifield 2011 points to the problem of collective action that must be overcome to provide the public good of international migration. Sykes 2013 echoes Hatton’s research on the lack of reciprocal migration flows and what he calls the “one way problem,” as well as welfare migration as barriers to international cooperation. Geiger and Pécoud 2014 examines the role of international organizations themselves in cooperation but argues that these organizations adopt the interests of powerful (receiving) states, thereby privileging as specific set of interests.


  Betts argues that, although there are no formal governance institutions except for refugees, there is a tapestry of informal institutions, arising in an ad hoc fashion at the bilateral, regional, and multilateral levels. Betts explains the variation across flows by reference to the type of externality generated: public good, club good, and private good.


  Focuses on the role of international organizations in the global governance of migration. They are seen as independent actors who play a role in designing and implementing immigration policy. However, the authors argue, these organizations adopt the interests of powerful, migrant-receiving states.


  Points out the lack of reciprocity in international migration flows that presents a stumbling block to international cooperation on migration.


  Hollifield argues that “suasion” must be employed to create an international migration regime.


  In this, and in several earlier articles, Hollifield makes the claim that international migration, like international trade, provides a global public good. Overcoming problems of collective action that arise from the provision of a public good are required before an international regime can be constructed.

The authors argue that some dimensions of an international migration regime are growing through the convergence of migration practices on both forced (refugee) and voluntary migration flows, although the regime suggests closure rather than openness.


Rudolph draws a parallel between regime formation on trade and regime formation on migration, focusing on global security threats, international leadership, shared ideas, the evolution of regimes over time, and regime design flexibility as determinants of regime formation in international migration.


Sykes evaluates the potential for international cooperation on migration given the global economic efficiencies that more open migration would bring. He points to asymmetric information, welfare migration, and the “one-way problem” as barriers to international cooperation.

### Migrant Rights: Normative Debates and Institutional Structure

Migrant rights have been on the political agenda since at least the late 19th century. The literature reflects four different dimensions of scholarship. The first is the normative dimension: what rights should migrants have? The philosophical debate opposes those who argue that states have a moral right to exclude non-citizens from entry and those who argue that the only justifiable moral position is open borders. A second dimension of the research is legal and historical. Here, researchers document the evolution of international organizations dealing with migrant rights and analyze international conventions of both the United Nations (UN) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) as well as regional agreements. The research is primarily descriptive although some authors take a more analytical stance and suggest factors that contribute to treaty negotiation and treaty ratification of international standards protecting migrant workers and migrants more generally. The third and fourth strands are more recent. One strand examines public opinion on migrant rights and theorizes and analyses mobilization of various actors on behalf of migrant rights (see under Politics of Migrant Rights). The last strand consists of case studies of mobilization for migrant rights within a wide array of countries (see Mobilizing for Migrant Rights).

### Normative Debates about Migrant Rights

Walzer 1983 is the author usually cited as the theorist who provides a moral argument for states to control entry over immigration although, he argues, once immigrants are admitted, states should facilitate the path to full membership. Carens 2013 responds that open borders is the only morally justifiable position. This debate generally distinguishes between refugees who, according to the United Nations Convention on Refugees, cannot be turned away at the border and so-called voluntary migrants. Ottonelli and Torresi 2013 questions this division of flows into “forced” and “voluntary” migration. Smith argues that prior activities of states, such as colonization, create a moral obligation for a broader intake of migrants.

Carens responds to Walzer’s argument. He examines all dimensions of migrant rights in democracies, arguing that residence is the basis of rights. More controversially, he argues that democratic theory supports a policy of open borders.


The authors argue that defining when migration is voluntary is central to the debate over migrant rights, to theorize the normative claims of the migrants and the proper policy responses.


Smith makes the claim that colonial powers have an obligation to the members of previously colonized societies and that one way of meeting those obligations is to permit larger immigration flows from those now-independent states.


This is a seminal essay that argues for a moral basis for states to control the entry of immigrants; although, once these immigrants are admitted, democratic states are morally obliged to facilitate their access to full membership in the community through access to citizenship.

**Legal and Historical Description of Migrant Rights**


  Provides a short but effective overview of the International Labour Organization’s activities on behalf of migrant workers since 1919, when the organization was established by the Versailles Treaty at the end of First World War.


