INTRODUCTION

This first chapter to the handbook encourages readers to conceptualize the introduction of a gender perspective on mobilities into a cartography of global chains and circuits. This is done in order to present a particular field on gender and migration studies, specifically in relation to the important works, concepts, debates and trends found in the different chapters and which we think should constitute a comprehensive overall work for many years to come. This introduction addresses the challenge of summarizing extensive areas of literature as well as describing the written work from which it is drawn. It provides an extensive bibliography, which also indicates further reading in the selected topics of interest.

Our point of departure is that this new phase in the study of global mobilities follows on from considering previous studies, first within the scope of gender and development, and second in terms of gender and migration analysis. More specifically, this introduction examines the connections between gender, migration, development and transnationalism in the context of globalization. The contributions in this volume address, one way or another, the terms of such connection between the different axes, which have somehow become parts of the book. Theoretically and operationally, such connections are strategic and capable of illuminating the issues at hand. They provide the elements that will enable us to explore the contents of the handbook, be they theoretical or empirical, by introducing a vast range of case studies, examples drawn from around the world. Each of the chapters presented here illustrates in different ways gender and mobilities in the processes of globalization.

Over the past two decades there has been growing academic and policy interest in gender and migration, resulting, as we shall see, in a very productive literature. Research has centred mainly on the analysis of the reproductive role of migrant women, as domestic servants, sex workers and caregivers within the process of globalization (Truong, 1996; Hochschild, 2000; Parreñas, 2001a; Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2002; among others).
Literature also expanded around the issue of the transnational family (Grasmuck and Pessar, 1991; Levitt and Sørensen, 2004; among others). Some more recent works have been compiled from a feminist policy approach, which consider the gendered nature of the meanings we give to migration (Palmary et al., 2010), or focus on the diversification and stratification of gendered migratory streams, as shown in the work edited by Piper (2008a), which analyses the extent to which the level of skill, legal status, country of origin and mode of entry constitute key axes of differentiation between male and female migrants. In addition, some other publications adopt a historical perspective, reflecting on the differences between men and women in terms of their participation in the labour market, the creation of networks and the processes involved in immigrant organization, belonging, diaspora and vulnerability (Schrover and Yeo, 2011). They also fall within the historical, legal, political and cultural framework of European Migration (Stalford et al., 2009). Nevertheless, published work to date has spent far less time considering gender and migration in the nexus of migration and development (Sørensen, 2005; Piper, 2008b; among others). Thus, one of the main contributions that this handbook makes to this body of literature is that it addresses the issue of gender and migration from a migration–development nexus. Furthermore, our main thesis covers the influence of global changes, which represents the work’s principal analytical approach, namely the analysis of transnational migration flows from the perspective of the articulation of production and reproduction chains.

Thus, the thematic connection between gender, migration, development and transnationalism will be dealt with analytically, as follows: Part I: Framework of changes in gender, migration and transnationalism from the vantage points of globalization and development; Part II: New theoretical and methodological issues in the study of female migration and development; Part III: Gender, migration and development through different case studies; Part IV: A perspective on migration and transnationalism; Part V: Global production; and Part VI: Global care chains.

Together, these parts reflect a comprehensive discussion of the interplay between the various sections in this introduction. First we shall discuss the links between globalization and the various social processes that are fundamental to the migration–development nexus.

Second, this introduction will analyse the gender and migration axis, giving a chronological order to the presentation of the debates. We shall examine detailed accounts of the periods informing discussion on the uses of gender in migration studies to be able to understand the social thought and conceptualization of today’s debates.

Third, we shall discuss how contemporary issues of development have
been affected by the policy discourse regarding international migration – especially female migration – focusing on the complex intersection between development studies, migration studies and gender. Although there are multiple visions of development, we shall focus on the migration–development nexus. We shall consider – again by giving a chronology – the different development visions and interests of varying stakeholders used in the field of what we loosely term ‘gender and development’, and also include current discussions about gender and postcolonialism. We shall then examine such issues within the circuits of production and reproduction in the global era, ending with a brief conclusion.

THE GLOBAL CONTEXT AND ITS MOBILITIES

Globalization as a Point of Entry

Globalization provides the general context in which to understand international migration. Globalization forces backed up by neoliberal ideologies about market-oriented growth have been key in many aspects of what we nowadays call the ‘global era’. However, such neoliberal ideology has to be considered from before the crisis in 2008, as well as by its nature, which is historically specific and unevenly developed (Brenner et al., 2010).

The persistent disparities and asymmetries are important when regarding the mobility of not only capital but also labour around the world. One of the strong impacts of globalization is the increasingly precarious conditions for workers worldwide, which has a huge effect on the conditions where contemporary mobilities take place.

Mapping an Articulated Geography

Nevertheless, the global shift is a complex process and even when we consider migration spaces, globalization should not be viewed, therefore, as an undifferentiated unity but rather as a ‘geographically articulated patterning’ of global capitalist activities and relations (Cox, 1997). Thus, when we refer to a ‘geographically articulated patterning’ we take into consideration the uneven geographical development that takes place on a number of scales.

The global-economic features such as hypermobility and time–space compression are not self-generative. They need to be produced and such a feat of production requires capital fixity (Harvey, 1982), vast concentrations of highly mobile material and less-mobile facilities and infrastructures. Thus, even if state and territory continue to play an important role,
state territorial power is rearticulated and reterritorialized in relation to both sub- and suprastate scales (Brenner, 1999, p. 433) Here, the nation-state reproduces both old and new roles of administrative forms, including categories and subcategories of classifying mobilities and populations.

In this volume we are able to pin down such an articulated geography with reference to many different case studies, so the reader will be able to consider them across different scales and places. Such examples alert us to the existence of a whole battery of reading about globalization scales, as does Chapter 2 by Benería, Deere and Kabeer, which also makes available a full perspective on a regional-wide variation of case studies.

**The National and the Global**

Thus globalization is definitely challenging the state-centric model or the territorial focus of social sciences, thereby highlighting the importance of mobilities in contemporary societies and in social theory (Bauman, 1998; Held and McGrew, 2000; among others). In contrast to the ongoing attention reserved for a variety of classic perspectives on integration (which may be called ‘assimilation’ or ‘adaptation’, and refers to the idea of settlement), and the predominance of a unilocal, unilineal, unidirectional and ethnocentric approach, the existence of various and multidirectional human mobilities typical of the global era – of varying durations and in different directions, even in opposing directions (hence the idea of circularity) – tends to be overlooked.

Much of social science has operated with the assumption of the nation-state as a container, representing a unitary spatio-temporality. However, authors such as Sassen (2000) try to shed light on current discussions regarding such supposed achieved territorial-time fixity as they argue that modern nation-states themselves never achieved spatio-temporal unity and the global restructurings of today threaten to erode the usefulness of this proposition for what is an expanding arena of sociological reality. This corresponds to most of Sassen’s effort in her works when she tries to explain the dynamics of the national–global overlap and interaction.

Another problem added to the role of the nation-state is fully developed by Stolcke in Chapter 3. She unveils the political background, namely, the articulation of the nation-state in which transnationalism operates. In addition she shows how the financial and economic world crisis has brought to light within the European Union endless quarrels inspired by new and old fears about the loss of national sovereignty. The author uncovers the production of the discourse on immigrants as a threat to cultural integrity of the nation. The collective identity would then be constructed in terms of ethnicity, culture, heritage, tradition, memory and difference, with only
the occasional reference to ‘blood’ and ‘race’. Culturally different ‘aliens’ would be ratified through appeals to basic human instincts in terms of a pseudo-biological theory. Racism has usually provided a rationalization for class prerogatives by naturalizing the socio-economic inferiority of the underprivileged (to disarm the political) or claims of national supremacy (Blanckaert, 1988, quoted by Stolcke in Chapter 3).

Turning it through the contemporary debate we could then underline two main ideas brought to the fore by Stolcke. First, that modern racism constitutes an ideological sleight-of-hand for reconciling the irreconcilable – a liberal meritocratic ethos of equal opportunity for all in the marketplace and socio-economic inequality – which, rather than being an anachronistic survival of past times during the era of slavery and/or European colonial expansion and the ascriptive ordering of society, is part and parcel of liberal capitalism. Second, the new global order, in which both old and new boundaries, far from being dissolved, are becoming more active and exclusive, poses formidable new questions for anthropology. We would even contend that it also poses formidable new questions for the study of globalization and development.

**Introducing the Global Assembly Line**

There are three prevailing components to delocalization: decentralization from nationally oriented bureaucratic regimes; devolution from the public to the private sector; and deterritorialization of formerly place-fixed production and institutions. Globalization is not simply the delocalization into placeless fluidity, but a reterritorialization into new configurations – whether they are multiscalar (where the urban and supranational gain prominence), public–private partnerships or new spatial forms of organization. Something new is being laid out, using the raw materials of a nationally oriented mode of accumulation and regulation.

