

Cambridge AS & A Level · Sociology 9699 · Notes

Globalisation and migration A2

Read online at pastopic.com/cambridge/sociology-9699/notes/globalisation-and-migration

Last checked 6 October 2026

Read first: [Perspectives on globalisation](#)

© 2026 Pastopic. Free for personal study. Please share the link, not the file.

What you need to know

By the end of this topic you should be able to:

1. **Explain why people migrate across borders.** Know the words **immigration**, **emigration** and **net migration**; use **push and pull factors**; describe **global labour patterns** (which kinds of workers move, from where, to where); and explain how **tourism** is linked to migration.
2. **Explain the consequences of global migration, good and bad**, for the countries people leave, the countries they go to and the migrants themselves. The syllabus names **cultural diversity**, **economic benefits**, **concerns over scarce resources** (jobs, housing, health care, schools) and **negative perceptions of migration** (hostile media coverage, prejudice, political backlash).
3. **Weigh up the debate about who benefits from migration:** rich or poor countries, employers or workers, skilled or unskilled migrants, men or women, using neoliberal, functionalist (assimilation), Marxist, feminist and transnational perspectives.

Every exam question so far has been a 35-mark essay on the consequences and the "who benefits" debate, but you need the causes too: why people move explains who gains when they arrive. The wider debate about globalisation and inequality is in *Globalisation, poverty and inequalities*, and hybrid identities are in *Globalisation and identity*.

Understand it

The words you need

- **Migration** is moving to live somewhere else, for a year or more (shorter stays count as visits). **Internal migration** happens inside one country (village to city); **global** or **international migration** crosses a border.
- **Emigration** is people leaving a country; they are **emigrants** from it. **Immigration** is people arriving; they are **immigrants** to it. The same person is an emigrant from one country and an immigrant to another.
- **Net migration** = immigration – emigration over a year. It is positive when more people arrive than leave (a **net gain**) and negative when more leave (a **net loss**).

- **Economic migrants** move mainly for work. **Refugees** flee war or persecution and are protected by the 1951 Refugee Convention; **asylum seekers** have asked for that protection and are waiting for a decision. **Irregular** (undocumented) migrants have no legal permission to be where they are.
- **Remittances** are money that migrants send home. A **diaspora** is a group living outside its homeland that keeps links with it (for example, Indians in the Gulf, the UK and the USA).
- **Return migration** is going back home; **circular migration** is moving back and forth, often on seasonal contracts.

Scale. The UN counted about 281 million international migrants in 2020, about 3.6% of the world's people. So most people never leave their country; migration matters because of where migrants are concentrated (big cities, rich countries, the Gulf) and because of the money and ideas that travel back.

Why people move: push and pull

Ravenstein's "laws of migration" (1885) and **Lee's** model (1966) explain migration as a balance:

- **Push factors** at home: poverty and unemployment, low wages, war and persecution, discrimination, natural disasters and climate change (drought, rising seas), lack of schools or health care.
- **Pull factors** abroad: jobs and higher wages, safety, political freedom, family already there, universities, better services.
- **Intervening obstacles** in between: distance, cost, visas and border controls, language. Lee added that **personal factors** (age, skills, contacts, attitude to risk) decide who actually goes.

The model is a useful checklist, but sociologists say it **describes rather than explains**: it treats migrants as individuals adding up pros and cons, and cannot say why most poor people never move, or why migrants from one village all go to the same town abroad. The explanations below look at the **structures** that channel people.

Why people move: deeper explanations

- **Dual labour markets.** **Piore** (*Birds of Passage*, 1979) argued that rich economies have two kinds of jobs: a **primary sector** of secure, well-paid careers, and a **secondary sector** of low-paid, insecure, low-status work (farm picking, cleaning, care, meat packing) that local workers avoid. Employers fill the secondary sector by recruiting abroad, so migration is driven by **demand** in rich countries as much as by poverty at home.
- **Household strategy.** The **new economics of labour migration** (**Stark**) says families, not individuals, decide. Sending one son or daughter abroad spreads risk: if the harvest fails, the remittances keep coming. This explains why migrants often send most of their pay home.
- **Networks.** **Massey** described **cumulative causation**: the first migrants from a place find jobs and housing, and each one makes it cheaper and safer for the next, so chains of migration grow from particular villages to particular cities.
- **State policy.** Governments open and close the doors: West Germany's **guest worker** (*Gastarbeiter*) schemes recruited workers from Italy, Turkey and elsewhere from 1955 to 1973; Canada brought in a **points system** favouring skills in 1967; the **EU's free movement** let Polish and other workers move to the

UK, Ireland and Sweden when the EU enlarged in 2004; the Gulf states' **kafala** (sponsorship) system ties a worker's visa to one employer. Sending states also act: the Philippines trains nurses and domestic workers for jobs abroad.