  This volume analyzes both ILO and UN conventions on the rights of migrant workers, spelling out the areas in common with other human rights conventions and areas that are distinctive to the migrants.


  This volume focuses specifically on the UN International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. It discusses the origins of the convention, analyzes the constraints associated with the lack of ratification, and provides case studies of migrant rights in eight countries.

This is a firsthand account of the actors, positions, and negotiations of the UN Convention on the Rights of Migrant Workers, with a strong analytical focus.

**The Politics of Migrant Rights**

The normative and institutional analysis of migrant rights does not provide a sense of how migrant rights are established. The literature reviewed in this section addresses these issues directly by evaluating public opinion toward migrant rights as distinctive from public opinion toward migrants (see Public Opinion on Migrant Rights). An interesting contradiction often exists, at least in democracies, that public opinion is usually unfavorable toward migrants yet favorable toward migrant rights. The literature on the determinants of migrant rights is thin. Migrant rights are often seen as human rights, and the United Nations International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families is classified as a human rights treaty. However, this treaty is poorly ratified, as are the International Labour Organization treaties dealing with migrant workers. Although there are numerous international nongovernmental organizations that are pressing for wider ratification of international treaties, researchers tend to focus on local and national mobilization as prime determinants of migrant rights.

**Public Opinion on Migrant Rights**

Crush 2000 provides insight into support for and opposition to migrant rights in South Africa. Ceobanu and Escandell 2011 examines public attitudes toward the granting of citizenship to migrants in twenty European countries. Fauvelle-Aymar 2014 focuses on the interaction of citizenship, voting, and the socioeconomic status of migrants and argues that host country workers are more favorably disposed toward immigrants when immigrants are able to vote.


  The authors present a comparative analysis of attitudes toward granting citizenship and dual citizenship to migrants in twenty European countries in 2003. Two institutional dimensions of access to citizenship, the length of residence required and dual citizenship, increase public opposition to granting of citizenship to migrants.


  Presents public opinion toward migrant rights in South Africa. Despite having one of the most liberal constitutions in the world, intolerance for migrants is widespread. Only one group of South Africans, which has close contact with migrants, is more tolerant.


  The author analyzes public opinion in the European Union toward migrants from poor countries. Fauvelle-Aymar hypothesizes that when migrants have the right to vote, they support parties and
policies that redistribute wealth to the poorer classes so that poor natives have more favorable views toward immigrants when they have the right to vote.

Determinants of Migrant Rights

What determines the level of rights migrants receive in the host society? Soysal 1995 argues that postnational membership ensures that migrants receive rights based on their status as humans rather than on their status as migrants. Thus, migrant rights are protected to the degree that human rights are protected in the host country. However, case studies of migrant rights suggest that migrant rights are widely abused. Moreover, social protections granted in wealthy Western democracies are not always portable and social protections may not be offered to migrants elsewhere. Holzman, et al. 2005 provides an initial survey of the portability of pension and health-care benefits. Avato and Koettl 2010 surveys migrants’ access to social protections and concludes that only one-fourth of all international migrants fall under the most favorable regime and that these migrants are generally “north-north” migrants from wealthy Western democracies. To explain cross-national disparities in migrant rights, Koopmans, et al. 2012 focuses on the timing of migrant mobilization and anti-immigrant counter-mobilization. Ruhs 2013 observes a trade-off between the level of migration and the rights granted to migrants. Money, et al. 2015 argues that migrant rights are distinctive from human rights because migration is viewed as a choice rather than as a status and because migrant rights are for non-citizens as opposed to citizens, complicating the task of political mobilization and counter-mobilization.


  The authors survey migrants’ access to social protection globally, distinguish four regimes, and determine the number of migrants in each regime: protection provided by a bilateral or multilateral social security arrangement; access to social security and services in the host country; exclusion from access to social security and services in the host country; and undocumented migration.


  This is an initial survey of social protection portability for international migrants. The authors indicate that only about 20 percent of international migrants are covered by portability and that the best method of ensuring portability is through bilateral agreements.


  The authors generated a data set for ten European countries between 1980 and 2008. They found that immigrant rights expanded until 2002 but contracted thereafter; the authors also found that there was no trend toward convergence. They attributed change over time to migrant mobilization in the initial period and right-wing counter-mobilization in the latter period.