The bigger question we wish to address here is how to relate our work to global commodity chains. We could relate it to different global chains, which in principle could range from finance, to kinship and care. A commodity chain consists of a series of linkages stretching from raw-material production at one end through manufacture and assembly, to wholesale and retail distribution at the other, and generally encompasses important segments of a limited number of interdependent industries. The process of industrial transformation can be understood in terms of the relations between these chains. Restructuring and job loss in the garment industry has accompanied North–South trade liberalization in the search for a low-cost production site.

Consider this example. Flexible production has had a major impact on US garment workers and on the once-powerful unions. Wages have
dropped and sweatshops are once again to be seen in US cities, often staffed by foreign, undocumented workers. There, workers slave long hours for piecerate wages (that is, payment by the piece instead of by the hour) without the basic protections of minimum wage, overtime, the prevention of industrial homework or child labour, or benefits of any kind (Bonacich, 2002, p. 123).

Another aspect of such flexibilization is the fact that the garment industry is more advanced than most in terms of outsourcing and offshore production, although it is also true that other sectors are gradually moving in a similar direction. Reactions against these practices are ongoing protests from anti-globalization movements. The anti-sweatshop campaign has been among the most visible and successful of efforts to forge a cross-border movement based on solidarity between First World consumers and workers in so-called developing countries.

This global stage, driven by the internationalization of production, finance, banking and services, coupled with cheap labour, takes full advantage of information technology and weakens the role of the state in decisions on where to locate production plants. In many parts of the world, this location has been a female-led industrialization in export processing zones, particularly in countries such as Bangladesh, Morocco, Mexico and Singapore. Nevertheless, these processes of industrial delocalization and the emergence of export zones were particularly intensified in certain regions of the world, namely Southeast Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean. It was what some authors have labelled as ‘the global assembly line’ (Fernández-Kelly, 2006).

However this is not completely new. During the 1980s and early 1990s, economic recession in northern countries had a major impact on southern nations – those of the Global South – specialized in export manufacturing industries, which led to a reduction in overall household income. In addition, structural adjustment programmes further worsened women’s social situation, leading to a sharp rise in female migration (for example, Sassen, 1988).

Some authors have explained the participation of women in international migration as the result of the recomposition of capital on a worldwide scale. In particular, the impact of economic globalization on developing economies can be associated with an increase in their foreign debt (especially in light of the World Bank’s and the International Monetary Fund’s (IMF) structural adjustment programmes), the increase in unemployment rates and cuts in social spending, as well as the closure of companies that traditionally targeted local and domestic sectors due to the growth in export industries (Fernández-Kelly, 1983; Salzinger, 2003; Sassen, 2005, p. 523).
But such chains are much more complex, as we shall unveil in this introduction. In this respect we base our conceptualization on Sassen (2000), because she provides us with a framework in which to understand the profound transformations of the economic globalization processes (structural adjustment programmes, opening up to foreign capital and removal of state subsidies) which match the growing significance of female international migration as a way of activating household survival strategies – from domestic work to industrial cleaners, from searching for marriage partners to sex work – from many of those sectors where the global economy is present. Such sectors are utilizing the specific circuits that connect labour demand and supply. Through such circuits they are able to connect labour and capital from the Global North to investing in multiple ways in their own households of origin in the Global South.

**Highlighting the Fordist Migration Model**

We cannot possibly review all of the emerging migration patterns here. However, we do want to look more closely at a change in the migration process that impinges most directly upon the ways we understand contemporary international migration. Fordism, as described by Harvey, is not only a system of production, but also – we should bear in mind – a society defined by mass consumption, a new system of labour power reproduction, a new politics of labour control and management, a new aesthetic and psychology, a new kind of rationalized, modernist and populist democratic society (Harvey, 1990).

In the Fordist period, international migration was seen as peripheral, as the national industrial society was seen as the ‘container’ for all aspects of social being, and crossing borders was the exception and a deviation from the nation-state model (Castles, 2008). During that time, studies on migration and development, despite being strategic policies for many ‘Third World countries’ had only scant influence on social theory. In terms of the European experience during the industrial era, migratory movements from the South reached the factories of European cities (especially in France, Belgium, the UK and Germany), contributing to the expansion of the Fordist cycle. This migration cycle in Europe started as early as the First World War and acquired mass proportions after the Second World War, completing the cycle until the crisis in the 1970s and the obsolescence of Fordism in Europe’s industrial regions. The state changed from being hospitable and charitable to being repressive, and was constructed by the restriction of borders (Ribas-Mateos, 2013b), converting integration into a residual symbolic measure.
Introducing Transnationalism as Opposition to the Fordist Migration Model

Globalization has been challenging the state-centric model or the territorial focus of social sciences, which finally stress the importance of mobilities in contemporary societies and in social theory (as mentioned above). Although transnationalism is not a completely new phenomenon, it did reach a particularly high degree of intensity on a global scale at the end of the twentieth century as a result of globalization, technological changes and decolonization processes. Transnationalism implies people building their lives around references to the various social worlds, imagined in a scope that goes beyond national borders, in which they spend considerable amounts of time. Peraldi (2001) believes that contemporary migrations cannot really be considered as a single unequivocal form of mobility, in the sense of an institutionally organized social destiny. While ‘controlled migration’ (using Sayad’s terminology) characterizes the essential nature of labour migrations during the Fordist age, today they have changed radically. There are a number of reasons for these changes: on the one hand, there are those who consider the entire range of forms of movement, and on the other, those who look at the fluidity and types of involvement in the economy. In other words, according to Peraldi, if we consider the Malthusianism of the receptor states, we should then replace migratory movements with a typology of social forms of mobility.

Catarino and Morokvasic, in reference to previous works (Morokvasic, 1999, 2004), highlight in their chapter (ch. 11, this volume) the fact that migrants are more anxious to ‘settle in mobility’ than to settle in the receiving country. Mobility therefore becomes an alternative to migration; migrants attempt to remain mobile in order to guarantee the standard of living in their country of origin. As a result, mobility is seen as a resource and a dimension of migrants’ social capital.

Pointing Out Sharp Asymmetries as Global Contradictions

In Chapter 2, Beneria et al. bring to the fore certain aspects of globalization that are crucial in understanding the rapidly growing pace of labour migratory movements. They show first how globalization forces, backed up by neoliberal ideologies on market-oriented growth, have been crucial in many aspects of what is today termed the ‘global era’. According to these authors, migration is also impacted by the global crisis that has been affecting many high-income countries since 2008, whose roots lie in the excesses of financial globalization and other neoliberal policies, which have generated high unemployment. So, they also show how the
globalization impact results in a widening gap in inequalities between low- and high-income areas; the development of international networks (non-profit, country-based, international associations, commercial, family); and the intensification of interregional migrations: the ‘care crisis’.

These authors have drawn attention to a clear contradiction: while globalization has increased the opportunities to which individuals can aspire in various countries, it has also created a context in which these opportunities are tinged with vulnerability and precariousness. Therefore we witness the growth of social inequalities within and across countries, as well as the persistence of abject poverty in many locations.

In short, increased circularity is to be considered one of the elements of global migration. The participation of women in international mobilities is another of its key features, covering new regions and migration poles (West Africa, Southern Europe, the Gulf, China), as well as emerging new countries of emigration–immigration and spaces of transit (Sub-Saharan Africa, Maghreb, Turkey, Mexico). Women now cover all the global parameters of migration: the structure of the global care chains and new transnational practices (related to remittances, subjective transnationalism and transnational identity) (Ribas-Mateos, 2013a).

**THE GENDER–MIGRATION AXIS**

In principle, women’s growing participation in labour-based migratory flows is largely due to the globalization of production and worsening labour conditions in the Global South, as well as to the transfer of social reproduction fomented by the demand in developed countries for women willing to take on work classified on the bottom rungs of the labour market in terms of its social value (domestic service, personal care services and sex work). As a consequence, several authors in this handbook have chosen the context of globalization to provide a general framework in which to understand the conditions of foreign and ethnic minority women working in the international division of reproductive work.

As mentioned above, industrial delocalization processes have brought with them a fall in the need for foreign labour for the North’s industrial activities, as production processes are increasingly being transferred to southern countries. The rapid growth of duty-free zones has brought with it an increase in female migratory flows in developing countries, particularly in Latin America, Asia and the Caribbean (Sassen, 1988). But this model was easily replicated in many areas of the world, such as in the Mediterranean (Ribas-Mateos, 2005).

In the North, the growing involvement of migrant women in paid work
was mainly the result of an increase in the demand for labour in unskilled and poorly paid jobs in the services sector in migrant-receiving countries. Domestic service, catering, personal and sex work cannot be exported in the same way as industrial activity and therefore results in the recourse to foreign labour and the development of exclusively female migratory flows (Sassen, 1988). Immigrant women work in those jobs that are scorned by their autochthonous counterparts and carry out the work required for social reproduction in a commodified manner. We are therefore witnessing an international South/North transfer of reproductive work, a process that runs parallel to the transfer of productive activities on a global scale (Truong, 1996).

