

Mapping Gender and Migration in Sociological Scholarship: Is It Segregation or Integration?

Sara R. Curran

Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, University of Washington

Steven Shafer

Department of Sociology, Princeton University

Katharine M. Donato

Department of Sociology, Rice University

Filiz Garip

Department of Sociology, Princeton University

A review of the sociological research about gender and migration shows the substantial ways in which gender fundamentally organizes the social relations and structures influencing the causes and consequences of migration. Yet, although a significant sociological research has emerged on gender and migration in the last three decades, studies are not evenly distributed across the discipline. In this article, we map the recent intellectual history of gender and migration in the field of sociology and then systematically assess the extent to which studies on engendering migration have appeared in four widely read journals of sociology (*American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *Demography*, and *Social Forces*). We follow with a discussion of these studies, and in our conclusions, we consider how future gender and migration scholarship in sociology might evolve more equitably.

INTRODUCTION

A review of the sociological research about gender and migration shows the substantial ways in which gender fundamentally organizes the social relations and structures influencing the causes and consequences of migration. Yet, although a significant sociological research has emerged on gender and migration in the last three decades, studies are not evenly distributed across the discipline. Much of the recent scholarship has been by qualitative sociologists, who have been more successful than their quantitative counterparts incorporating gender in migration studies. Therefore, gender is only partially included in

sociological studies of migration in a way that illustrates it as a “key constitutive element” (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2003:9).

In this article, we map the recent intellectual history of gender and migration in the field of sociology and then systematically assess the extent to which studies on engendering migration have appeared in four widely read journals of sociology (*American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *Demography*, and *Social Forces*). We follow with a discussion of these studies, and in our conclusions, we consider how future gender and migration scholarship in sociology might evolve more equitably.

GENDER AND MIGRATION: A REVIEW OF THE SCHOLARSHIP

In this section we describe the evolution of sociological scholarship on gender and migration since the 1970s.¹ Drawing heavily from Hondagneu-Sotelo (2003) and Grieco and Boyd (2003), we describe how studies have developed over time in distinct ways. Our aim is to emphasize the alternative and distinct differences in these studies across time, evaluate epistemological developments, and to include studies up through the early 21st century.

Beginning in the late 1970s, studies depicted women in the migration process and recognized they were as likely as men to migrate to the United States. Since then, women migrants were the subject of many studies and special volumes on gender and migration (*see* Dumon, 1981; Phizacklea, 1983; Morokvasic, 1984; Morawska, 1986; Simon and Brettell, 1986; Pedraza, 1991; Tienda and Booth, 1991; Chant, 1992a, 1992b; Gabaccia, 1992, 1994; Bujis, 1993; Zlotnik, 1993; Schenk-Sandbergen, 1995; Grieco and Boyd, 1998; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1999, 2003; Hondagneu-Sotelo and Cranford, 1999). Together these studies examined the characteristics of immigrant women, the timing and volume of their migration from sending communities, and their adaptation process in receiving nations. They also suggested that women were both independent economic actors and dependent family members in the migration process (Boyd, 1975, 1976, 1984; Fernandez-Kelly, 1983; Tyree and Donato, 1985, 1986; Foner, 1986; Pessar, 1986, 1988; Findley and Williams, 1991; Wolf, 1992; Donato, 1993; Hugo, 1993; Zlotnik, 1993). In this way, sociological scholarship “added women and stirred” (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2003), either by focusing on women and men or only on the experiences of

¹This article largely describes the gender and migration scholarship published by sociologists. Although at times it refers to studies outside of the discipline, it does so only if they are widely referenced by sociologists.

women. This phase of scholarship added important new evidence, but, in many cases, women migrants were presented as a special case (Chant, 1992a; Lawson, 1998; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1999; Hondagneu-Sotelo and Crawford, 1999).²

By the late 1980s, the evidence had grown large enough to require redrawing the map of gender and migration scholarship and new theoretical formulations emerged (Pedraza, 1991; Tienda and Booth, 1991; Chant and Radcliffe, 1992; Hugo, 1993; Zlotnik, 1993). In these frameworks, the household economy became a critical site for revealing the relationship between migration and women. Some implied that migration would tend to reinforce gender asymmetries via the tensions between reproductive labor and productive labor markets (Tienda and Booth, 1991; Zlotnik, 1993). Others suggested that migration created opportunities for reworking gender with possible improvements in women's status (Pedraza, 1991). Still others were more equivocal, pointing instead toward the need for more research about the context of migration (Hugo, 1993).

At this point there was enough evidence to indicate two limitations in quantitative migration scholarship. Key among these is the male bias embedded in migration studies, *e.g.*, the longstanding practice of interviewing only (or largely) men (Pessar, 2003). By asking most questions of household heads (for the most part these are identified as men), these projects have limited data about women (Hugo, 1993; Zlotnik, 1993, 1995; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2003; Pessar, 2003). A second limitation is that most migration data collection efforts fail to observe pre- and post-migration experiences and contexts (Tienda and Booth, 1991). By only focusing on migrants, researchers lose sight of non-migrants (frequently women). Therefore, without these data, quantitative studies on gender and migration are biased toward the experiences of men, especially for migration flows where men migrate first and then women follow (as in the Mexico-U.S. case).

Instead of relying on quantitative data to generate insights about gender and migration, by the mid-1990s sociologists had effectively turned to qualitative methods to understand the dynamics of gender and migration. At the same time, their studies shifted their lens away from women to gender in the migration process. By addressing methodological and theoretical critiques of early reviews, the new scholarship showed how migration processes are reciprocally related to the social construction of gender. For example, studies of Dominican

²Or, as in the economic development literature, the add women and stir approach yielded evidence about women as economic agents of change or women as profoundly disempowered as result of economic change (Elson, 1991).

migrants showed how variable investment decisions, remittance patterns, and social ties to origin communities can only be understood with a gender lens (Grasmuck and Pessar, 1991); how migration processes and outcomes in Mexican-U.S. migration can profoundly affect gender relations and social change (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994); or how Indonesian rural-urban migrant women dynamically interact with their household of origin in ways that challenge presumptions about a uniform logic governing household economies (Wolf, 1992). These and other seminal works (*e.g.*, Hagan, 1994; Kibria, 1994; Moodie, 1994; Pessar, 1994; Mahler, 1995; Morawska, 1996; Constable, 1997; Menjívar, 2000) along with edited collections (Boyle and Halfacree, 1999; Momsen, 1999) effectively provided the evidentiary bases for systematic inclusion of gender when analyzing migration causes and consequences via a household lens. Household dynamics as explanation for migration outcomes could no longer be understood without accounting for both men and women's behavior (Lawson, 1998).