  The politics of migrant rights differ from those of human rights because of two factors. First, domestic political actors supporting migrant rights may face opposition because the policies benefit a non-citizen
population. Second, human rights are based on a status (human, female, child, disabled, etc.) whereas migrants are viewed as having choice.


Ruhs explores the nexus of migration and rights. He argues that the determinants of migrant rights include “economic efficiency, national identity, social cohesion, and national security.” He also observes a trade-off between the level of migration and the rights granted to migrant workers.


Soysal observes that migrants in Europe are able to access most, if not all, the social protections available to members of the host society, despite some opposition from host society citizens. Courts are one avenue for the protection of migrants as human beings whose rights are protected via international and domestic human rights laws.

**Mobilizing for Migrant Rights**

This section surveys the large and growing research on local and national mobilization for migrant rights. The emphasis is on the mobilization of undocumented migrants who are at risk of deportation when they mobilize at their workplace and in the community. A significant literature also focuses on women migrants and domestic work, as there are far fewer protections for domestic workers than for other workers in the economy. However, the literature captures all actors in the mobilization process, including churches, unions, and other nongovernmental organizations. These actors may have different ideas on end goals as well as strategies, so that mobilization requires coordination and/or cooperation. The articles are usually case studies, and it is not clear whether the hypotheses generated regarding the possibilities for mobilization in one context carry to other contexts. Elias 2010 examines migrant advocacy for women domestic workers. Voss and Bloemraad 2011 presents the work of several scholars describing immigrant mobilization in the United States in 2006. Kim 2011 points to nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) as important actors in protecting migrant rights in South Korea. Monforte and Dufour 2011 compares three cities to determine the possibilities for political mobilization, based on the institutional context. Grugel and Piper 2011 is skeptical that nongovernmental organizations will be able to “penetrate” international institutions to protect migrant rights. Nicholls 2013 describes and analyzes the actors that mobilize for migrant rights in France, suggesting problems of coordination. Hellgren 2014 compares migrant mobilization in Sweden and Spain and argues that the institutional context is crucial, in addition to the individual attributes of the organizers.


Argues that local pro-immigrant nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) are central to understanding the expansion of migrant rights in South Korea, rather than the state or international human rights norms.


This is one of many examples of research on migrant advocacy, here focused specifically on women domestic workers. The author argues that the human rights frame brings both organizing strengths as well as weakness in this gendered context.

Describes the impenetrability of mechanisms of global governance to the growing number of migrant and civil society associations that petition for migrant rights. This article suggests that migrant rights are best addressed at the national or subnational level.


Argues that the political opportunities for mobilized actors vary based on the structure of the welfare system, the state’s migration regime, and the structure of the labor market, in addition to the choices of individual actors.


Compares variation in “citizenship regimes” and “leeway” of undocumented migrants in Berlin, Montreal, and Paris to determine the possibilities for mobilization among undocumented immigrants.


This is an example of the research on the domestic mobilization of political actors in migrant rights movements in France.


This edited volume examines the mass mobilization for immigrant rights in the United States in 2006.

**International Travel Regime**

The international travel regime has only recently been identified as a distinctive dimension of international cooperation on migration. The seminal pieces are Koslowski 2011 (cited under Types of International Migratory Flows) and Koslowski 2011, which differentiate among the refugee regime, the labor migration regime, and the international travel regime. The international travel regime affects all individuals who cross international borders, both voluntary and forced international migrants as well as short-term entrants, such as business people, tourists, and individuals who come to visit family. However, research on refugees and asylum seekers is excluded here, as those types are considered part of the flow of “forced migration.” Koslowski goes on to describe a wide array of international collaboration on international travel, pointing out that the level of international cooperation is highest in this specific mobility regime. The central issue of the international travel regime is how to facilitate entry for individuals who are desired by the state while preventing entry of those whose presence is not desired (labeled “secure facilitation”). One central component of the international travel regime is the travel document: passports and visas, for example. Torpey 2000 provides a historical account of state building and documentation for citizens, to move within the nation-state as well as to distinguish between native and foreigner. Salter 2003 provides a more detailed account of the global adoption of the British passport. Sadiq 2011 points out that passports are dependent on the state’s underlying ability to document individuals within a state (“breeder documents”), beginning with birth certificates. Developing states are often limited in their capacity to document their population, reducing the availability and veracity of passports. Another central component of the international travel regime is inspection at the border through ports of entry.
and the patrolling of the “green border,” the border between ports of entry. Ackleson 2011 argues that even among developed states, national security interests prevent an optimal amount of cooperation among states on border inspection. An often-overlooked dimension of cooperation on international travel is the option of United Nations Travel Bans, described by Ginsburg and Tanaka 2011. Gavrilis 2011 describes efforts to improve cooperation between developed and developing states by exporting “border management assistance” to specific sending or transit states. The “critical mobilities school” is represented by Kloppenburg 2013. The article traces public and private actors that regulate individuals’ movement among states in the international system over time and space.