Some researchers refer to ‘global chains of care’ in order to explain the way in which, in a global context, women replace one another in those tasks traditionally associated with personal care and affection: the autochthonous woman is replaced by the immigrant woman, whose place in turn is filled by other women who take charge of her children in her country of origin (grandmothers, sister and so on) (Hochschild, 2000; Ehrenreich and Hochschild, 2002).

In turn, Sassen discusses the South–North female migratory flows to work in the informal economy within a framework that she refers to as the ‘counter-geographies of globalization’. She considers that these circuits generate major economic resources that very often remain invisible (Sassen, 2003). Benería et al. (ch. 2, this volume) speak of the ‘ commodification of care work on a global scale’. They highlight the way in which changes in fertility rates and life expectancy, as well as the sharp rise in the female workforce, have contributed to the ‘care crisis’, leading to a demand for immigrant women to work in paid care work (paid domestic work, childcare and nursing). Such global commodification of care would then be a part of the globalization of the labour force.

From the perspective of the Global South countries, following the intensification of economic informalization trends, the neighbourhood and the household have re-emerged as strategic localizations of migrant and non-migrant economic activity, often operating in spatial and temporary organizations, and often of a circular nature. In this context, new questions emerge, such as how international migration alters gender patterns and how the formation of transnational households can empower women. All these issues have taken on an added complexity, with many migrants living their lives and planning their futures within the parameters of transnational circuits. It is within this matrix that we understand the complexities surrounding the various types of migration in our selected cases in the different chapters – as we shall show later – due to processes of internal, return and temporary migration. Furthermore, these are some of
the issues that have fuelled the debate surrounding the gender–migration axis as we shall see next.

From ‘Birds of Passage are also Women’ to ‘A Glass Half Full?’

As social science literature has revealed, up until around three decades ago female migration was largely overlooked, with the focus of study centring mainly on male migratory flows. Based on previous works, the treatment of female migration can be classified into three major historical periods (Golub et al., 1997). If one wonders why we decide to review such historical periods, it is because they are determinant in understanding today’s conceptualization debates.

The first period, would last up until the mid-1970s, and is characterized by the almost complete absence of studies on female migration. Scientific production has repeatedly shown that immigrant women have been largely overlooked because of the predominance of the patriarchal family model. This model sees women as dependent on men, the principal breadwinners and heads of the household (Morokvasic, 1984). Up until the late 1960s, the stereotyped image of women as being economically inactive prevails in the academic discourse of various fields of study, including economics, sociology and history (Borderías and Carrasco, 1994), thereby influencing classical migration theories.

In addition, traditional analytical approaches to the study of population movements, namely those focused on analysing demographic movements from the point of view of the rational decisions of the individual (the neoclassical perspective), and those based on the perspective of the macrostructural factors behind migration (the structural approach) – influenced by classic development paradigms – (modernization and dependency), have generally tended to overlook gender. Indeed, as Scott shows in her analysis of women’s role in the theory of modernization, development has been conceptualized as being opposed to the traditional household. Modernity requires the appearance of rational, industrial beings that emigrate to urban environments. This is achieved through a market-based system, which enables competitive and enterprising men to triumph. While men dominate a city’s public space, women are associated with nature and relegated to the private, rural and tribal space, which are considered impediments to development (Scott, 1995).

In connection with the socioeconomic constraints of migration the dependency theory could be highlighted, especially in the case of Latin America: a more exhaustive world systems theory focused on the way less-developed ‘peripheral’ regions were incorporated into a world economy controlled by ‘core’ capitalist nations. In such analyses, the presence
of multinational corporations in less-developed economies accelerated rural change, leading to poverty, the displacement of workers, rapid urbanization and the growth of informal economies. Again in keeping with the findings of Scott, the approach to dependency focuses on public production as the key to development, based on the subordination of the periphery to the centre in the global capitalist economy, where men are perceived as the agents of development and revolutionaries, and women are confined to the private sphere of the home (ibid.).

As stated earlier, these two paradigms of development influenced classic migration theories. Consequently, they coincide in highlighting the figure of the migrant as a source of labour, a worker and an economic actor, while choosing to overlook the role played by women. These paradigms, in turn, relegated women to the private space of the home and their economic contribution to society is largely ignored.

The second period begins with the closure of European borders (1974–75) and the emergence of the figure of the visible female migrant, who, as yet, remains limited to a stereotyped image of the reunited woman, economically inactive who accompanies and is dependent on the male migrant. Following the implementation in Europe of restrictive immigration policies, women have dominated entry flows, although they continue to represent a minority in terms of the stock of immigrants (Zlotnik, 1995). There is a growing awareness that immigration is far from being a merely temporary phenomenon, and instead involves family groups settling in the receiving country, which naturally includes women. The figure of the female immigrant therefore makes its appearance, albeit restricted to the perspective of the reunited wife rather than as playing a relevant role as an economic and social actor (Morokvasic, 1984; Golub et al., 1997). Yet beyond the invisible nature of female migration, which has been amply brought to our attention in social sciences literature, how and why does the figure of the immigrant woman appear?

In the third period, from the 1980s onwards, the active role played by female migration begins to emerge. A series of publications are brought out, which draw our attention to the underestimation of the numbers of migrant women and are considered classics within their field, including Morokvasic’s article, ‘Birds of passage are also women’ (1984). This growing awareness of the figure of the immigrant woman is partly attributable to a more open analytical approach within the field of social studies that allows the economic contribution of women to be brought to the fore. New theoretical approaches begin to appear that highlight the problems involved in domestic work, such as the new family economy (Borderías and Carrasco, 1994) or Delphy’s belief that in addition to capitalist production, which produces goods under (formal) industrial methods, there
is an alternative type of production, creating domestic service and goods within the (informal) family sphere, and which is responsible for the biological and social reproduction of the group (Delphy, 1970).

Consequently, female migration begins to emerge on a parallel with the increasingly visible phenomenon of the working woman, which in turn coincides with a new, more comprehensive approach to the analysis of migratory phenomena. Traditional approaches, which focused almost exclusively on the figure of the male immigrant worker, are left aside in favour of theoretical considerations that take other more sociological conditioning factors into account when considering population flows. As a result, new perspectives also arise that refer to macro- and micro-determining factors when describing and explaining migratory processes (Massey et al., 1987).

Within such a new perspective, the focus on networks as well the focus on household has been decisive. Thus, the new wider theoretical approach to the analysis of networks as a factor behind migratory phenomena now extends to the role of women in population flows. A further factor that favours the increased visibility of female immigration is that migratory phenomena are no longer considered to be the result of an individual decision, but rather as part of family and community strategies (Stark, 1984), together with the growing importance of considering the ‘household’ as a unit of analysis in the study of population flows (Boyd, 1989; Grasmuck and Pessar, 1991; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1991; among a vast international literature on this topic). In short, there is a shift from the individual male to the household and the community as the driving forces behind geographical movements. This means that the woman becomes visible and is no longer seen merely as a dependant but also as an actor within migration processes.

Consequently, there is a growing awareness that migratory processes do not have the same effect and impact on men as on women and, by focusing on the male migrant only, we fail to fully understand the complexities involved in migration. So, what are the principal lines of research addressed in recent years in terms of gender and migration? There are two contributions to this book that enable us to move forward in a very complete review of such a rich bibliography (Hondagneu-Sotelo, ch. 10 and Catarino and Morokvasic, ch. 11).³

**New Debates on Gender and Migration**

In order to give some clues to the general debate we shall now consider a number of axes that we have chosen as being more relevant to the contemporary debates on gender and migration, by mainly describing the organization
of references used by Hondagneu-Sotelo and Catarino and Morokvasic in this volume, and we could also add the work by Sørensen (2011).

Thus, we structure such a new debate on the following items: the controversy around the feminization of migration; the gender perspective; the axis of care work; sexualities and sex trafficking; the transnational household as a unit of study; the implications of a focus on agency; and, finally, the emerging debates on intersectionality.

The feminization of migration discourse: from migrant women to gender and migration studies

Since the 1990s, immigrant women have acquired a degree of visibility. As Oso and Catarino pointed out (2012), the discourse surrounding the feminization of migration is now an international phenomenon, as revealed in some international reports (United Nations, 2006). These authors tend to refer to the work of Zlotnik, to show that the percentage of women among international migrants grew a mere two percentage points between 1960 and 2000 (rising from 46.6 to 48.8 per cent). This increase ‘is small compared to the high level of feminization that already existed in 1960’ (Zlotnik, 2003, p. 1). Nevertheless, Morrison et al. (2008) refer to more recent data, according to which in 2005 women made up 49.6 per cent of the migrant population (Oso and Catarino, 2012).

Catarino et al. (2005), were the first to note the recurrent discourse regarding the feminization of migration as part of an academic ritual consisting of drawing attention to women’s previous invisibility. A revision of such invisibility studies would highlight data that would show the relevance of female migration. Besides, as Oso and Garson state, discourse regarding the feminization of migration appears to have anticipated the statistical trend. Indeed, rather than a sharp rise in the number of women opting to migrate, they noted a ‘feminization of migratory discourse’ (Oso and Garson, 2005). These authors formulated their work in response to descriptions of the feminization of migration that did not necessarily correspond to empirical findings.