On the whole, this work challenged the assumption that women were part of an equitable set of relationships guiding household decisions about migration (Findley, 1987; Lauby and Stark, 1988; Folbre, 1992). In some contexts, power differences embedded in households offer men preferential access and rights over resources that women do not have, thereby affecting decision making about who migrates (Tilly and Scott, 1978; Roldan, 1988; Grasmuck and Pessar, 1991; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1992; Riley and Gardner, 1993; Gonzalez de la Rocha, 1994; Repak, 1995; Grieco and Boyd, 1998; Cerrutti and Massey, 2001). However, in other contexts, women were advantaged migrants, paving the way for men's later migration (*e.g.*, Philippine-Hong Kong migration (Constable, 1997)). As the number of studies delineating gender and migration systems worldwide grew, including cases from the Philippines, to Turkey and South Africa, to Mexico and South America, the evidence strongly demonstrated how gender was central to understanding migration cause and consequence and how migration was a critical site for uncovering the mutability of gender relations.

Despite this progress, many studies often relegated gender analyses to the level of the family or household, and by doing so, gave license for scholars to ignore gender in other domains of the migration process. Among the first to identify this ghettoizing of women in migration studies, Hondagneu-Sotelo and Cranford (1999) attempted to redirect scholarship on gender and migration away from households into other domains. Fueling their insights was evidence from ethnographic studies that demonstrated the nuanced complexities of lives reworked in new locations, the contingent, sometimes

ambivalent, connections to origins, and the ways in which state, market, family, and individual interact.

Scholarship on gender and migration extending beyond household boundaries includes employment studies (Boyd, 1984, 1989; Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1992, Zhou, 1992; Gilbertson, 1995; Lee, 1996; Espiritu, 1999; Menjívar, 1999; Tyner, 1999; Livingston and Kahn, 2002; Livingston, 2006). For example, although enclave economies may offer significant advantages to migrants, in some contexts women were more disadvantaged by enclave economies than were men (Zhou, 1992; Gilbertson, 1995; Livingston and Khan, 2002). Livingston (2006) and Hagan (1998) show how immigrant men and women used different networks to obtain jobs with significant network advantages accruing to men. Menjívar (2000) shows that Salvadoran women were much more likely to fully claim access to social support resources from the state than were men. Other studies reported evidence of gender differences in migrant social networks (Boyd, 1989; Gilbertson, 1995; Greenwell, Valdez, and DaVanzo, 1997; Curran and Saguy, 2001).

Subsequent studies also document the blurring of categories between work, identity, and parenting and the family conflict that results (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2001; Espiritu, 2003; Gold, 2003; Kurien, 2003; Menjívar, 2003; Singer and Gilbertson, 2003). For example, Central American women who worked as domestics in U.S. families were more likely to make egalitarian claims in their own homes (Menjívar, 2003), Jewish émigré women who were less willing than their husbands to compromise employment status reported conflicts over returning or staying, and Dominican men used their U.S. citizenship status to return back to their origin communities while women sought citizenship to permanently settle in the United States.

Other, recent scholarship also goes beyond households by examining migrant relationships with the state and with a larger set of formal and informal ties that link origin and destination. For example, not only does Constable (1997) demonstrate how women have led many out of Filipino origin communities, she also shows how Filipina domestic workers in Hong Kong created unprecedented social, economic, and political spaces which then generated opportunities to challenge both the Hong Kong and Philippine states' control over their lives. In this case, we are reminded that women's community-building efforts in destinations and their capacity to mobilize must be considered when examining the process of incorporation.

A growing collection of studies also demonstrates the wider set of community and civil society associations that are influenced differently by men and women migrants and that also differentially affect men and women migrants'

destination experiences. Levitt (2001) shows how family and gender relations were shaped in both origin and destination via religious, kin, and political connections between Boston and the Dominican Republic. Espiritu (2003) portrays how colonial legacies in the Philippines, racial relations in the U.S., and immigrant experiences influence complex identities and behaviors among Filipinos to develop meanings of home, community, friendship, love, and family. In addition, Goldring (2003) examines Mexican hometown associations where migrant men occupied a privileged place and improved their gender status.

The more recent and rich ethnographic literature extends gender as a constitutive concept within migration theories beyond the realm of family and household to the market, civil society, and state institutions. The theoretical claims and empirical evidence previously described lays a strong foundation and expectation for gender to be a key organizing lens in any study of migration. We turn now to observe whether this qualitative heritage has an impact on mainstream sociology studies of migration, as it is published in leading sociology journals. We ask the following question: How widespread is the development of a migration framework that treats gender as a “constitutive element”? In the next section, we conduct a systematic appraisal of recent migration studies published in key sociological journals. Our review focuses on three flagship journals and one specialty journal in demography. A content analysis of these peer-reviewed sociology journals reveals the extent to which scholars hold each other accountable for having gender as a central component in their studies.

HOW GENDERED ARE MIGRATION STUDIES IN SOCIOLOGY JOURNALS?

This analysis asks three questions about the scholarship published in the 1993–2003 period. First, what is the prevalence of manuscripts about gender in four journals that are important publication outlets for sociological quantitative studies of migration? Second, how frequently does migration appear in the flagship journals? Finally, how much and to what extent does gender appear in these migration publications? The answer to the first question provides us with a baseline proxy measure of the extent to which gender is generally included in sociology scholarship. The answer to the second question provides a universe of migration studies in sociology’s flagship journals. Most importantly, however, is the answer to the third question. It is the central concern of this paper.

Based on the literature review above, we begin with two key expectations. In light of special volumes that appeared as journal issues and emphasized gender in migration studies since the late 1970s, we expect that no study would

fail to describe the sex composition of its sample. We also expect that a considerable proportion of recent migration studies would treat gender as a key organizing principle in its analysis. However, because prior migration studies do not universally treat gender as a salient feature, and if they do, gender appears in different ways in different studies, *a priori* it is difficult to predict exactly how many migration studies contain gendered content.

Our data represent all published articles that appeared in the *American Journal of Sociology* (AJS), *American Sociological Review* (ASR), *Social Forces*, and *Demography*. To search the articles in each of these four journals, we looked for “gender” in titles or article abstracts found in the Proquest database program. We used the same search engine to search for the terms “migrant,” “immigrant,” “migration,” and “immigration” to generate counts of migration articles in each of the four journals. We also searched *International Migration Review* (IMR) as a basis for comparison, and used the same approach, searching all titles and abstracts of published manuscripts. However, for IMR, we used a different search engine, JSTOR, rather than Proquest.³

We begin with a description of the migration content of the flagship sociology journals. Table 1 provides a count of the number of articles with the terms migration, immigration, migrant, or immigrant in the title or abstract. Looking down the migration column for each journal, there is evidence of a small increasing trend in the number of articles on migration across the 11-year period. This is likely related to a variety of factors, including rising levels of immigration worldwide.⁴

In *Demography*, studies of immigrant incorporation were common and covered a variety of topics, such as childbearing, residential segregation, employment, education, and earnings. Analyses of the determinants of migration focused on both expected and real moves from Mexico to the United States, but also dealt with internal migration in the United States and China. Explanatory variables included the social and economic context of origin communities, social networks, and the role of border control. Scholarship that addressed the development consequences of migration focused on remittances, availability of

³For all of the sociology, demography, and IMR journal issues, we excluded from the sample book reviews, review messages, commentaries, rejoinders, conference reports, introductions/conclusions to special issues as well as reflections on migration after September 11, 2001.