  Ackelson introduces the concept of “security community” to analyze cooperation on international travel between wealthy Western democracies: the United States and Canada and the United States and the European Union. He argues that although local cooperation at borders remains strong, it is less well constructed at the national political and policy levels.


  Gavrilis documents the “offshoring” of border management from wealthy Western democracies to poor, often authoritarian, regimes. These states are source or transit states, and wealthy Western democracies deploy resources and training to these countries to insert an additional layer of inspection in the international travel regime.


  United Nations travel bans are a form of sanction that can be applied to leaders of states that violate UN principles. The UN Security Council decides who to place on the travel ban, which can include the extended family of the principal target.


  Kloppenburg uses the case of drug smuggling from the Caribbean and the Netherlands to illustrate a mobilities regime, a set of regulations that attempts to facilitate legitimate travel while preventing illegitimate travel. Cooperation among states and private actors is substantial and creates borders at various locations at various times.


  This chapter introduces readers to the international travel regime by surveying the types and numbers of people who cross international borders annually, far exceeding refugee and labor migration flows. Koslowski argues that greater international cooperation is visible here because there is larger support for travelers from the tourism industry and relatively little opposition.

Sadiq explores border management from the perspective of developing countries, noting that these states have weak bureaucracies and therefore lack the capacity to document all of their citizens. This represents a problem for the international travel regime as birth certificates are primary “breeder” documents that underlie the international passport regime.


Salter’s book examines how states control the movement of individuals across international borders through the use of travel documents, from the “health passport” in Italian city-states during the bubonic plague, to the modern-day passport with its biometric features.


Torpey provides a detailed account of the use of travel documents in Europe during the period of the French Revolution as a method of state building (“embracing” the state’s population), by controlling the “legitimate means of movement.” Identification documents such as the passport provide for free movement within the state while constraining entry and exit of both citizens and foreigners.

**Migration and the International System: Linkages**

International migration is just one dimension of the larger process of globalization in the contemporary international system. The research delineated above focuses on specifically on migration and migrants. However, these flows are implicated in other dimensions of the international system. A rich literature is developing that explores the connections between international migration and other policy arenas and international flows. This section presents research on the security components of international migration, defined in terms of both state security and societal security. The link between trade and international migration is also developed. Migration and development forms the third topic of interest: the implications of migration on the prospects for poor countries in the world. Migration may also be linked to foreign aid flows as a means of reducing or preventing future migration. Finally, the linkages between migration and foreign direct investment are explored.

**Migration and Security**

Security and human mobility are inextricably linked in the contemporary environment where globalization facilitates human mobility. The United States’ internment of Germans during the First World War and Japanese during the Second World War illustrates the concern with migrants as a threat to security. Hollifield 2004 points to increased immigration resulting from states that liberalize their markets to trade and other international flows. As a result, state security becomes increasingly sensitive and vulnerable to the transnational movement of persons. State security has been conceptualized in two ways. First, state security considers how human migration poses challenges for traditional conceptions of the sovereign nation-state. Second, societal security is distinctive from national security by focusing on national identity that may be challenged by an immigrant population. The flows of immigrants into receiving states and challenges of assimilation threaten the integrity of societal identity. However, security concerns not only states but also human populations broadly. Human security transcends state borders to consider the security of people regardless of their citizenship in a sovereign state or identity vis-à-vis the society. A focus upon human security is also concerned with migrant rights and how this, in turn, often affects receiving states. The first section presents research on the relationship between migration and state security. The following section addresses societal security and human security.