So, we could say that instead of emphasizing the feminization of migration discourse it might be more interesting to highlight the interest in including the gender perspective in the analysis of international migration. On this trend, Hondagneu-Sotelo (ch. 10) refers to the special issue of *International Migration Review*, published in 2006 and dedicated to gender and migration studies (Donato et al., 2006), to show how, from the 1990s onwards, the research focus shifts from the study of migrant women to the analysis of ‘migration as a gendered process’. Below is an overview of the principal debates on gender and migration generated in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.
Migration and care work

According to Hondagneu-Sotelo, one of the principal areas of debate considers the connection between women’s migration, paid domestic work and family care. The key concepts addressed in literature include ‘care work’, ‘global care chains’, ‘care deficits’, ‘transnational motherhood’ and ‘international social reproductive labour’. Reference to these works has already been made in the previous section on global context and mobilities. These issues make up much of the literature on gender and migration from the 1990s onwards (see Vidal-Coso and Miret-Garamundi (ch. 15), Setién and Acosta (ch. 18), Safuta and DeGavre (ch. 19) and Casado i Aijón (ch. 20)). However, as Catarino and Morokvasic claim, there is another, less positive side to this line of research, namely the reproduction of stereotypes through the analysis of migrant women essentially in their reproductive role.

Sexualities and sex trafficking

The sexualities-based approach would include work on ‘gay and queer identities, as well as heteronormativity and compulsory heterosexuality, employed both as a form of legal immigration exclusion as well as inclusion’ (Hondagneu-Sotelo, ch. 10, p. 237). This author posits that such an approach is more developed in the United States than in Europe, although Catarino and Morokvasic (ch.11) show how in France:

> the emphasis has shifted from (unpaid) work to sexual/sexualized issues and from class per se to ethnicity . . . Indeed, feminist debates and research rather concentrate on different forms of sexuality and gender, thereby increasingly questioning the heterosexual norms of society. At the same time, research has demonstrated that questions about sexuality are racialized and racial issues sexualized. (Ch. 11, pp. 253, 254).

Both reviews in this handbook provided by Hondagneu-Sotelo and Catarino and Morokvasic reveal that the question of trafficking is also an emerging issue. They refer to several works in which discourse on trafficking moves beyond a criminalizing and victimizing approach (see for example, Guillemaut, 2006; Agustín, 2007).

Transnational households

During the 1990s burgeoning literature on migrants’ transnational connections in the global era (Glick Schiller et al., 1992; Levitt et al., 2003; Vertovec, 2004) would provide a further angle on the subject of gender and migration. Within such literature, an interest in the transnational family emerges. The participation of women in migration gave rise to a particular formation of transnational families in many different intra-family
processes which would affect gender roles and the children and adults left behind, family reunion processes, changes in care roles, the role of remittances and household allocation, and so on.

Parella (ch. 14) reviews the concept of the transnational family, quoting Herrera (2005a, p. 12), ‘the transnational family should be understood as a locus of social and emotional support, but also as a field of conflictive power relations between its members’. That definition allows her to avoid approaching the family as a uniform entity or unified object of analysis, and to take into account the unequal power relations within it (gender relations, intergenerational relations), as well as the differentiated allocation of roles in processes of identity construction and in the reproduction of the welfare of its members.

Bledsoe and Sow (ch. 8) refer to a particular case of such transnational practices: the possibility that African families must try to protect their children in the West by sending them away underscores the need to probe beneath vague rationales of sending children back home to know their kin or to become familiar with the traditions of the homeland. They explain why West Africans living in Europe or North America, places often identified as the global centres of safety and opportunity for children, are then not there when they want to send their children back to live in Africa. Why might they send children to West Africa at a crucial moment in their educational trajectories, when the children should be preparing most intensively to succeed in the new home their parents have tried so hard to create for them? The materials these authors have found tell a remarkably consistent story of West African immigrant parents’ despair at being denied adequate disciplinary means to protect their children from what they see as Western society’s indulgent attitude towards children.

**The agency-based approach**

This transnational approach, in turn, leads to a recurrent question in gender and migration studies, namely the impact of migration on the status of migrant women. Does it transform gender relations? And what can be said of the process of empowerment?

One characteristic of scientific production in the last decade has been the impact of the agency-based approach, namely the role played by immigrant women as agents of empowerment. The aim is to try to shed the stereotyped image of a passive female immigrant who is dependent on the male migrant. Nevertheless, as already pointed out in this introduction there is a new tendency showing that despite the current focus on agency and empowerment-based discourse, studies continue to be centred on the reproductive sphere (domestic service, personal services and sex work). Indeed, only a few researchers have opted to look into the way women set up their
own empowerment strategy within the framework of other economic areas of activity such as ethnic entrepreneurship or skilled labour (Catarino et al., 2005). In this area, mention must be made of the research into qualified migrant women by Erel and Kofman (2003) or early literature addressing the issue of ethnic entrepreneurship and gender (for example, Morokvasic, 1991; Anthias and Mehta, 2002; Apitzsch and Kontos, 2003).

Furthermore, certain academic and political circles would seem to have established a linear link between the supposed ‘feminization’ of migration, the role of women as agents in the migration processes, and empowerment. It is important to note that even though immigrant women participate in the economies of their country of origin and destination by sending large remittances and maintaining transnational households, this role as social and economic agents does not necessarily imply an increase in their status or empowerment (Oso, 2002). The same issue is also raised by Catarino and Morokvasic (ch. 11), focusing on France. They discuss the fact that in recent years, research in France has focused on women who migrate alone, who are considered autonomous, in contrast to women who form part of family migratory projects.

Intersectionality theory
The key concepts that are referred to in a number of contributions in this volume, such as care work, care deficits, transnational motherhood, production and reproduction work, are also connected with contemporary studies on intersectionality. Studies on black feminism (Crenshaw, 1989) led to a line of research that aims to focus on this approach.

Thus, Hondagneu-Sotelo (ch. 10) describes how the development of this literature has been made possible by theories of intersectionality. She shows the origins of the debate from the 1970s, when feminist research projects started to emphasize the ways in which institutions and social privileges are constructed in ways that favour men. Since then, most feminist-oriented scholars have dispensed with unitary concepts of ‘men’ and ‘women’. Multiplicities of femininities and masculinities are recognized today as interconnected, relational and intertwined in relations of class, race-ethnicity, nation and sexualities.

Over the past four decades, studies of race, gender and class have criticized conceptualizations of identity as discrete or additive, and of oppression as consisting of types of discrimination and the effects of the burdens of disadvantage simplistically added together (Lurbe, 2011). Current scholars of inequality and discrimination have found the application of an intersectional approach appealing, to overcome the problem of reductionism, whereas social practice tends to be much more complex, comprising multilayered social relations, contested concepts of identity
and multiple social roles. Thus, for Lurbe, cultural patterns of oppression are not only interrelated, creating a system that reflects intertwined, multiple forms of discrimination; they are also bound together and influenced by the intersectional systems of society, where any particular individual stands at the crossroads of multiple groups. Lurbe’s reading of intersectionality emphasizes the identity categories and social positions that are found when multiple forms of subordination occur simultaneously, the ‘intercategorical’ approach adopts existing categories to investigate the multiple and conflicting dimensions of inequality among them. This relational version of intersectionality begins by identifying the processes, such as dichotomizing gender and racializing selected ethnicities, that interact to produce dynamic and complex patterns of inequality for everyone, not merely the most disadvantaged (Hancock, 2007, quoted by Lurbe, 2011). Struggles and conflicts, rather than groups, are the preferred focus of study for Lurbe because these are understood as both ubiquitous and informative. A context-dependent, relational intersectionality approach applied to specific fields of migration research on local integration and social exclusion, to which Lurbe’s study on extremely marginalized minorities, particularly Roma, in France, seeks to solve one of the fundamental problems of migration research: how to reconcile structure and agency without promoting cultural essentialism.

In conclusion, during the last decade, the efforts of scientific production have been successful in shedding the cape of invisibility that has tended to shroud immigrant women and the secondary role to which history has traditionally relegated them. Growing awareness of the female migrant figure is due to a number of social science analyses that bring female workers to the fore, combined with the appearance of new approaches that focus on micro and macro factors when addressing migratory processes.

Together with the importance of the household, we have been guided in the past by the reassurance, through migration research, that the answer to many of our questions lay in household dynamics, especially when focusing on gender and migration and in relation to the formation of transnational families. However, research has mainly considered the role of migrant women in worldwide care chains, revealing, albeit to a lesser extent, their influence on production chains within the framework of globalization. The major global chain is hence of a reproductive nature and relates primarily to care.

The identification of such care chains shows us how gender divisions of labour are incorporated into uneven economic development processes. The connection between migrant care work, globalization and the privatization of social reproduction has been variously designated as the ‘new domestic world order’, the ‘new international division of reproductive
labour’, or the ‘transnational economy of domestic labour’. Nevertheless, some questions still remain less developed.