⁴Worldwide increases in migration (from developing to other developing nations, or from developing to developed nations) have been noted around the world (*OECD Observer*, 2001). Moreover, even given that the United States remains among the top two largest receiving nations, most sociological research published in the United States focuses on U.S. domestic concerns (Aksartova *et al.*, 2004).

TABLE 1
TOTAL NUMBER OF ARTICLES AND NUMBER OF GENDER^a AND MIGRATION TAGGED ARTICLES IN *AJS*, *ASR*, *DEMOGRAPHY*, *SOCIAL FORCES* AND *IMR* (% OF ARTICLES WITH GENDER OR MIGRATION MENTIONED)

Year	<i>AJS</i>			<i>ASR</i>			<i>Demography</i>			<i>Social Forces</i>			<i>IMR</i> ^b	
	Total	Gender	Migration	Total	Gender	Migration	Total	Gender	Migration	Total	Gender	Migration	Total	Gender
1993	32	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	49	4 (8.2)	0 (0.0)	43	4 (9.3)	2 (4.7)	44	1 (2.3)	2 (4.6)	28	1 (3.6)
1994	38	2 (5.3)	1 (2.6)	39	26 (66.7)	1 (2.6)	33	2 (6.1)	5 (15.2)	55	33 (60.0)	2 (3.6)	32	5 (15.6)
1995	32	2 (6.3)	0 (0.0)	46 ^c	28 (60.9)	1 (2.2)	36	5 (13.9)	4 (11.11)	61	29 (47.5)	2 (3.3)	37	1 (2.7)
1996	38	4 (10.5)	0 (0.0)	54	30 (55.6)	2 (3.7)	36	16 (44.4)	6 (16.7)	52	31 (59.6)	3 (5.8)	29	2 (6.9)
1997	38	3 (7.9)	1 (2.6)	47	41 (87.2)	2 (4.3)	38	18 (47.4)	6 (15.8)	51	38 (74.5)	3 (5.9)	38	1 (2.6)
1998	35	7 (20.0)	1 (2.9)	56	35 (62.5)	4 (7.1)	31	25 (80.7)	3 (9.7)	50	38 (70.4)	3 (6.0)	34	3 (8.8)
1999	35	14 (40.0)	2 (5.9)	42	27 (64.3)	4 (9.5)	42	17 (40.5)	7 (16.7)	54	29 (53.7)	3 (5.6)	35	3 (8.6)
2000	33	16 (48.5)	0 (0.0)	42 ^d	28 (66.7)	2 (4.8)	41	17 (41.5)	4 (9.8)	49	21 (51.2)	5 (10.2)	35	0 (0)
2001	37	24 (64.9)	1 (2.7)	39	31 (79.5)	2 (5.1)	42	26 (61.9)	11 (26.2)	50	19 (38.0)	3 (6.0)	39	2 (5.1)
2002	26	16 (61.5)	1 (3.9)	39	23 (59.0)	4 (10.3)	40	22 (55.0)	3 (7.5)	42	28 (66.7)	4 (9.5)	36	2 (5.6)
2003	27	17 (63.0)	1 (3.7)	32	23 (71.9)	0 (0.0)	28	25 (89.3)	5 (17.9)	51	41 (80.4)	4 (7.8)	35	2 (5.7)
Total	371	105 (28.3)	8 (2.2)	485	296 (61.0)	22 (4.5)	410	177 (43.2)	56 (13.7)	559	308 (55.1)	34 (6.1)	378	22 (5.8)
Avg.	33.7	9.6	0.72	44.1	26.9	2	37.3	16.1	5.1	50.8	28	3.1	34.4	2

Notes: ^aWe used the Proquest database to search each journal for the term "gender" in the title or abstract of the article and did not include any book reviews.

^bWe used JSTOR to search *IMR*, not including documentation, documentation notes, book reviews, review essays, commentaries, rejoinders, or conference reports or introduction/conclusions to special issues, as well as reflections on migration after 9/11 (2002, vol. 1).

^cSeveral issues during this year had exchanges or debates. Exchanges were counted as one when there was a substantial analysis.

^dWe did not count the special, millennium issue.

welfare, and air quality. Among the four journals evaluated here, *Demography* published the highest proportion of articles about migration over the period (56 of 410 articles were about migration *see* Table 1).

In the *American Journal of Sociology* and *American Sociological Review*, most articles addressed U.S. immigrant incorporation, the causes of Mexico-U.S. or internal U.S. migration, and the social consequences of migration. *AJS* published 8 migration studies out of 371 and the *ASR* published 22 migration studies out of 485 in 1993–2003. *Social Forces* covered similar issues; it also published studies that examined the role of remittances for enhancing development, and racial prejudice and conflict resulting from immigration. Over the time period *Social Forces* published 34 migration studies out of 559.

Before considering counts in these journals, we present information about the migration prevalence of articles in *Gender and Society*. This establishes a lower bound expectation of prevalence for articles on gender and migration. To do this, we counted how many articles in this flagship sociology journal pertained to gender-addressed migration. (This table is available on request from the authors.) Given that there were unusually high and low years during the 1993–2003 period, we calculated an average based on removal of the extremes at either end. We found that, on average, 20% of the articles in *Gender and Society* covered migration, a figure close to the annual averages in 2002 and 2003. Now let us compare this standard to the gendered content of migration articles in the other journals.

To estimate an upper bound evaluative figure, we estimated the percentage of all articles published with gender in the title or abstract in the flagship sociology journals. Table 1 presents the total number of gender articles published in each of the four sociology journals as well as *IMR*. In the second-to-last row in the table, we see these counts for the entire period, and in the final row, we present the average number of published manuscripts. *AJS* published an average of 34 articles per year; with respect to the number of gender articles, it published an average of approximately 10 each year. In contrast, *ASR* and *Social Forces* published more total manuscripts and more that featured a gender dimension than *AJS*. *ASR* averaged 44 manuscripts published each year, with gender appearing in the title or abstract of an average of 27 articles, and *Social Forces* published approximately 51 manuscripts each year, with gender featured in 28 on average. Like *AJS*, *Demography* published fewer articles and fewer gendered pieces. *Demography* published on average approximately 37 articles each year, and of these, 16 featured gender in their title and/or abstract. Note that *IMR* published the fewest articles on gender, averaging only two each year.

Looking down and across the rows of Table 1, we also see that in three of the five journals (*ASR*, *Demography*, and *Social Forces*), more than half of the articles featured the term “gender” in most years between 1993 and 2003. In fact, in many years, the proportion was above 60%. The high level of gender prevalence in these three journals contrasts with much lower levels in *AJS* and *IMR*. In fact, only in three years did *AJS* publish more than half of its articles on gender, and the proportion of *IMR* articles with gender in the title or abstract never exceeded 16% in any year, and it was significantly less in most years.

