



LUND UNIVERSITY

“On the Move: Changing Mechanism of Mexico-U.S. Migration,” (author Garip, publisher Turner and Francis)

Hemmaty, Mona

Published in:
Ethnic and Racial Studies

2017

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Hemmaty, M. (2017). “On the Move: Changing Mechanism of Mexico-U.S. Migration,” (author Garip, publisher Turner and Francis). *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40(8), 1368-1369.

Total number of authors:

1

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00



On the move: changing mechanism of Mexico-U.S. migration

Mona Hemmaty

To cite this article: Mona Hemmaty (2017) On the move: changing mechanism of Mexico-U.S. migration, Ethnic and Racial Studies, 40:8, 1368-1369, DOI: [10.1080/01419870.2017.1287929](https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1287929)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1287929>



Published online: 07 Feb 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 147



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

On the move: changing mechanism of Mexico-U.S. migration, by Filiz Garip, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2016, xvi+294 pp., £32.95 (hardcover), ISBN: 9780691161068

The book *On the Move: Changing Mechanism of Mexico-U.S. Migration* by Filiz Garip charts migration from Mexico to the US during 1965–2010 in order to understand how and why it has changed over time with regards to origin, destination and settlement outcomes. Perhaps most importantly, it sets out to explain who the US-bound Mexican migrants are; their multiple reasons to migrate, aspirations, the hopes they carry and how these unfold in interaction with realities in both Mexico and the US. The study draws from a large-scale survey data set called the Mexican Migration Project boiled down to a sample of 19,243 first-time Mexican migrants during the period of 1965–2010. Survey data are matched with fieldwork in Jalisco during 2011 and 2012 resulting in 139 interviews with migrants and non-migrants. Before the familiar mission of studying Mexican migration, Garip uses an unconventional analytical strategy. In contrast to the *modus operandi* of testing a theory's supremacy, she carefully mixes selected bits and pieces from major points in the migration literature on the determinations of migration, to show the *conditionality* of each theoretical model, that is, for whom and when it is relevant. As such, the approach is informed by the notion of a multiplicity of migration theories advocated predominately by Douglas Massey and colleagues. The result is an idiosyncratically designed book, in which continuous reports of the logical reasoning, possible data errors and precautions against them accompany the reader.

A first principal layer of the analysis aims to empirically re-discover who the US-bound Mexican migrants during the past half century are. To do so, the author uses cluster analysis as a proclaimed technique capable of showing the actual heterogeneity of Mexican migrants. The initial findings reveal four clusters of Mexican migrants with changing patterns over the course of time: *circular migrants*, *crisis migrants*, *family migrants* and *urban migrants*. By turning to the when and why-questions, each cluster is thoroughly analysed in separate chapters of the book. Firstly, Garip pays specific attention to how each group responds differently to particular structural constraints and opportunities both in Mexico and the US. In this part of the inquiry she finds that a particular logic of migration for each cluster resonates with a particular theoretical model in migration theory. Additionally, the author applies a typology of network effects across the cases to explain the nitty-gritty of the clusters on relational levels. In doing so, the results uncover how different structural conditions generate each cluster's prevalence, without losing track of micro-level understandings of the motivations, actions, constraints and opportunities of the migrants. All together, the book offers key insights into mechanisms that drive Mexican migration and how these change in response to economic and demographical trends, cultural norms and societal expectations. In the case of the latter, Garip zooms very elegantly in on gender roles in a separate part of the analysis.


A major strength of the book, besides the transparent theorizing already mentioned, is its sophisticated contribution to middle-range theories within migration

research. The author must also be praised for the ambition to combine a methodologically demanding endeavour, with a commitment to challenge the implications of the same methodology for policy and in the long term, for the lives of many migrants. The publication is from this perspective also timely, as it makes brief but significant references to the political failures of curbing migration by building walls. A minor concern that can be raised is that, while Garip's claim concerning the primacy of neoclassical understandings of migrant behaviour in migration control is a perceptive one, other arguments come across as less attentive of the ways liberal democracies base policies on differentiating between categories of migrants: refugees, labour migrants, forced, voluntary, etc. When the author argues that, 'If migrants are a diverse pool, then one needs diverse migration polices to manage that pool' (177), it appears as if motivations to migrate are irrelevant in migration policy-making. Despite the focus on the specific context under study, such a generic statement might be problematic, mainly because it confronts the liberal constraint hypothesis for which migration scholars have provided considerable evidence. Another concern is the way that migration supply-factors are emphasized in the selection of primary data. Given that one of the main interests of the author engages with multiplicity, the analysis could perhaps have benefited from reckoning additional demand-side actors (e.g. employers) in the cross-cluster accounts of 'networks externalities'. Although the analysis accounts for labour recruitment as a stimulus, few – if any – actors other than smugglers are treated as endogenous to the ties, help and information that she is empirically examining through the qualitative material.

All in all, the importance of Garip's work springs from something that we all realize is an enormously difficult task, namely integrating empirical research of this nature and magnitude into the complexity of migration in terms of theories, while remaining mindful of the richness in individual migration stories. The sociologist does not only demonstrate that all this can be done, but presents at the same time a scientifically original and high-quality way of accomplishing this within migration scholarship.

Mona Hemmaty

Department of Sociology, Lund University

 mona.hemmaty@soc.lu.se

© 2017 Mona Hemmaty

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1287929>



Winning the war for democracy: the March on Washington Movement, 1941–1946, by David Lucander, Springfield, University of Illinois Press, 2014, xi + 320 pp., \$60 (hardback), ISBN 978-0-252-03862-4

In his book, *Winning the War for Democracy*, David Lucander could be accused of reading history backwards. In his examination of the March on Washington