Several of such questions have already been highlighted by the 2004 World Survey on the Role of Women in Development: Women and International Migration (United Nations, 2005). How can migrant women best contribute to the development of their country of origin, particularly through mechanisms such as remittances, temporary and permanent return and the skills and financial resources of diaspora communities? How can women best benefit from economic, political and social development so that they can obtain employment opportunities, education, healthcare and other services in their home community without being forced to migrate? This brings us to the nexus between gender, migration and development, which we address below.

ADDING DEVELOPMENT AS A RESULT

First, we should consider the concept of development, although reviewing all the given definitions is not possible here. Even so, we do want to look more closely at how we can apply the concept in a way that results in connecting it to migration outcomes. Cortés (ch. 5) gives some hints on such a discussion when present in the different development visions and interests of different stakeholders that are conducted through their daily livelihood activities or institutional initiatives. These stakeholders would be government actors (government officials, regional and/or municipal), technicians of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) working in migratory contexts, as well as the migrants themselves. The development stakeholders have different visions of development, power and influence in order to enforce them. In this regard, as we shall discuss below, the European conceptions of the link between migration and development are based on a modernizing vision of this relationship, which defines development exclusively within economic paradigms. These visions do not incorporate critical development reviews, nor do they include new proposals such as human development, or the progress already made on the topic of gender and development. We could even consider co-development, which for Cortés would be to generate patterns of governance on migration and would consist of values, norms and cultural representations on migration and ‘suitable’ ways for their management, facilitated by the relationship established between the state and civil society organizations. And, if referring to concrete projects, would be very varied: voluntary return, migrant associations and, especially, financial remittances from migrants, and so on.
Second, if we think again in terms of a chronological perspective, Benería’s work presents an overview of the conceptual approaches that have been used in the field of what we loosely term ‘gender and development’ (Benería, 2011). During the 1970s there was great emphasis on the domestic labour debate and the significance of reproduction and women’s unpaid work and criticism of the neoclassical model.

Beginning briefly with Ester Boserup’s modernization approach and the different frameworks that sprang from the critique of her work, Benería goes on to consider the conceptual transformations that took place in the 1980s, particularly the significance of introducing a ‘gender perspective’ and the postmodern influences that followed throughout the 1990s. Her interest continued during work on building safety nets within the structural adjustments of the early 1990s. Feminist post-development thought would also be included. It was then the time to review the postcolonial condition, by tackling gender analysis in a time of growing inequalities. Finally, her chronology explores present conceptual currents underpinning the multiple aspects of work being carried out, including: neoliberalism, the human development/capabilities approach, the social reproduction framework and human rights approaches.

Third, we should consider from which point of view we talk about women and development. Current discussions about gender and postcolonialism have resurrected concern about what type of feminism we refer to. Jabardo (2011) introduces the perspective of black feminism into African female migratory flow analysis, by showing how the categories used to construct gender relations in Western feminism have concealed the practices and social agendas of female migrants of African origin. In this sense, she places the theoretical nexus in both gender–development–migration and multiculturalism and gender. In a return to the concept of social agency posited by Saba Mahmood, understood as the capacity for action created and recreated by certain relations of subordination, she reinterprets the practices of African female migrants from the conceptualization of the feminine as a new sphere, which although removed from the public arena, extends beyond the private one. For that reason she shows how in a number of theoretical contributions the concept central to feminist theory is problematized in application to the life of black women: ‘family, patriarchy, reproduction’ (Carby, 1982 quoted by Jabardo, 2011). It is around these three concepts that ‘black British Feminism’ articulates the criticism on the adoption of ‘inclusive’ arguments of socialist feminism (Parmar, 1982; Amos and Parmar, 1984; Bhavnani and Coulson; 1986; Knowles and Mercer, 1992; all cited in Jabardo, 2011).

Fourth, we should see such issues under the context of migration and development literature. Prior to the 1990s, gender was relatively overlooked
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in studies of the links between migration and development; indeed, the book published by Chant in 1992 (Gender and Migration in Developing Countries) was a pioneer in this field. The start of the twenty-first century has seen a growing body of literature on the topic of gender, migration and development (see, for example, Salih, 2001; Elhariri, 2004; Escrivá and Ribas-Mateos, 2004; Monquid, 2004; Zapata and Saurez, 2004; Herrera, 2005b; Ramírez et al., 2005; Semyonov and Gorodzeisky, 2005; Sørensen, 2005; Amuedo-Dorantes and Pozo 2006; Gainza, 2006; King et al., 2006; Kunz, 2008; Pauli, 2008; Kunz, 2008; Piper, 2008b; Ribas-Mateos and Basa, 2013), including INTRSAW publications that take an in-depth look at gendered patterns in the sending, reception, use and management of remittances (for example, INTRSAW, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2010), and which highlight how remittances may act as a means for the transformation of relations between men and women in a developing context. The evolution of these gender-focused studies is linked to the development of a more open analytical approach to the debate addressing the migration–development nexus. Therefore, we require further elaboration of the development and migration relation to bring us up to date with the topic at hand. As indicated by de Haas (2010), over the last five decades, analysis of the migration–development nexus has shifted considerably, from the debates of the ‘migration optimists’ which lasted up until the early 1970s, to those of ‘migration pessimists’ (until the 1990s). These outlooks in turn form part of the legacy of the two great paradigms of the social sciences (functionalist versus structuralist), and also of the theories of development (balanced growth versus asymmetric development paradigms). Recent years have seen a return to an optimistic vision (ibid., pp. 229–30).

During the 1980s and 1990s empirical research revealed the heterogeneous and non-deterministic nature of the impact of migration on development. This falls within the emergence of more pluralist and hybrid approaches to social theory that attempt to integrate the impact of structure and agency in their analyses. Consequently, the New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM), the livelihood approaches, as well as sociological and anthropological research on migrant transnationalism ‘provide a more nuanced perspective on reciprocal migration and development interactions, which integrates structure and agency perspectives, and gives sufficient analytical room for explaining the heterogeneous relationship between migration and wider development processes’ (ibid., p. 242). According to de Haas, the NELM sees migration as risk-sharing behaviour undertaken by families and households, whereby households diversify their resources, such as labour, in order to minimize income risks. Then, the livelihood approaches consider migration as a strategy that employs households ‘to diversify, secure and potentially, durably
improve, their livelihoods’. In turn, the transnational perspective enables us to understand ‘migrant engagement with origin countries is not conditional on their return, but can be maintained through remitting money and ideas, telecommunications, holiday visits and pendular migration patterns’ (ibid., p. 247).

As a result, households and transnational communities (or diasporas) are becoming increasingly important units of analysis, in their capacity as social actors of development. This has also broadened the gender approach when analysing the migration–development nexus. On the other hand, international institutions – through specific programmes – have made NGOs and households themselves the key actors of such a desired social development.

De Haas and Fokkema (ch. 9) develop the framework of transnational return and pendulum migration strategies. The case study is that of Moroccan migrants from the Todgha valley, by examining intra-household power inequalities, tensions and conflicts of interest in migration decision making and the consequences of migration strategies for intra-household power relations. These authors conclude that although this migration is part of a household-livelihood strategy of improvements in standards of living, not all members of the household are on an equal footing when it comes to the material and non-material benefits of this strategy. Far from being a consensus-based decision, migration instead reflects intra-households’ inequalities along lines not only of gender but also of generation.

Taking the European context as their reference, Bachmeier, Lessard-Phillips and Fokkema’s results (ch. 12) show how, in the first generation, transnationalism is the exception rather than the rule, as most second-generation adults are oriented overwhelmingly towards life in their country of origin. Indeed, transnational engagement is complementary to host-country economic integration among members of the second generation. Integration and transnationalism are also gendered processes as the second generation also seem to show, but different. They reveal that second-generation women are relatively more integrated ethno-culturally and economically than their adult male counterparts. Therefore that makes important differences to their transnational behaviour on the development of the countries of origin: remittances, transnational practices and so on. Furthermore, they also suggest that the more economically integrated second-generation women are less likely to sustain origin country attachments while more economically integrated men are more likely to sustain meaningful attachments. So they conclude by pointing out that it is possible that development strategies focused on second-generation migrants may have little impact on gender-relations regimes in origin countries.
Following the same topic of generations in Europe, Christou (ch. 13) brings us the case of the Greek–Danish second generation by using ethnographic and life history data with a gendered and affective approach. She examines women’s portrayals of their fluid sense of self and blurred sense of place in negotiating their emotions and their impact on their diasporic lives. She considers the way in which intimate attachments, desires and emotionalities shape mobility experiences, addressing issues of cultural marginality and the emotionally embodied context of belonging. The author reveals how gendered identities are appropriated within gendered (power) diasporic relations and how cultural processes take place in diasporic settings. Ultimately she analyses women’s sense of self and identity, considering that the journey of counter return to the ancestral homeland is still an expectation for a future life. In her conclusion she notes:

As the participants are still shuffling the fragments of memory of an ancestral past Greek life while coping with the present life of Danish/Greek context, the ultimate expectation is the attainment of equilibrium between the ‘cultural stuff’ of Danishness and of Greekness that gets in the way of finally accepting the self, neither coherent, nor split but in the making. After all, isn’t this the pathway of adulthood as the life course progresses and stages follow one after the other, don’t we all yearn to ‘settle’ somewhere and somehow? (Christou, ch. 13, pp. 307–8)

International Institutions and Stakeholders

Another approach to understanding the migration–development nexus can be found in the new roles of international institutions. Castles (2008) cites the example of the British government suggesting that the UN Refugee Convention of 1951 was no longer appropriate because, in a situation of enhanced global migration flows, it was creating the conditions for the misuse of the asylum system by economic migrants. To save the Convention, then UN Refugee Commissioner, Rudd Lubbers, suggested ‘Convention Plus’: a set of measures to safeguard asylum while also addressing the issue of ‘mixed flows’ and the causes of forced migration. Similar objectives were to be found in the French approach adopted of co-développement, which would afterwards spread throughout Southern Europe, by seeking to link development measures for African and Latin American countries to measures designed to encourage return or managing remittances as shown in Cortés (ch. 5).