**State Security and Migration**
Weiner 1992 is among the first to propose a security framework to explain the decision to migrate and its effects upon host countries. Rudolph 2003 argues migration policy is, in fact, a tool of the state’s internal and external security policy. Andreas 2003 focuses upon clandestine migration as a unique problem for the security of recipient states. Adamson 2006 analyzes international migration to assess how these flows affect national security of host countries. D’Appollonia and Reich 2008 focuses upon the challenge arising from the intersection of state security and immigration integration. Ginsburg 2010 proposes a framework for security that moves toward bilateral and multilateral cooperation to securitize international migration. We then move from the perspective of the state security to that of the society.


  Adamson provides a framework for analyzing the relationship between international migration and national security by surveying how cross-border migration flows affect state interests in three areas of national security: state sovereignty; the balance of power among states; and the nature of violent conflict in the international system.


  The author departs from previous studies on migration and state security by focusing upon “clandestine transnational actors.” Unlike traditional migrants, these actors operate across national borders in violation of state laws and pose direct threats to traditional modes of state security.


  This edited volume examines the evolution of emergent security frameworks and their implications for policymaking. In so doing, the attention is mostly focused upon the nexus of state security and immigrant integration in the United States and European Union.


  Ginsburg proposes new framework for state security that incorporates border security and immigration enforcement and situates it in a more encompassing paradigm. This framework includes traditional unilateral measures but also bilateral, regional, and multilateral cooperation to secure human mobility.


  Hollifield directs attention to the evolution of the “migration state,” whereby the openness that comes from increased demand for trade and investment will lead to increased migration. He emphasizes the liberal paradox: the economic logic of liberalism is one of openness, but the political and legal logic of the nation-state is one of closure.


  Migration policy is an instrument of state grand strategy and a tool for external and internal security. The state has three dimensions of security interests: (1) geopolitical or external interests, (2) material
production and economic growth, and (3) internal security. As a tool of the state, migration policy is at the nexus of the three dimensions.


Weiner was the first prominent scholar to propose a security/stability framework to explain the migration decisions by individuals and the consequences for receiving and sending states. The security/stability model directs attention to the ethnic composition of the receiving state and international strains that result if clashes with new migrants arise.

**Societal Security and Migration**

Whereas securitization most often concerns national interest and societal security, the individual has also emerged as a unit of analysis under the rubric of “human security.” Just as societal security transcends the state, so too can human security transcend a national identity and focus upon migrant security. The following research develops the framework of security toward migrants from the societal and human security perspectives. A prominent mode of research in this strand of literature is the so-called Copenhagen school which emphasizes discourse as a central element in the politics of immigration policy. *Waever 1993* redefines the notion of security away from the state, with traditional territorial borders, to the society. *Doty 1998* turns attention away from both the state and society to emphasize human security in the domain of immigration policy. *Ibrahim 2005* focuses upon the power of discourse to influence how a society perceives a threat to human security. The way discourse is shaped around security is also important for *Boswell 2007*, which argues the political discourse and practice in Europe have remained surprisingly unaffected by the terrorism threat.


Rejecting the predominant view that the attacks of September 11, 2001 encouraged a “securitization” of migration control, Boswell argues that political discourse and practice in Europe have remained surprisingly unaffected by the terrorism threat. Using insights from neo-institutionalism and systems theory, the article provides a theoretical basis for making sense of recent developments.


Doty emphasizes human security rather than state or societal security. Human security focuses upon the importance and security of the person. While state and societal security are predicated by “us” and “other” identities, human security ignores identity structures.


Ibrahim focuses upon the power of discourse to influence how a society perceives a threat to human security. With specific emphasis upon the effect of migrants to threaten the security of a society, the author assesses the role of media coverage and migration in Canada to demonstrate the power of discourse on security.

Waever redefines the notion of security away from the state, with its traditional territorial borders, to the society. In doing so, Waever and the Copenhagen school focus upon the importance of identity in the formation of society. Immigration then becomes a threat to societal security.