The preceding analysis suggests a possible upper bound of expectations about the gender content of migration studies. In the mainstream sociology literature, insofar as the term “gender” in the title or abstract indicates gender content, gender is a highly prevalent conceptual category or key element in all four of sociology’s flagship journals.⁵ For all four journals and in most years, gender is represented in 40% or more of the published articles. Thus, we have roughly estimated a lower bound of 20% and an upper bound of 40% gender content in migration articles.

The next step in our analysis describes the gendered context of migration articles in the four flagship sociology journals.⁶ To double-check the search engine’s reliability for finding articles about migration we also paged through each issue and found that we generated exactly the same number of migration articles for each year.^{7,8} We then read each of these articles and coded their gender content in three ways. First, we noted whether the article indicated the sex composition of the sample (no indication, only men, only women, or both). We expected it would be extremely unusual to find studies since the 1990s that omit sex composition characteristics in describing their samples. Second, when the article did note the sex composition of the sample, we noted whether there was a variable for sex of individual or whether the sample was

⁵We recognize that this may be an undercount of articles about gender relations. It is very likely that there are additional studies that also include analyses that pertain to gender, but might not have used the term “gender.” Alternatively, the studies that do use the term may also not be what a critical gender scholar would identify as a gender analysis. Again, we do not assume that our approach is foolproof. The exercise was meant to generate a statistic to help us evaluate our own careful reading of the migration literature.

⁶Due to the small sample sizes in Table 1, we could not evaluate the gendered context of articles in *IMR*.

⁷A list of the articles reviewed can be obtained from the authors on request.

⁸We did not evaluate articles that were about migration, immigration, migrants, or immigrants if the articles were essentially about measurement or policies. We did not consider these to be necessarily at risk of requiring a gender lens in the analysis.

only men or only women. Third, when the study noted the sex composition of the sample, we noted if the treatment of gender went beyond the “add women and stir” approach that either controls for sex or includes only women (described by Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2003).

Going beyond the “add women and stir” approach means that published studies considered the migration process as inherently different for men and women and/or that the process was influenced by gendered interactions and practices embedded in institutions and organizations. Among quantitative studies, these included those estimating interactions between sex and any explanatory variable, those estimating separate models for men and women, or those including some measure of gendered migration context, such as proportion of the labor force that is female. Among qualitative studies, we counted them as gendered if they noted separate findings for men and women and/or if they described the context of migration in terms of gender relations or gendered institutions, even if these were not central explanations for the research question. Finally, some studies (both quantitative and qualitative) observed that migration reorganized gender relations within social institutions. If they did so, we also counted them as gendered.⁹ Finally, among these articles, we identified a subset of studies that had conceptualized gender as a central, constitutive element in explaining migration processes. We considered these studies to have passed a relatively higher standard for inclusion.

A summary of our coding results is found in Table 2. The first column provides the total number of migration articles for each journal and the second column includes a count of all studies that were coded according to our second and third criteria, that is, they controlled for sex or the analysis took a gender approach. The third and fourth columns are counts of studies that took a gender approach disaggregated by a less stringent standard of inclusion and a more stringent standard of inclusion. Each column to the right is a subset of the column to the left. Implied, but not shown, in Table 2, is the number of articles that did not indicate sex composition of the sample. For example, approximately 20% of the migration articles in three of the four journals contained no reference to the sex composition of the study's sample, despite the fact these studies were about individuals. *AJS* is the exception, although its disproportionately higher rate reflects the small number of migration manuscripts published between 1993 and 2003. This is a surprisingly high proportion of articles failing to mention the sex composition of the sample.

⁹We devised this coded scheme as generously as possible to be inclusive of gender articles.

TABLE 2
TOTAL NUMBER OF ARTICLES, 1993–2003 (PERCENT OF TOTAL NUMBER OF MIGRATION ARTICLES)

	# Migration Articles	Articles Controlling for Sex OR With Gender Content	Articles with Gender Content	
			Less Stringent Standard	More Stringent Standard
<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>	8	4 (50)	4 (50)	1 (13)
<i>American Sociological Review</i>	22	16 (77)	10 (46)	8 (36)
<i>Demography</i>	56	46 (82)	19 (34)	11 (20)
<i>Social Forces</i>	34	26 (77)	12 (35)	7 (21)
Total	120	93 (78)	45 (38)	27 (23)

When the sex composition was indicated, few studies were of either men or women migrants only (data not shown). Instead, at least half of the studies include observations of both men and women migrants. Based on the third coding scheme of gender inclusion, when studies described the migration process as inherently different for men and women and/or indicated that the process was influenced by gendered interactions and practices embedded in institutions and organizations, we found that the prevalence of gender and migration articles ranges from a high of 50% (4 of 8 articles in *AJS*), to 45% (10 of 22 articles in *ASR*), to 35% (12 of 34 articles in *Social Forces*), and 34% (19 of 56 articles in *Demography*).¹⁰

In the last column of Table 2, we list only those studies that incorporated gender as a central element in migration. To determine which studies met this criterion, we re-read each article and determined that studies incorporated gender as a central element when: 1) the introduction and background text included discussions of gender relations; 2) the analysis conceptualized key measures as gendered; and 3) the conclusions discussed gender as a central element of the key results. This became our most stringent standard for gender content. Thus, in the far right column of Table 2, we see that our count of gender *and* migration studies is reduced by 44% to 27 articles (1 in *AJS*, 8 in *ASR*, 11 in *Demography*, and 7 in *Social Forces*). This count represents 23% of

¹⁰Some caution should be used when interpreting these findings. In fact, *Social Forces* and *Demography* both publish many more articles about migration and immigration than does either *AJS* or *ASR*. Thus, we find that when we examine gender content using our generous coding scheme *Demography* averages almost two articles per year that might be classified as a gender and migration article. *Social Forces* publishes one article per year with gender and migration content.

migration articles and 60% of the migration articles with gender content. Interestingly, articles about migration in *ASR* are more likely to theorize and observe gender as a central organizing principle than are articles in any other journal.

On the whole, the preceding statistics show that 1) at least 20 percent of the migration studies in these four journals still do not report the sex composition of the study's sample; and 2) only 23% of the published articles on migration appearing in sociological journals treat gender as a "key constitutive" factor in the migration process. We began this analysis with two key expectations, yet the evidence supports neither of them. To our surprise, substantial proportions of recent migration studies still do not include information on the sex composition of sample respondents or consider migration as a gendered process. On the whole, these findings suggest that substantial obstacles remain when publishing studies on gender and migration in refereed journals in the discipline. To gain some insight on this result, we now turn to a more detailed analysis of the 27 studies published in the mainstream sociology journals. These are the articles identified in Table 2 of the preceding analysis.