This line of analysis is also adopted by Chant (ch. 4). In her opinion, gendered migration and mobility receives scant attention in the World Development Report 2012. The author notes that this publication makes a passing reference to the topic of ‘migration and social norms’, highlighting
that migration can broaden women’s social networks and also reduce preference for sons (in certain countries such as China). More generally, migration can also lessen gendered constraints; however, it may also strengthen social conservatism. The economic crisis in countries such as Georgia has brought about the migration of women who send higher remittances than their male counterparts. The first World Development Report devoted to gender largely overlooks the topic of gender and migration, a notable omission that is highlighted by this author who questions whether the ‘WDR 2012 is likely to aid or abet the struggle to achieve gender justice in development’ (Chant, ch. 4, p. 97). She also draws attention to the fact that while ‘huge strides’ have been achieved for gender and development (GAD) since the United Nations (UN) Decade for Women, the encroaching dominance of the World Bank’s ‘smart economics’ rationale for ‘investing in women’, has led primarily to ‘building women’s capacities in the interests of development than with promoting women’s rights for their own sake’ (ibid., ch. 4, p. 97).

Cortés (ch. 5) highlights the fact that the Spanish cooperation policy for development has adopted the Women in Development approach (WID), which excludes the analysis of gender and power relations and their economic, social, cultural and political impact in order to comply with the rights of women focusing on positive action measures as a function or merely formal equality, without questioning the structures that cause inequality. This policy, through remittances, has put migration on the ‘development agenda’ within the framework of co-development projects. The creation of these projects is justified by a discourse that claims that migration has led to the dismantling of families in the country of origin, and also the misuse of remittances spent on non-productive activities. As a result, migrant families and women are instrumentalized with the aim of implementing initiatives designed to slow down migration. Development projects attempt to redirect remittances to productive activities in order to prevent international migration and encourage return, in such a way that ‘women would become a means of contributing to the reduction in migration, instead of the project activities being aimed at strengthening the rights, projects and needs of these migrant women’ (ibid., p. 140). Her case study on the development visions of staff members from NGOs in Ecuador and Spain reveals the tensions between development discourses and the reinforcement of class, gender, generation and ethnic hierarchies, not only in the societies of origin but also in host societies.

The chapters by Chant and Cortés show how development policies – either from a gender and development approach (smart economies), or the migration–development nexus (through co-development projects) – have
largely instrumentalized women, yet have failed to take into consideration the aim of improving women’s rights to any effective degree.

In short, in recent years, a more pluralistic approach to the migration–development nexus revealing the articulation between structure and agency has allowed for the development of the issue of gender in studies addressing the issue of migration and development. However, such studies have generally limited their scope to the descriptive differences in remittances sent by men and women, such as their use and management, analysing the transformation of roles and the impact of remittances on gender relations. Considerably less attention has been paid to the analytical framework on the nexus between migration, gender and development from the perspective of the articulation between productive and reproductive strategies, within the framework of global capitalism. This is precisely one of the main objectives of this book and one that is developed in the next section.

IDENTIFYING KEY CHAINS FOR THE GMD (GENDER, MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT) NEXUS

Our crucial issue has been to address the core debates surrounding topics of gender, migration, transnationalism and development, articulating analyses of global production and reproduction chains (and in particular, so-called ‘global care chains’) with new models developed around the emerging trends played out by women in contemporary mobility flows. The scope of the book is ambitious; it presents evidence of the importance of extended geographical chains that allow us to tackle gender in global migration processes. Such extended geographical chains encompass North Africa (Northern and Southern Morocco), West Africa, Asia (China), Latin America (Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador), Northern and Southern Europe (Belgium, the UK, France, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark, Greece, Spain), and Eastern Europe (Poland).

Classic Production Chains

Production chains relate principally to consumer commodities, such as clothing, footwear, toys and electronic appliances for the international market. Such manufacturing industries, especially in China, have created a continuous demand for labour, including many young peasant women. Nevertheless, similar processes have been developed in many other areas
of the Global South. In such chains, smaller manufacturers may also decide to subcontract to other manufacturers or homeworkers. These forms of industrial development have been the basis of advocacy strategies to develop educational programmes around workers’ rights in industry. As discussed earlier by Sassen (2003), *inter alia*, migrant women have become crucial agents in ‘global survival circuits’.

In relation to labour production, Vidal-Coso and Miret-Gamundi (ch. 15) highlight just such a process. By using Spanish Labour Force data from the recent period of economic growth, 1999–2008, they study the dynamics of labour supply and integration in the employment structure of female immigrants from developing countries. The existence of labour complementarities by birthplace explains why while young Spanish women are mainly employed in skilled occupations, immigrant women, regardless of their human capital, are overrepresented in more unskilled, feminized, labour positions. The second hypothesis they give is the existence of a process of socio-demographic substitution in domestic occupations: from mature and less-skilled native women to younger and more-skilled immigrant women. Finally, the authors hypothesize that the initial demand for domestic help is not sufficient to explain the acceleration of female immigrant flows during recent years in Spain. It is the arrival of a low-cost and available migrant labour force that has caused an additional effect, generalizing the hiring of domestic workers within the middle classes and multiplying the demand for this type of labour. On the supply side, economic trends such as growing inequalities between high- and low-income countries and insecurity, vulnerability and instability due to economic crises, together with gender-related factors such as abuse, family conflict and discrimination have led to an increase in the numbers of women who migrate in order to obtain paid work.

**Production Chains and Remittances**

We also consider an overview of the importance of remittances as a new global trend. The link between transnational migration, remittances and the processes of change and development in the places of origin and transit for migration is a relatively new issue on the political and research agenda in many parts of the world. As already mentioned, remittances are a key factor in the survival of household, community and country in a number of developing countries and exporting workers is one means by which governments cope with unemployment and foreign debt.

Literature points to a widely held belief that women send a larger percentage of their income to their household of origin. Indeed, the stream of remittances sent by women is both more constant and continued over
time, and as they are also the principal recipients of remittances (Gregorio Gil, 1998; INSTRAW, 2006, 2007), families may even actively encourage women to migrate, as they are more responsible than men in sending money back to their country of origin (Tacoli, 1999; Parreñas, 2001a and b; Ribas-Mateos, 2004; Ramírez et al., 2005). On the other hand, we must note that a study carried out into remittance trends among Filipino men and women revealed that men send higher amounts of money, as their incomes are higher (Semyonov and Gorodzeisky, 2005).

The figure of women as the recipients of remittances sent by male migrants has also been the object of study. Pribilsky’s research highlights the way that Ecuadorian women achieve a position of greater authority thanks to the control they exert over their husbands’ remittances (Pribilsky, 2004). However, very few studies have actually managed to quantify the sending of remittances from a gendered perspective. This is the main aim of the work carried out by Campoy-Muñoz, Salazar-Ordóñez and García-Alonso (ch. 17), and which considers one of the principal corridors from Latin America, between Ecuador and Spain. Using a Bayesian framework, the chapter describes the cause–effect relationships among the key factors that determine remittance flows. In the absence of robust data, Monte-Carlo simulations and ‘fuzzy logic’ confirm that Ecuadorian migrant women who reside in Spain display a greater propensity to send remittances in comparison with their male counterparts. During the 2000–10 period, Ecuadorian men’s propensity to send money varied from 10 per cent to 15 per cent, while women’s propensity to remit rose from 20 per cent to 30 per cent at the end of the period, results that indicate the relevant contribution of Ecuadorian females in supporting their families back home even though they have been severely affected by the economic crisis.