- **Global capitalism.** Marxists such as **Castles and Kosack** (1973) see migrant workers as a **reserve army of labour**, drawn in during booms and sent home or left unemployed in slumps. **Sassen** (*The Global City*, 1991) showed that global cities such as New York and London need both highly paid finance workers and a large low-paid workforce (cleaners, nannies, waiters) to serve them, and that second group is mostly migrants.
- **The migration hump.** **de Haas** found that the very poorest people rarely migrate far, because moving costs money. As a poor country develops, emigration usually **rises** at first (more people can afford it), and only falls when the country is fairly well off. So development does not simply stop migration.

Global labour patterns

Who moves, and where, follows the shape of the world economy.

Stream	Who	Typical routes
Low-wage labour, South to North	farm, construction, cleaning, care and factory workers	Mexico and Central America to the USA; North Africa and Eastern Europe to Western Europe
Low-wage labour, South to South	construction and domestic workers on fixed contracts	South Asia and East Africa to the Gulf states; within West and Southern Africa
Skilled and professional	doctors, nurses, engineers, IT staff, students	India, the Philippines, Nigeria and Ghana to the UK, USA, Canada and Australia
North to South	company managers, aid workers, retirees, "digital nomads"	Europe and North America to Asia, Africa and Latin America
Forced	refugees and trafficked people	Syria to Turkey and Germany; Afghanistan to Pakistan and Iran; trafficking routes worldwide

Two patterns stand out. First, the **feminisation of migration**: women are now about 48% of international migrants, many moving on their own for care and domestic work. **Hochschild** called this the **global care chain**: a Filipina mother cares for a family in Hong Kong while her own children are cared for by a grandmother or a poorer woman back home. Second, most refugees stay in **neighbouring developing countries**, not in rich ones.

Tourism and migration

Tourism is **temporary** movement (under a year), but it is tied to migration in several ways. Before the COVID-19 pandemic there were about 1.5 billion international tourist arrivals a year.

- **Tourism creates jobs that draw migrants**: hotel, building and service workers in Dubai, the Maldives or Thai resorts are often from Nepal, Bangladesh or Myanmar.

- **Tourists become migrants:** holidays lead to study, marriage or retirement abroad. **Lifestyle migration (Benson and O'Reilly)** is better-off people moving for a better way of life, such as British retirees in Spain or Western remote workers in Bali.
- **Tourism shapes how places are seen:** Urry's *tourist gaze* (1990) describes how tourism packages poor countries as exotic and "unspoilt", a picture that can feed later stereotypes of their migrants.
- **Exploitation:** sex tourism and the trafficking that serves it fall hardest on poor women and children.
- **Gains:** tourism brings foreign currency and jobs to places that have little else, which can reduce the push to emigrate.

Consequences: the countries people leave

Think of four things that flow between home and abroad: **money, skills and ideas, people and ties.**