A Reappraisal of Gender and Migration Studies in Sociology Journals

The 27 studies identified in the preceding analysis range dramatically across the spectrum of studies about migration or gender. In this section we briefly review and appraise the insights to be gained from these studies.¹¹ We begin with five studies that examine the gendered causes of migration, and describe the studies that examine how the consequences of migration for origin communities must be understood in terms of gender relations. Next we turn to studies that examine immigrant assimilation in the United States, and finally, we examine how migration affects other outcomes for destination communities, such as income inequality, employment inequalities, market relations, and civil society.

We begin with a series of quantitative studies that rely on data from the Mexican Migration Project (MMP), which now has more data on women than in the past.¹² Kanaiaupuni (2000) found that traditional explanations of men's migration do not apply to women. As decisions to migrate are made within a larger context of gendered expectations among individuals, families, and

¹¹Note that we do not discuss studies of gender in the process of internal U.S. migration in this section. An example is Shauman and Xie (1996).

¹²We did not count the special, millennium issue.

institutions, human capital investments in education differentially affect migration risks for men and women, because human capital reflects other factors such as labor market structure and socialized normative guidelines for behavior. Moreover, although being married reduced the risk of migration among women, having children did not further reduce these risks, because the expectations of being a good wife, not the weight of having more children, restrict women's mobility.

In a different study using MMP data, Cerrutti and Massey (2001) reported that most Mexican migrant women still follow their male relatives, and that intergenerational mobility is sex-segregated with sons significantly influenced by fathers and daughters by mothers. Curran and Rivero-Fuentes (2003) found that the gendering of migrant networks has important consequences for understanding how cumulative causation affects sex-differentiated patterns of Mexican internal and international migration. Specifically, female networks equally facilitate men's and women's migration for internal migration, but male migrant networks facilitate men's international migration and female networks facilitate women's. Kandel and Massey (2002) report that Mexican youths' migrant aspirations were substantially influenced by cultural expectations about life course trajectories. Therefore, young men were expected to migrate as a cultural rite of passage but women were not expected to do the same. Together, these studies represent a substantial break from earlier quantitative studies, of which most suffered from a reliance on data sets that contained biased samples of men. Together with the qualitative studies reviewed in the earlier section, they deepen our understanding of Mexico-U.S. migration as a gendered process.

In all the studies that examine the causes of migration, disaggregating men's and women's lives and social contexts significantly improves our understanding of migration. The strength of these studies is their capacity to provide comparative insights that derive from demonstrably distinct gender contexts, and they therefore demonstrate the centrality of gender as a critical element influencing the migration process. Three other studies investigate how gender and migration dynamics affect social life in origin communities. In two, fertility behavior of men and women is the focus of analysis in two different contexts. Kaufman (1998) demonstrates how a system of male migration in South Africa gave rise to uneven patterns of contraceptive use across homeland communities. Lindstrom and Saucedo (2002) show how observing migration and fertility in the aggregate fails to show a conclusive relationship. However, when gender is taken into account offsetting patterns reveal themselves, and male migration does not lower fertility, but female migration does.

Studies of immigrant assimilation represent the vast majority of studies of migration in the flagship sociology journals. We organize our presentation of these studies according to their relatively important insights on gender and migration. In a seminal article, Hagan (1998) demonstrates how Mayan men and women immigrants occupy very different social locations in Houston, Texas, because of gendered access to social ties that access citizenship and employment opportunities. Four other articles of immigrant assimilation examine employment trajectories across men and women in Malaysia (Chattopadhyay, 1998), across different generations of Latina women (Myers and Cranford, 1998), across countries (Boyle *et al.*, 2001), and across countries and racial identity (Model and Ladipo, 1996). Together this scholarship suggests that women's lives are not uniform but vary dramatically across contexts, history, and social categories and identities (Glenn, 1998, 2002). Among migrants from Puerto Rico, for example, Landale and colleagues report that young women migrating from the island to the mainland are significantly more at risk of informal unions, transitions to marriage, and early pregnancy (Landale and Tolnay, 1993; Landale, 1994; Landale and Hauan, 1996; Singley and Landale, 1998). They speculate that migration disrupts gender relations and the institutions that reinforce gender relations and cultural expectations about gendered behavior.

Finally, although the least integrative of a gender analysis, studies on assimilation incorporate gender as a component by focusing on family stability and the role of social capital for minimizing the disruptive effects of migration and facilitating successful assimilation. One focuses on gender and social capital with respect to migrant assimilation. Hagan, MacMillan, and Wheaton (1996) identify how fathers and mothers provide very different affective relationships with children, which significantly affects boys and girls' educational adjustment and attainment. Sanders and Nee (1996) show how the gender composition of family members facilitates access to migrant social capital and influences immigrant entrepreneurial success. Other studies about gender in immigrant assimilation emphasize social networks that facilitate resource access. Plenty of ethnographic researches now show that these social networks, and an immigrant's access to the resources therein, are critically defined and constrained by gender relations (Hagan, 1998).

A final study about immigrant assimilation examined U.S. religious institutions as they incorporated migrants into their congregations (Ebaugh and Chafetz, 1999). Her analysis revealed a non-linear pattern of participation and institutional change explained by the shifting roles of immigrant men and women within the community. Initially, men take layperson positions to

enhance their status and compensate for their downward mobility upon arrival to the U.S., and women assume traditional roles, nurturing through food rituals and reinforcing tradition in religious ceremonies. But, as women's participation grows, their roles in congregations expand toward more nuance and radical stances and away from conservative tendencies (Ebaugh and Chafetz, 1999).

The last six articles identified in our reappraisal examine destination outcomes that are hypothesized to be influenced by migration. These articles address how migration has changed patterns of inequality or the organization of civil and market relations. We begin with a description of studies that have incorporated a gender analysis to understanding migration impacts on inequality. We then turn to two exciting and innovative works, both qualitative, that offer a gender lens on migration impacts on civil life.

Alderson and Nielson (2002) argue that a combination of gendered labor migration systems and female labor force employment in destination countries complicates generalized conclusions about the causes of income inequality trends in the OECD. Therefore, low-wage service sector migration flows that are primarily composed of women have very different impacts upon income inequality as compared with skilled manufacturing migrant labor systems (as is found with Turkish labor migration to Germany). Similarly, McCall's two studies of wage inequality (2000, 2001) also incorporate a gendered migration lens. First, she examines how migration undermines men and women's human capital returns, finding that migration undermines women's returns on education more than men's (McCall, 2000). Second, she finds that different immigration patterns spatially and across sectors differentially impact three-way interactions of gender, race, and ethnic wage disparities. In her conclusions she suggests that highly polarized high-paid service workers create demand for low-wage low-end service workers, creating gendered migration systems at the low end of the income scale (McCall, 2001). The Alderson and Nielson study and McCall studies provide both new insights on sources of inequality and new ways in which social structural conditions in a destination may fuel gendered migration systems. On the whole, these studies make clear that gendered migration relations are linked to the perpetuation of social inequality.