Similar attention is also focused on this corridor in Mata-Codesal (ch. 16), who opens the black box of households to explore the negotiations, tensions, continuities and changes triggered by remittances. She sheds light on the family dynamics of remittance sending and receiving practices in two contrasting rural settings in Southern Highland Ecuador (Xarbán and Pindo). She operationalizes the concept of ‘remittance dyads’, which are contrary to traditional approaches (that focus either on remittance senders or receivers), and considers the relationship between remittance sender(s) and receiver(s). The work takes into account the gender of the receivers and the gendered effects of material remittances, as well as the power, emotional and symbolic negotiations taking place between remittance senders and receivers, considering gender as a key variable of negotiations. She also differentiates between two types of remittances: ‘emic remittances’ and savings. The former consists of small amounts of
money sent periodically to pay for food, utilities and cover the expenses for the basic physical reproduction of the household members (including children’s education and small medical expenses). She also shows how these remittances have dramatically increased well-being among residents. Such remittances comprise to any money transfer not intended to cover the daily expenses of the receiving household. The chapter concludes with an explanation of how the effects of remittances are gendered.

Reproduction Chains and Care

The second major chain is of a reproductive nature and relates primarily to care. Recent and contemporary studies, such as the works of Truong (1996) in the 1990s on the internationalization of reproduction, reveal how care is increasingly set up in complex diasporic and interfamily settings (as also shown by Sørensen, 2011), and that the consideration of professional women and their interaction between the productive and reproductive spheres is a key element in explaining transnational mobility patterns (as also shown by Cieslik, ch. 21).

Verschuur’s (ch. 6) theoretical contribution offers us a critical review of the concept of social reproduction and, particularly, that of care in the global context. Feminist studies have conceptualized those activities and relations that are indispensable for social reproduction, as well as the role of women migrant workers in the new global economy, articulated with the domestic economy. Women’s work is connected to processes of globalization and considerable research has been conducted into women and work and into the shifting divisions of productive and reproductive labour globally, particularly in development studies. She opens up the discussion on the opposition between market/non-market production (often associated with male/female), which shows that it is not the nature of production that makes the difference, but the problem of the appropriation of the work – paid or unpaid – of individuals. She considers that when commodities are produced outside the family, the work to produce them is paid. When commodities are produced in the framework of domestic-type relations and exchanged on the market, the work is generally not remunerated or not adequately remunerated.

Verschuur’s primary interest is testing the theoretical implications of the notion of care. For her, care consists of activities such as physical care and attention to close persons, family members, children and the elderly. It also includes caring for non-dependent persons, which is not always taken into account in studies. Care includes unpaid tasks such as preparing meals, cleaning, washing clothes, shopping and so on. In countries with limited infrastructure, care work may also include fetching water and
collecting wood, all of which form part of social reproduction. Care can be paid or unpaid.

For Verschuur the concept of care, associated with the reflections on migration, has also shown the links between the domestic and the global economy. However, the concepts of social reproduction and care cannot be merged. While the concept of care has widened the focus of analysis of social reproduction, she sheds light on some important limitations in the context of gender, development and migration studies. These are especially relevant when taking into account both the increase of social and gender inequalities, and the subjective dimensions, emotion or intimacy. The concept of care has been useful in illuminating them but they are not fully acknowledged or taken into consideration in the debates on social reproduction. Furthermore, care, be it conceptualized as ethics of care, mainly perceived as a relational activity, or in the frame of research on social policies, is associated with reflections on migration, as a growing part of care work is commoditized and undertaken by migrant women from different classes or races.

Logically, problematization is even harder when we consider the concept of the care chain. The identification of care chains shows us how gender divisions of labour are incorporated into uneven economic development processes. The connection between migrant care work, globalization and the privatization of social reproduction has been variously designated the ‘new domestic world order’, the ‘new international division of reproductive labour’, or the ‘transnational economy of domestic labour’. On the demand side, the participation of women in migration is fuelled by the increase in women’s labour force participation, falling fertility rates, increasing life expectancy, changes in family structure, shortages of public care and the increasing commodification of care in the North.

Migration not only has implications for policies designed to reconcile paid employment and care responsibilities in both host and home countries, but it also has sharp contradictory impacts. As already indicated, the employment of migrant women to perform care work in the receiving countries of the North is an individual and privatized solution to the broader problem of combining paid work with unpaid care work. Since this solution is only an option for families who can afford it, lower-income families are left in a difficult position. In fact, as Benería (2008, p.10) points out, ‘the employment of migrant women from the South might contribute to a vicious circle in the host country, in which private solutions delay collective efforts to search for appropriate public policies’. As it is mostly women who move in to assume the family roles of migrant females, there is a growing need for reconciliation policies in the South. While
women’s decisions to migrate can increase their financial autonomy and enable them to contribute to their household through remittances, their absorption into the care markets of the North reinforces the gendered nature of care. Thus, not only do global care chains illustrate the ways in which unequal resources are distributed globally, they also reveal the gendered nature of this inequality.

Access to citizenship by immigrant women employed in care work is another issue addressed in this book. Setién and Acosta (ch. 18) explore the rights and obligations involved in working in the care sector, with a special focus on care provided by immigrant women. The assessment and perception of how rights are achieved and exercised in the social relationship of care provide evidence of the denial of rights under such conditions, as found in other studies. This results in the exercise of limited citizenship in the case of women immigrant carers as well as dependants, who find themselves in the most precarious of situations.

Safuta and Degavre (ch. 19) also consider the problems of domestic work through the study of undocumented migrant women, albeit from a different perspective, namely that of the use of reciprocity and redistribution. Their chapter focuses on the informal home-based provision of paid care for the elderly by migrant women in Poland and in Belgium. It maps the combination of socioeconomic principles prescribing over this type of care provision and identifies the resources that each of these principles (as well as their combination) offers migrant care providers.

Safuta and Degavre’s work throws light on how, in contemporary market societies, men and women are expected to be ‘commodified’ – to survive on resources stemming primarily from what Karl Polanyi (1944) called ‘market exchange’. Redistribution (the welfare state) and reciprocity (social links and obligations) are said only to supplement or temporarily replace market resources when individuals are unable to take part in market exchange. Because they do not have access to the safety net offered to citizens and legal residents by redistribution, reciprocity is of utmost importance for undocumented migrants. In this chapter the authors thus examined the usages of Polanyian reciprocity by undocumented migrants, focusing on those who are or have in the past been employed in domestic services.

Based on Degavre and Nyssens’s (2008, 2009) pioneering application of Polanyi’s transactional modes (reciprocity, redistribution, the market and householding) to the analysis of elder care provision, Chapter 19 shows the ways in which migrant women (can) make the most of each principle when creating their migration and empowerment strategies. The resources offered by the socioeconomic principles
under consideration can be both of a monetary or non-monetary nature. Monetary resources are mainly wages (stemming from the market or, in the case of cash-for-care allowances, from redistribution), but literature cites other monetary means, such as the case of employers financing the education or holidays of the migrant care worker’s child. Non-monetary resources available to migrant care providers can stem from the market (such as the room and board in live-in provision) or reciprocity (for example, when employers help their undocumented migrant employee to obtain a stay permit). Through in-depth interviews with migrant providers and elderly receivers of informal home-based care, the chapter contributes to the scholarly debate on the effects of employment in predominantly ‘migrant’ sectors. In particular, it aims to test empirically the ‘paradoxical effects of care’ concept developed by Degavre and Langwiesner (2011, p. 3), who posit that a job in the care sector can simultaneously contribute to the worker’s emancipation but can also be a socioeconomic trap.

Furthermore, care work for migrant women has also brought with it new forms of mobility through transnational family networks, as in the case of the population studied by Casado i Aijón (ch. 20). This author analyses the temporary migrations of Riffian women between Nador (located in the Rif, Northern Morocco), Catalonia and Europe. As a result of the intensification of contemporary migrations carried out by this population during the second half of the twentieth century, today we can draw a map whereby extended families are found practically throughout Europe – in Catalonia, Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, France – and also in Morocco. It is in such a context that we witness heterogenic migration processes in which we can highlight a specific type of migration, namely that the maintenance of the female role of employment of migrant women from the South might contribute to a vicious circle in a Riffian family, and the usage of the transnational network that the settlement of diverse domestic units of the extended family has configured. The specificity of those migrations highlights three different characteristics, differentiating them from other migration projects from the Rif: they have a temporal delimitation; they are clearly feminine – integrated by women who travel, very often alone; and the objectives of these temporary migrations are assistance, support and care in cases of sickness of family members, but especially during and after pregnancy of any family members in general, but particularly sisters. The transnational nature of extended families also has clear consequences, involving the perception of tasks attributed to women and the maintenance of family principles of family role organization and status according to specific notions of maternity, feminine solidarity and family functions.
Towards an Articulationist Approach

Beyond a focused approach on care chains, this introduction and the whole book aim to highlight the relevance of analysing the interaction between the productive and reproductive spheres. And it is precisely this articulation to which we wish to draw attention through the remaining contributions to this book.

The need to articulate the analysis focused on the GMd nexus, from the perspective of production chains and remittances in relation to care and reproduction chains, is revealed through some of the empirical studies presented in this book, including the chapters by Sáiz López (ch. 7), Parella (ch. 14) and Cieslik (ch. 21). These chapters will provide three different European realities, that of the Chinese and Bolivian communities in Spain and that of Polish migrants in the UK.