Trade and Migration

Increases to human mobility wrought by globalization have ushered in a new era of migration as well as the freeing other economic flows such as trade, foreign aid, foreign direct investment, and remittances. These flows are not independent of each other. The presence of migration may both enhance and diminish other economic flows between states. Moreover, the interactive effects of migration with other economic flows shape both receiving and sending states in a bilateral relationship. Scholarship has focused upon how migration affects other flows as well as how migration, in turn, is affected by the presence of other economic trans-border activities. Below, scholarship is reviewed on migration’s unique relationship with trade. Gould 1994 argues that immigration drives bilateral trade flows as host countries tend to both widen and deepen their trade with the countries of origin for their immigration populations. Hatton and Williamson 2005 tests the link between migration, trade, and domestic labor in a cross-national historical analysis. The trade-migration link has been confirmed in empirical studies, and White and Tadesse 2008 shows it may counter the trade-inhibiting influence of cultural disparity between states. More recent scholarship attempts to explain not only trade flows but the relationship between trade and migration policies. Peters 2015, for example, provides an inquiry into the seemingly counter-intuitive relationship between trade restrictiveness and the restrictiveness of migration policy.


Gould argues that immigration networks between receiving and sending states promote bilateral trade ties. Immigrant ties, including knowledge of home-country markets and language, have the potential to decrease trading transaction costs. His argument is supported by empirical evidence from the United States.


The authors assess the relationship between migration and economic performance, including trade, for two centuries. With emphasis after the First World War and coverage that includes and extends beyond industrialized countries, the authors assess international migration’s impact upon trade and domestic labor.


To explain the paradox of liberal trade/close migration (and its opposite), the author argues that liberalized trade decreases labor-intensive production in labor-scarce states leading to reduced lobbying from immigrant-reliant industries. Conversely, more restrictive trade regimes pressure wages to rise through increasing domestic production in labor-intensive industries leading to increased demand for immigrant labor.

In acknowledging that trade tends to decrease between more culturally disparate states, the authors argue that immigrants counter the trade-inhibiting influence of cultural differences between host and home countries. Immigration both initiates bilateral trade flows and increases the intensity of existing trade flows.

**Development and Migration**

The literature on migration and development is several decades old, with a first wave of research optimistically pointing out the benefits of migration to the host country, the migrant, and the home country, in terms of poverty alleviation and economic development. This research generated a backlash, beginning in the 1970s and 1980s, with research that focused on continued inequality in the global economy and how migration exacerbated that inequality through the “brain drain” and the “brawn drain.” The third wave of research provides a more nuanced view of the topic. The primary focus is on migrant-sending states, and multiple dimensions of effects have been identified, including economic growth, social and cultural impacts, as well as political dimensions. The impact of migration on development has been found to be conditional on characteristics of the sending country as well as on the type of migration (skilled/unskilled; permanent/temporary). Depending on the context, migration may help stimulate development or hinder development. The newest research focuses more on the social, cultural, and political impacts of migration on the country of origin but is insufficiently theorized to determine the balance of positive and negative impacts. The research that addresses the specific impact of skilled migration from developing to developed countries is reviewed in the section Skilled Migration Policies. There are two sub-sections that address specifically economic remittances and social remittances. Massey 1988 is considered a seminal piece that explains how economic development generates migration, in which the causal arrow goes from economic development to migration. The subsequent authors focus on how migration may facilitate development in the migrant’s country of origin. Taylor, et al. 1996 argues that the research needs to consider the migrant’s home community rather than the initial focus on the migrant’s family; remittances affect the community as well as the family. Adams and Page 2005 evaluates the role of remittances using cross-national quantitative evidence from seventy-one developing countries and concludes that remittances reduce poverty in the country of origin. Faist 2008 introduces transnational actors, such as “home town associations,” that may serve as development actors in the country of origin. The United Nations Development Programme focused its 2009 annual Human Development Report on international migration and its role in development, providing a primer for those interested in the connection between migration and development (United Nations Development Programme 2009). Portes 2009 argues that the characteristics of the country of origin as well as the type and duration of international migration shape the prospects that migration will facilitate development. Beneria, et al. 2012 brings a gendered lens to the migration and development debate, providing evidence that women’s remittance behavior is systematically different than men’s and creates more positive development outcomes. De Haas 2012 provides a recent overview of the debates in the research and concludes that the development potential of international migration is dependent on the country of origin context.


This research generates a new data set on seventy-one developing countries to estimate the impact of remittances on poverty reduction. The results show that international migration and remittances reduce the level, depth and severity of poverty in the seventy-one countries.