The preceding detailed description of gender and migration articles found in the flagship sociology journals is meant to both broaden our perspective on gender and migration scholarship and to provide pointers along the intellectual map of history for future scholars. Nonetheless, only a few of the articles are theoretically and empirically integrative of a gender and migration framework. These include the recent scholarship examining the causes of migration (Kanaiaupuni, 2000; Cerrutti and Massey, 2001; Curran and

Rivero-Fuentes, 2003), migrant social networks (Hagan, 1998), and U.S. religious institutions (Ebaugh and Chafetz, 1999). Of the quantitative studies, they rarely show how their gender analysis provides new explanations for previously unexplained or paradoxical outcomes. As a result, they have not made a forceful enough case to other quantitative migration scholars for the need to employ a gender framework. In contrast, the substantial body of qualitative migration studies, much of it authored by Hondagneu-Sotelo, has made a clear case for a gender lens.

CONCLUSIONS: FUTURE INTEGRATION OF GENDER IN MIGRATION STUDIES IN SOCIOLOGY

What we have shown is that a significant corpus of work in sociology demonstrates the centrality of gender for understanding migration cause and consequence. Much of this work resides within one methodological genre, primarily qualitative and ethnographic studies (which are discussed more extensively by Pessar and Mahler in this issue). Furthermore, our analysis of studies published in mainstream, peer-reviewed sociology journals between 1993 and 2003 suggests that only 23% of migration articles contained gender content. This statistic compares poorly with the gender content of mainstream sociology articles, which is well over 50% in most years between 1993 and 2003. It is beyond the scope of this study to completely explain this segregation, although we speculate about some possible reasons in the text below.

Although some quantitative migration scholars may have been aware of the gender and migration scholarship in sociology, it is often not acknowledged in their own work. Migration survey data may not be capable of translating gender frames and concepts into measures and models. Alternatively, recent growth in both quantitative and qualitative migration scholarship may not have created enough opportunities to iterate between types of research and findings, or to investigate puzzling contradictions between the two types of scholarship. In fact, the wealth of published qualitative studies by 2003 suggests a threshold that may – finally – result in their results seeping into quantitative scholarship. What gender and migration scholars in the qualitative tradition have shown is how gender imbues social relations at all levels, and that these gender distinctions influence how migration is experienced and observed.

Normative pleas, however, may not be enough to convince quantitative migration scholars to account for gender relations. Instead, it is now necessary for gender and migration scholars to demonstrate how their models are significant improvements on prior models. But statistical sophistication is not

the only means to make the case to quantitative migration scholars. Instead, they may also address the puzzling and paradoxical findings currently residing in the quantitative literature and offer gendered explanations with evidence to explain away the paradoxes. This type of work may be the most compelling in the future, but success must also include publication in the mainstream sociology outlets for migration scholarship.

Quantitative gender and migration scholars may significantly extend knowledge about how gender relations influence migration via creative analysis of relatively new data sources. Although much published work has shown how gender relations exist across ethnic groups, generations, origin country, destination, and migration experience, future insights will rely on extant data sources such as the Latin American Migration Project (LAMP). It collects migration data primarily from household heads, but the nations represented in LAMP vary in their gendered migration systems. Therefore, comparative studies using LAMP data will uncover the ways in which gender operates in different migration systems.

Also, gender and migration scholars may turn to other migration streams where origins and destinations may be distinctly gendered. Significant data sources now exist to observe migration from North Africa, Turkey, and the former Soviet Union; they are very different countries with quite distinct sets of gender relations and gender welfare and employment policies. Other longitudinal data about internal migration are also available from Asia, including surveys from China, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, South Africa, and Thailand. Given gender variations in legal (divorce), policy (welfare), employment, and demographic (age and sex composition) contexts, these might prove to be valuable comparative sites for uncovering differences in the mobility of women versus men. Finally, future research questions will demand new data collection efforts that must marry quantitative and qualitative methodologies and permit prospective study designs to follow migrants over time and better understand the gendered consequences of migration in origin and destination communities. And new substantive areas should be tackled, including the processes of civic and political participation in origin and destination communities.

The intellectual history we have mapped and the suggestions offered for the future portend important new scholarship for migration studies that will include gender as a central and constitutive element. We are hopeful that in the next 11 years, migration studies in sociology will be less gender segregated than the last 11 years. We expect that significant findings by gender and migration ethnographic scholars will be more completely incorporated into quantitative migration studies. Likewise, we expect that quantitative gender and migration

scholars will acknowledge and engage with their new audience and explore the nuances of paradoxical or unexplained findings in prior studies. The final result, we hope, will be a more thorough and integrative gender framework for migration scholarship during the 21st century.

REFERENCES

- Aksartova, S. *et al.*
 2004 *Only in My Back Yard: International Sociology in the United States*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Alderson, A. S., and F. Nielson
 2002 "Globalization and the Great U-Turn: Income Inequality Trends in 16 OECD Countries." *American Journal of Sociology* 107(5):1244–1299.
- Boyd, M.
 1989 "Family and Personal Networks in International Migration: Recent Developments and New Agendas." *International Migration Review* (Silver Jubilee Issue) 23:638–671.
-
- 1984 "At a Disadvantage: The Occupational Attainments of Foreign-Born Women in Canada." *International Migration Review* 18(4):1091–1119.
-
- 1976 "Occupations of Female Immigrants and North American Immigration Statistics." *International Migration Review* 10:73–80.
-
- 1975 "The Status of Immigrant Women in Canada." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 12:406–416.
- Boyle, P. J., and K. Halfacree
 1999 *Migration and Gender in the Developed World*. New York: Routledge.
- Boyle, P. J., T. J. Cooke, K. Halfacree, and D. Smith
 2001 "A Cross-National Comparison of the Impact of Family Migration on Women's Employment Status." *Demography* 38(2):201–213.
- Bujis, G.
 1993 "Gender and Immigrants." In *Migrant Women Crossing Boundaries and Changing Identities*. Ed. G. Bujis. Oxford, Providence RI: Berg. Pp. 179–194.
- Cerrutti, M., and D. S. Massey
 2001 "On the Auspices of Female Migration From Mexico to the United States." *Demography* 38(2):187–200.
- Chant, S.
 1992a *Gender and Migration in Developing Countries*. London: Belhaven Press.
-
- 1992b "Conclusion: Towards a Framework for the Analysis of Gender-Selective Migration." In *Gender and Migration in Developing Countries*. Ed. S. Chant. New York: Belhaven Press. Pp. 197–206.
- Chant, S., and S. A. Radcliffe
 1992 "Migration and Development: The Importance of Gender." In *Gender and Migration in Developing Countries*. Ed. S. Chant. New York: Belhaven Press. Pp. 1–29.