Sáiz López (ch. 7) gives an Asian perspective, more precisely, a Chinese one, based on migrants originating from Qingtian, Wenzhou (Zhejiang province) and Changle (Fujian province) and living in Spain, in a ‘family migration’ pattern. The Chinese diaspora is analysed from two angles: on the one hand, the transnational practices of the family business, differentiated between men and women; and on the other, the economic, social and symbolic dimensions of monetary transactions between origin and destination. Such an analysis helps us to understand the value and significance of gender relations as well as how they affect families and developing communities. It is interesting how Sáiz López is able to link through a very specific case study the articulation of both the production and the reproduction cases. She sheds light on the combination of the economic insertion in Europe, as a model of upward social mobility (with a rural family-based culture) with a social system where behaviour, norms, ideals, attitudes and values are linked by kinship and marriage. Furthermore, in such a model, both men and women participate in the securing of success and, by extension, in migration. Familism also explains the involvement of women throughout the family business cycle, from the accumulation of capital and the business consolidation phase, to business expansion.

Parella (ch. 14) covers the experiences of Bolivian migrants in Spain from a methodological approach based on a transnational perspective, which involves the study of the arrangements that diasporic families generate in terms of productive links (remittances), provision of care (caring work) and kin-keeping support (kin work). The chapter begins with a theoretical discussion of the concept of the ‘transnational family’, aimed at identifying the dimensions that are most relevant for the analysis of the geographical separation of families from a gender perspective.
However, beyond family economic transfers, Parella underlines the other types of existing links, grounded in the overlapping of the productive and reproductive spheres (management of affect and care, also known as caring work) and kin work towards the maintenance of kinship bonds within the family group. Furthermore, in the case of Bolivia, the influence of gender should be framed in the context of the recent feminized migratory patterns from Bolivia to Spain (and Europe), which have substantially altered the canons of Bolivian society’s ‘migratory culture’, characterized by its masculinization, its circularity and its intra-regional character. In general terms, Parella overviews the impact of migration in the development of transnational links (remittances, trips to Bolivia), accompanied by the migrants’ desire to return. However, there are considerable differences between men and women. For the latter, according to her results, migration is motivated more by family welfare than by individual advancement, which results in a greater capacity for saving and the sending of remittances, which are used mainly for family consumption and children’s education.

Decisions concerning childrearing also influence the transnational mobility of skilled women, as shown by Cieslik (ch. 21). On the basis of research into skilled Polish migrants in the United Kingdom, the chapter considers if and how family planning decisions influence international migration trajectories. The ‘if’ part of the question highlights women’s expectations regarding their future mobility and how such expectations are modified by their plans to have children. The ‘how’ considers the migrants’ emotional ties to places, their beliefs about the right places for raising children and the role of family as a support system in childrearing. Research findings suggest that an important factor influencing the mobility of skilled migrant women lies in the perceived advantages and disadvantages of having children in Poland and the UK. A primary consideration pulling them back to Poland is the availability of childcare help from parents and grandparents. The UK, on the other hand, is an attractive location because of the child-friendly provisions offered by most employers. Emotional attachment to home and family tends to tip the scales towards returning to Poland. The free movement of people in the EU market is directly linked to reproductive choices made by skilled migrant women, frequently on the basis of emotional rather than ‘rational’ calculations. As can be seen, this chapter also reveals the gap in the social sciences literature concerning professional migrant women and the interaction between the productive and reproductive spheres.
CONCLUSION: LINKING PRODUCTION AND REPRODUCTION CHAINS IN CONTEMPORARY MOBILITY

This introduction has proposed a means of linking production and reproduction chains in contemporary gender mobility, by considering its extended connection with development. Our starting point was provided by the framework of globalization. Authors such as Mittelman (2000) draw our attention to the contradictory trends of globalization, revealing how cross-border flows of undocumented workers and instant telecommunications are positioned outside the effective control of state regulatory bodies. In keeping with this perspective, globalization also represents a dialectical set of continuities and discontinuities, an intensification of previously established models, as well as new features of a system that is lacking in effective regulatory measures.

Such a global context has allowed us to specify the processes that constitute the link between the different types of global changes through a particular type of conceptualization that brings to the fore how women’s strategic migration projects have emerged in the play of global chains. Conceiving of globalization along these lines confronts theory and research with fresh challenges related to transnational migration.

It is in this global context that we have located the persistent disparities and asymmetries regarding the mobility not only of capital but also of labour around the world. Some of the topics covered in Part I – the global context and its mobilities – were the notion of the global assembly line and the change from the Fordist migration model to transnationalism. We then understood the mobility of people as a fundamental resource of mobility chains when considering it in different scales and places provided by a number of case studies in this handbook.

Second, we focused on gender and the migration axis. Meanwhile in migration studies, traditional approaches, which almost exclusively emphasize the figure of the male immigrant worker (the *homo economicus* interpretation), have given way to contemporary ones that focus on more sociological conditioning factors when considering population flows. As a result, new perspectives arise that refer to macro- and micro-determining factors when describing and explaining migratory processes. We have considered all such issues of the new debates: migration and care work, sexualities and sex trafficking, the transnational approach, the agency-based approach and the intersectionality theory related to migrant women status. This contemporary scope has led us to introduce a more combined approach, which we think we can solve through linking production and reproduction chains.
Third, we covered development as a result – Part II – of the perspective on policy discourse regarding international migration – especially female migration – focusing on the complex intersection between development studies, migration studies and gender. Starting from a critical conceptualization of gender as well as gender and migration, we have seen – with our contributors’ help – that the cases can be heterogeneous, even by using examples from the same country and by acknowledging that the impact of migration on development is far from being a deterministic model. This again has driven us to reflect on a more combined approach of structure and agency, which we think we can solve through linking production and reproduction chains.

Lastly, we have tried to deconstruct the key chains for the GMD nexus, by articulating analyses of global production and reproduction chains (and in particular, so-called ‘global care chains’) with new models developed around the emerging trends played out by women in contemporary mobility flows. By examining them we have revealed an articulation based on the complex interaction of productive and reproductive systems.

NOTES

* This publication was made possible by the generous support of the research projects of the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad: The Impact of Migration on Development, Gender and Transnationalism (SEJ2007/6379); Gender, Transnationalism and Inter-Generational Strategies for Social Mobility (FEM2011-26210, FEM20/1002/E), Network Gender, Migration and Development (SEJ2007-30782-E) and FEM2010-10702-E which funded part of the English editing of the book, as well as different seminars and meetings related to the theme of the handbook. We benefited greatly from these discussions.

The English editing of the book was also made possible by the 2011 call for consolidating and structuring competitive research units (ref. CN2011/03 for ESOMI, University of A Coruña), (Department of Education and University System of Galicia, co-financed by the Regional Development Fund of the EU).

We are grateful for the comments and constructive criticism that we received from the editors at Edward Elgar and for their support and that of their staff. Thanks to Sarah Moss for translating some parts of the introduction from Spanish into English, and to Montse Golias and Sofia Laiz for last-minute help with formatting. We are also grateful for the feedback from Caroline Bledsoe, Sylvia Chant and Ivan Light, and last, but not least, to Ali Stewart for translating some parts of the Introduction and for editing the manuscript as well as for her continuous and engaging support throughout the whole process.

1. We are aware that it is a complex conceptualization. The contrast between the concept of gift and commodity has many sources: as Appadurai indicates, ‘among them are the tendency to romanticize small-scale societies; to conflate use value (in Marx’s sense) with gemeinschaft (in Tönnies’ sense)’ (1986, p. 42), where gifts and reciprocity often appear to clash with the profit-oriented, self-centred and calculated spirit that fires the circulation of commodities. The issue of the ‘objectivization of persons’ also has to be taken into account in cross-cultural perspectives. However, Marxist approaches have focused on the production-dominated view of the commodity while overlooking the consumption
facet. What Appadurai’s analysis reveals is the commoditization (after lengthy explanations) that lies at the complex intersection of temporal, cultural and social factors.

2. This title refers to two previous articles, both published in special issues of the *International Migration Review* (Morokvasic, 1984; Donato et al., 2006).

3. We have opted not to cite the wealth of literature addressing each of these issues, as it can be consulted in the chapters by Hondagneu-Sotelo, and Catarino and Morokvasic.

4. See Jabardo (2011) for extensive literature on this issue.

5. They interpret the data of the TIES survey (the Integration of the European Second Generation), carried out in 15 cities across eight European countries (France, Germany, Spain, Austria, the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland and Sweden). They focus on three expressions of second-generation transnational engagement (visiting, remitting and return intention), in order to examine the extent to which second-generation transnational engagements, from the perspective of gender, are associated with host-country incorporation outcomes.

6. The study is based on 67 in-depth interviews held with different actors involved in the social scope of care (women immigrant carers, employers and dependents) in both Spain and Chile.

7. Other works have also highlighted the relevance of this articulationist approach in gender and migration studies (Catarino and Oso, 2012).
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