Provides a useful lens on the gendered dimensions of remittances, where women, on average, remit a greater proportion of their earnings to their families at home and, when receiving remittances, spend
them on nutrition, health and education; thus they also contribute to human capital formation in their countries of origin.


De Haas argues, as does Portes in 2009, that the outcomes of migration on development are contingent or conditional on structural conditions in the countries of origin. Migrants have a development potential that can be released if conditions in the home country are propitious.


Identifies and discusses four transnational actors that may act as development agents: village and hometown associations, networks of business persons, epistemic networks, and diasporas as ethno-national communities. Faist points out that these agents are not unitary actors nor are their interests always aligned with communities or states of origin.


This seminal piece argues that economic development causes migration by displacing the population in economic sectors undergoing transformation, especially agricultural, and generating both internal and international migrations. This signals policymakers in developed countries that, at least initially, economic development will increase international migration rather than decrease it.


Portes argues that the migration and development nexus is dependent on the context: structural features in the country of origin and the type and permanency of migration. Temporary or circular migration tends to produce better development outcomes, but migration itself cannot change the structural conditions that attract migrant investments in their countries of origin.


The research agenda developed here places the impact of international migration into a community setting rather than examining only the migrant worker and remittances to his or her family. Remittances generate increased demand in the local community, thereby spurring a broader economic effect.


The United Nations Development Programme issues an annual human development report. The 2009 report focuses on international (and internal) migration. The UNDP commissioned original research as well as provides an overview of extant research on the migration and development nexus.
No economic flow is as inextricably linked with migration as remittances. While the flow of remittances is directed explicitly toward countries of origin, the impact of remittances has been of growing interest to scholarship in migration. Taylor 1999 examines the efficacy of remittances as a tool of development in migrants’ countries of origin. Remittances’ success therefore is judged by their capacity to spur both economic and social development. Rapoport and Docquier 2006 investigates the micro determinants of remittances and the macroeconomic effects upon receiving economies. Recent scholarship has begun to examine other consequences of remittances upon countries of origin such as the research provided by Singer 2010 into the changes wrought by remittances upon exchange rate regimes.


  The authors examine existing economic literature on migrants’ remittances both in terms of the micro-foundational determinants of remittances and the macroeconomic growth effects of remittances in sending countries. They authors describe the growth potential of remittances and explore the relationship between remittances and inequality.


  Recognizing remittances as a significant source of external finance for developing countries, the author argues the receipt of remittances increases the likelihood that a country adopts fixed exchange rates. An analysis of de facto exchange rates for seventy-four developing countries from 1982–2006 supports the argument.


  Early scholarship examines the links between remittances and the economic development of sending countries. Remittances contribute to base income growth in migrants’ respective countries of origin and are key in promoting migration-based development.

**Social Remittances**

While the determinants and effects of economic remittances have been examined across disciplines, at times being hailed as an inducement to democracy, the role of social remittances has been explored only recently. Levitt 1998 calls attention to social remittances in providing an early distinction between the economic and social-political flows between migrants and their country of origin. Scholars have often pointed to the role of social remittances to promote democracy. Using surveys in Mexico, Perez-Armendariz and Crow 2010 posits migrants remit political change through various channels of influence to the home country. Burgess 2012a emphasizes how migrants exercise their voice to effect change in the country of origin. Rother 2009 posits a conditional relationship between social remittances and democratic pressures, whereby migrant experiences in the host country impact their attitudes toward democracy. Burgess 2012b argues that the efficacy of social remittances is shaped by existing migrant networks and the legacy of state-society relations in the home country.


  Burgess demonstrates the influence migrants exert in their home country through their monetary remittances and political voice. Migrants exercise voice after exit through two channels: (1) lobbying family members or political leaders and (2) contributing finances to political campaigns or causes.

Examines the political impact of remittances through a comparative case study of Mexico and El Salvador. Partnerships between migrants and their home governments have been more sustained and successful in Mexico due to migrant organizations, the territorial distribution of state resources, the extent of diaspora outreach, and legacies of state-society relations.


Levitt lays out a theory of micro-level cultural diffusion based upon migrants’ transfer of social remittances from the host country to sending country built upon a filtering of ideas and practices. The patterns by which norms flow shape who receives what kind of social remittances, how likely they are to adopt them, and the positive/negative effects upon social life.