- Chattopadhyay, A.
1998 "Gender, Migration, and Career Trajectories in Malaysia." *Demography* 35(3):335–344.
- Constable, N.
1997 *Maid to Order in Hong Kong: Stories of Filipina Workers*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.
- Curran, S., and E. Rivero-Fuentes
2003 "Engendering Migrant Networks: The Case of Mexican Migration." *Demography* 40(2):289–307.
- Curran, S., and A. C. Saguy
2001 "Migration and Cultural Change: A Role for Gender and Social Networks." *Journal of International Women's Studies* 2(3):54–77.
- Donato, K. M.
1993 "Current Trends and Patterns in Female Migration: Evidence from Mexico." *International Migration Review* 27(4):748–771.
- Donato, K. M., and S. M. Kanaiaupuni
1999 "Women's Status and Demographic Change: The Case of Mexico-U.S. Migration." In *Women, Poverty, and Demographic Change*. Ed. B. Garcia and K. Mason. Geneva: International Union for the Scientific Study in Population. Pp. 217–242.
- Dumon, W. A.
1981 "The Situation of Migrant Women." *International Migrations* 19:190–209.
- Ebaugh, H. R., and J. S. Chafetz
1999 "Agents for Cultural Reproduction and Structural Change: The Ironic Role of Women in Immigrant Religious Institutions." *Social Forces* 78(2):585–612.
- Espiritu, Y. L.
2003 *Home Bound: Filipino American Lives across Cultures, Communities, and Countries*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
-
- 1999 "Gender and Labor in Asian Immigrant Families." *American Behavioral Scientist* 42(4):628–648.
- Fernandez-Kelly, M. P.
1983 *For We Are Sold, I and My People: Women and Industry in Mexico's Frontier*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Findley, S.
1987 "An Interactive Contextual Model of Migration in Ilocos Norte." *Demography* 24(2).
- Findley, S. E., and L. Williams
1991 *Women Who Go and Women Who Stay: Reflections of Family Migration Processes in a Changing World*. Geneva: International Labor Office.
- Folbre, N.
1992 "'The Improper Arts': Sex in Classical Political Economy." *Population and Development Review* 18(1):105–121.
- Foner, N.
1986 "Sex Roles and Sensibilities: Jamaican women in New York and London." In *International Migration: The Female Experience*. Ed. R. J. Simon and C. Brettell. Totowa NJ: Rowman & Allanheld Publishers. Pp. 133–142.
- Gabaccia, D.
1994 *From the Other Side: Women, Gender, and Immigrant Life in the U.S., 1820–1990*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

-
- , ed.
1992 *Seeking Common Ground: Multidisciplinary Studies of Immigrant Women in the United States*. Westport CT: Greenwood Press.
- Gilbertson, G.
1995 "Women's Labor and Enclave Employment: The Case of Dominican and Colombian Women in New York City." *International Migration Review* 29(3):657–671.
- Glenn, E. N.
2002 *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
-
- 1998 "The Social Construction and Institutionalization of Gender and Race: An Integrative Framework." In *Revisioning Gender*. Ed. M. M. Ferree, J. Lorber, and B. Hess. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Pp. 3–43.
- Gold, S.
2003 "Israeli and Russian Jews: Gendered Perspectives on Settlement and Return Migration." In *Gender and U.S. Immigration: Contemporary Trends*. Ed. P. Hondagneu-Sotelo. Los Angeles: University of California Press. Pp. 127–147.
- Goldring, L.
2003 "Gender, Status, and the State in Transnational Spaces: The Gendering of Political Participation and Mexican Hometown Associations." In *Gender and U.S. Immigration: Contemporary Trends*. Ed. P. Hondagneu-Sotelo. Los Angeles: University of California Press. Pp. 341–358.
- Gonzalez de la Rocha, M.
1994 *The Resources of Poverty: Women and Survival in Mexican Cities*. Cambridge MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Grasmuck, S., and P. Pessar
1991 *Between Two Islands: Dominican International Migration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Greenwell, L., R. B. Valdez, and J. DaVanzo
1997 "Social Ties, Wages, and Gender in a Study of Salvadorean and Filipino Immigrants in Los Angeles." *Social Science Quarterly* 78:559–577.
- Grieco, E., and M. Boyd
1998 "Women and Migration: Incorporating Gender into International Migration Theory." Working Paper WPS 98–139. Center for the Study of Population, Florida State University.
- Hagan, J. M.
1998 "Social Networks, Gender, and Immigrant Incorporation: Resources and Constraints." *American Sociological Review* 63(1):55–67.
-
- 1994 *Deciding to Be Legal: A Maya Community in Houston*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Hagan, J. M., R. MacMillan, and B. Wheaton
1996 "New Kid in Town: Social Capital and the Life Course Effects of Family Migration on Children." *American Sociological Review* 61:368–385.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, P.
2003 *Gender and U.S. Immigration: Contemporary Trends*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

-
- 2001 *Domestica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in the Shadow of Affluence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
-
- 1999 "Introduction: Gender and Contemporary U.S. Immigration." *American Behavioral Scientist* 42(4):565–576.
-
- 1994 *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
-
- 1992 "Overcoming Patriarchal Constraints: The Reconstruction of Gender Relations among Mexican Immigrant Women and Men." *Gender and Society* 6:393–415.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, P., and C. Cranford
- 1999 "Gender and Migration." In *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*. Ed. J. S. Chafetz. New York: Kluwer. Pp. 105–126.
- Hugo, G. J.
- 1993 "Migrant Women in Developing Countries." In *Internal Migration of Women in Developing Countries*. New York: United Nations. Pp. 47–73.
- Kanaiaupuni, S. M.
- 2000 "Reframing the Migration Question: An Analysis of Men, Women, and Gender in Mexico." *Social Forces* 78(4):1311–1347.
- Kandel, W., and D. S. Massey
- 2002 "The Culture of Mexican Migration: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis." *Social Forces* 80(3):981–1004.
- Kaufman, C. E.
- 1998 "Contraceptive Use in South Africa Under Apartheid." *Demography* 35(4):421–434.
- Kibria, N.
- 1994 "Household Structure and Family Ideologies: The Dynamics of Immigrant Economic Adaptation Among Vietnamese Refugees." *Social Problems* 41(1):81–96.
- Kurien, P.
- 2003 "Gendered Ethnicity: Creating a Hindu Indian Identity in the United States." In *Gender and U.S. Immigration: Contemporary Trends*. Ed. P. Hondagneu-Sotelo. Los Angeles: University of California Press. Pp. 151–173.
- Lauby, J., and O. Stark
- 1988 "Individual Migration As a Family Strategy: Young Women in the Philippines." *Population Studies* 42(3):476–486.
- Landale, N. S.
- 1994 "Migration and the Latino Family—The Union Formation Behavior of Puerto-Rican Women." *Demography* 31(1):133–157.
- Landale, N. S., and S. M. Hauan
- 1996 "Migration and Premarital Childbearing Among Puerto Rican Women." *Demography* 33(4):429–442.
- Landale, N. S., and S. E. Tolnay
- 1993 "Generation, Ethnicity, and Marriage—Historical Patterns in the Northern United States." *Demography* 30(1):103–126.

- Lawson, V. A.
1998 "Hierarchical Households and Gendered Migration in Latin America: Feminist Extensions to Migration Research." *Progress in Human Geography* 22(1):39–53.
- Lee, S.
1996 "Issues in Research on Women, International Migration and Labor." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 5(1):5–26.
- Levitt, P.
2001 *The Transnational Villagers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lindstrom, D. P., and S. G. Saucedo
2002 "The Short-and Long-Term Effects of Us Migration Experience on Mexican Women's Fertility." *Social Forces* 80(4):1341–1368.
- Livingston, G. M.
2006 "Gender, Job Searching, and Employment Outcomes Among Mexican Immigrants." *Population Research and Policy Review*, in press.
- Livingston, G. M., and J. Kahn
2002 "The American Dream Unfulfilled: The Limited Mobility of Mexican Americans." *Social Science Quarterly* 83:1003–1012.
- McCall, L.
2001 "Sources of Racial Wage Inequality in Metropolitan Labor Markets: Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Differences." *American Sociological Review* 66(4):520–542.
-
- 2000 "Gender and the New Inequality: Explaining the College/Non-College Wage Gap." *American Sociological Review* 65(2):234–255.
- Mahler, S. J.
1995 *American Dreaming: Immigrant Life on the Margins*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Menjívar, C.
2003 "The Intersection of Work and Gender: Central American Immigrant Women and Employment in California." In *Gender and U.S. Immigration: Contemporary Trends*. Ed. P. Hondagneu-Sotelo. Los Angeles: University of California Press. Pp. 101–126.
-
- 2000 *Fragmented Ties: Salvadoran Immigrant Networks in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
-
- 1999 "The Intersection of Work and Gender: Central American Immigrant Women and Employment in California." *American Behavioral Scientist* 42(4):595–621.
- Model, S., and D. Ladipo
1996 "Context and Opportunity: Minorities in London and New York." *Social Forces* 75(2):485–510.
- Momsen, J. H.
1999 *Gender, Migration, and Domestic Service*. New York: Routledge.
- Moodie, T. D.
1994 *Going for Gold: Men, Mines, and Migration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Morawska, E.
1996 *Insecure Prosperity: Small Town Jews in Industrial America, 1890–1940*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

-
- 1986 *For Bread with Butter: The Life-Worlds of East Central Europeans in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, 1890–1940*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Morokvasic, M.
 1984 “Birds of Passage Are Also Women. . . .” *International Migration Review* 18(4):1–29.
- Myers, D., and C. J. Cranford
 1998 “Temporal Differentiation in the Occupational Mobility of Immigrant and Native-Born Latina Workers.” *American Sociological Review* 63(1):68–93.
- OECD Observer
 2001 *Rising Migration: From Public Disquiet to International Oversight*. May. <http://www.oecdobserver.org/news/fullstory.php/aid/467/Rising_migration:_from_public_disquiet_to_international_oversight_.html>.
- Pedraza, S.
 1991 “Women and Migration: The Social Consequences of Gender.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 17:303–325.
- Pessar, P.
 2003 “Engendering Migration Studies: The Case of New Immigrants in the United States.” In *Gender and U.S. Immigration: Contemporary Trends*. Ed. P. Hondagneu-Sotelo. Los Angeles: University of California Press. Pp. 20–42.
-
- 1994 “Sweatshop Workers and Domestic Ideologies: Dominican Women in New York’s Apparel Industry.” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 18(1):127–142.
-
- 1988 “The Constraints on, and Release of, Female Labor Power: Dominican Migration to the United States.” In *A Home Divided: Women and Income in the Third World*. Ed. D. Dwyer and J. Bruce. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press. Pp. 195–215.
-
- 1986 “The Role of Gender in Dominican Settlement in the United States.” In *Women and Change in Latin America*. Ed. J. Nash and H. Safa. South Hadley NJ: Bergin and Garvey. Pp. 273–294.
- Phizacklea, A.
 1983 *One Way Ticket: Migration and Female Labour*. London: Routledge.
- Repak, T. A.
 1995 *Waiting on Washington: Central American Workers in the Nation’s Capital*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Riley, N., and R. Gardner
 1993 “Migration Decisions: The Role of Gender.” In *Internal Migration of Women in Developing Countries*. New York: United Nations. Pp. 195–206.
- Roldan, M.
 1988 “Intrahousehold Patterns of Money Allocation and Women’s Subordination.” In *A Home Divided: Women and Income in the Third World*. Ed. D. Dwyer and J. Bruce. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press. Pp. 119–147.
- Sanders, J. M., and V. Nee
 1996 “Immigrant Self-Employment: The Family as Social Capital and the Value of Human Capital.” *American Sociological Review* 61(2):231–249.

- Schenk-Sandbergen, L., ed.
1995 *Women and Seasonal Labor Migration*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Shauman, K. A., and Y. Xie
1996 "Geographic Mobility of Scientists: Sex Differences and Family Constraints." *Demography* 33(4):455–468.
- Simon, R. J., and C. B. Brettell, eds.
1986 *International Migration: The Female Experience*. New York: Rowman & Allanheld.
- Singer, A., and G. Gilbertson
2003 "The Blue Passport: Gender and the Social Process of Naturalization among Dominican Immigrants in New York City." In *Gender and U.S. Immigration: Contemporary Trends*. Ed. P. Hondagneu-Sotelo. Los Angeles: University of California Press. Pp. 359–378.
- Singley, S. G., and N. S. Landale
1998 "Incorporating Origin and Process in Migration-Fertility Frameworks: The Case of Puerto Rican Women." *Social Forces* 76(4):1437–1464.
- Tienda, M., and K. Booth
1991 "Gender, Migration and Social Change." *International Sociology* 6(1):51–72.
- Tilly, L. A., and J. W. Scott
1978 *Women, Work, and the Family*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Tyner, J. A.
1999 "The Global Context of Gendered Labor Migration From the Philippines to the United States." *American Behavioral Scientist* 42(4):671–689.
- Tyree, A., and K. M. Donato
1986 "A Demographic Overview of the International Migration of Women." In *International Migration: The Female Experience*. Ed. R. J. Simon and C. B. Brettell. New Jersey: Rowman and Allanheld. Pp. 21–41.
- Tyree, A., and K. M. Donato
1985 "The Sex Composition of Legal Immigrants to the United States." *Sociology and Social Research* 69:577–585.
- Wolf, D. L.
1992 *Factory Daughters: Gender, Household Dynamics and Rural Industrialization in Java*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zhou, M.
1992 *Chinatown*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Zlotnik, H.
1995 "The South-to-North Migration of Women." *International Migration Review* 29(1):229–254.
-
- 1993 "Women As Migrants and Workers in Developing Countries." *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology* 30(1):39–62.