The authors argue for the role of migrants as agents of political change through social remittances. Using surveys in Mexico, authors posit international migrants promote pro-democratic attitudes through three processes: (1) migrant returns, (2) communication from migrants abroad, and (3) information networks in high migration-producing communities.


Rother examines the political attitudes of Philippine temporary migrants returning from Japan, Saudi Arabia, and Hong Kong. He argues that democratic preferences are correlated with experiences in the host country, so that migrant organization and the high degree of political mobilization found in Hong Kong, for example, promote democratic remittances.

**Foreign Aid and Migration**

Scholarship examining the relationship between migration and foreign aid has mostly been approached from two perspectives. First, in the section Aid as a Deterrent of Future Immigration to Donor Countries, foreign aid from donor to recipient states has been characterized as a tool of immigration policy. The efficacy of foreign aid has been called into question as a means to deter future immigration from developing recipient states to the developed donor state. Second, in the section Migration as a Determinant of Foreign Aid Flows, migration networks have been used to explain the direction and intensity of foreign aid flows.

**Aid as a Deterrent of Future Immigration to Donor Countries**

Foreign aid has been used as a tool of states to deter future migration. Faini and Venturini 1993 argues that development aid does not necessarily reduce migration but may instead act as a catalyst. Conversely, Hatzipanayotou and Michael 2012 contends that foreign aid from an advanced welfare state to a developing economy reduces the migration pressures to the developed state.

In examining the relationship of migration on economic flows broadly, authors argue that using foreign aid aimed at economic growth in developing economies may not deter immigration. In fact, development in poorer states may lead to increased emigration through providing the financial means to migrate.


The authors model migration as a costly movement from an aid-recipient developing country with low income and no welfare state toward a rich donor country with a well-developed welfare state. Increasing foreign aid is the best response for a developed donor state to deter immigrants from the developing aid recipient.

### Migration as a Determinant of Foreign Aid Flows

Regardless of whether foreign aid acts to induce or reduce migration, scholarship has been dedicated to using migration as an explanatory variable for foreign aid flows. Bermeo and Leblang 2009 argues that a migration-aid link exists: migrant populations participate in the host country political process to pressure the host government to increase foreign aid to the migrants’ country of origin. In examining foreign aid and refugee flows, Czaika and Mayer 2011 finds that short-term aid is strongly related to all types of involuntary migration, but long-term aid is primarily linked with the home state of asylum seekers.


The authors argue that the larger the migrant population from a “sending” country in the aid donor country, the larger the foreign aid receipts for that country. This migration-aid link is directed through two mechanisms: as a mechanism to slow migration and through the political voice of the diaspora community in the host state.


The authors examine refugee movements as a determinant of long-term and short-term foreign aid. The authors distinguish among types of refugee flows, internally displaced persons, refugees, and asylum seekers. Short-term aid is given to all three types while long term aid is reserved primarily for the home states of asylum seekers.

### Foreign Direct Investment and Migration

Migrant networks promote foreign direct investment (FDI) between investing countries and their home countries. Bandelj 2002 argues that immigrants in the investing state use their knowledge and ties to reduce transaction and information costs. Similarly, Leblang 2010 finds migrants in investing countries tend to influence the flow of FDI through reducing transaction costs and information costs. Twenty-first-century scholarship, however, indicates a potential irony to this relationship. While aided partly by migration networks, Peters 2014 argues that FDI activity may reduce interest group lobbying in the investing state for less restrictive border control. Thus, FDI may promote growth in countries of origin while simultaneously stifling future immigration.


The author uses migration as one of many indicators of “social relations” between investor and host countries to explain the direction and intensity of foreign direct investment.


Leblang argues that diaspora networks help to channel foreign direct investment toward the home country. Connections between migrants residing in investing countries and their home country influence global investment by reducing transaction and information costs. Empirical evidence supports the author’s contentions.


Peters argues that increased economic activity from abroad leads domestic firms reliant on immigrant labor to either close or outsource production abroad. Firms’ choices decrease their need for labor at home, leading them to spend their political capital on issues other than immigration. Their absence in lobbying allows policymakers to restrict immigration.