- **Money.** Remittances to low- and middle-income countries were about 650 billion US dollars a year in the early 2020s, several times all official aid. In countries such as Nepal, Tajikistan and Tonga they equal a fifth or more of national income. They go straight to households for food, school fees, medicine and housing, and they keep coming when a disaster hits. Groups of migrants also fund projects at home: in Mexico's **3x1 programme**, every peso that "hometown associations" in the USA gave for a road, clinic or school was matched by three levels of government. **Doubts:** remittances are often spent on consumption and houses rather than on businesses that create jobs; families without a migrant fall behind their neighbours, so inequality inside villages can grow; and a country that depends on them suffers when rich economies slump.
- **Skills and ideas.** The **brain drain** is the loss of educated people: nurses and doctors trained at public expense in Ghana, Zimbabwe or the Philippines staff hospitals in the UK, USA and the Gulf, so the poor country pays to train workers for the rich one. **On the other side:** the chance of a job abroad encourages more people to train, and not all of them leave (**Stark's** "brain gain"); some return with skills, savings and contacts, as **Saxenian** (*The New Argonauts*, 2006) showed of Indian and Taiwanese engineers who came home from Silicon Valley and set up IT firms; and migrants send back **social remittances (Levitt, 1998)**, new ideas about schooling, women's rights, health and democracy.
- **People.** Emigration takes mainly young adults. The **dependency ratio** (children and older people for every 100 people of working age) rises, so fewer workers support more dependents and the government collects less tax. Villages can be left with grandparents and children: "left-behind children" in Moldova or the Philippines grow up with one or both parents abroad. **On the other side:** in a country with many unemployed young people, emigration eases the pressure on jobs.
- **Neighbours.** Much migration is between developing countries. When large numbers of workers arrive in a poorer receiving country (for example from Zimbabwe to South Africa), they can undercut local wages and strain local labour markets, a cost borne by poor people on both sides.
- **Ties.** Families are split for years; marriages strain; migrants who come home after a decade may no longer fit in. Marxists and dependency theorists see the whole process as the **periphery** (poor countries) subsidising the **core** (rich ones) with its trained, healthy young workers.

Consequences: the countries people go to

- **Economic benefits.** Migrants fill jobs that employers cannot fill locally, from crop picking to surgery; younger migrant workers pay taxes that support ageing populations' pensions and health care; migrants start businesses at high rates. **Dustmann and Frattini** (2014) found that migrants who came to the UK from 2000 onwards paid more in taxes than they received in benefits and services. Consumers get cheaper food, care and building work.
- **Concerns over scarce resources.** Local people worry about competition for jobs, lower wages, and pressure on housing, school places and hospitals. Most research finds the effect on average wages is small, though the lowest-paid local workers may face some competition; the pressure on services is real where many migrants arrive in one town quickly and government spending does not follow them.
- **Cultural diversity.** Migration brings new foods, music, languages, religions and ideas; big cities become **super-diverse** (**Vertovec**, 2007), with people from hundreds of countries; new **hybrid** identities form among the second generation. It can also lead to segregation and tension if groups live separate lives.
- **Negative perceptions.** Media coverage often frames migrants as a "flood" or a threat. The Glasgow Media Group's **Bad News for Refugees** (**Philo, Briant and Donald**, 2013) found British news mixed up asylum seekers, refugees and illegal migrants and linked them with crime and cost. Such coverage can create **moral panics** (**Cohen**), feed racism and hate crime, and fuel **populist** parties and votes, such as the UK's 2016 referendum to leave the EU, in which immigration was a leading issue. In recessions migrants are easy **scapegoats**.

Consequences: the migrants themselves

Gains.

- **Income:** a labourer or carer can earn several times what the same work pays at home, even after rent.
- **Safety:** for refugees, migration can be the difference between life and death.
- **Opportunity:** where status at home depends on caste, family name or connections, a fresh start can let talent count for more (**upward social mobility**). The second generation often shows it most clearly: in England, children from Indian and Chinese migrant families now go to university at higher rates than White British children. Some routes open professional careers directly, such as a Kerala-trained nurse registering in the UK or Australia, or a Bangalore software graduate promoted in Toronto on a skilled visa. Migrants also found businesses at higher rates than the native-born in the USA; the Somali money-transfer shops of Minneapolis and London began as one-person counters.
- **Freedom:** some escape rigid traditions, caste, forced marriage or religious and political repression, and build a way of life that keeps what they value from home and drops what they don't.

Costs.

- **Exploitation:** debts to recruitment agents, passports confiscated, wages withheld, 12-hour days, crowded dormitories. Under the kafala system a worker who leaves an abusive employer can lose the right to stay. The ILO estimated about 27.6 million people were in **forced labour** in 2021, many of them migrants. **Debt bondage** and **trafficking** for sex or labour are the worst forms.

- **Danger on the way:** tens of thousands have died crossing the Mediterranean, the Sahara or the US–Mexico border since 2014.
- **Poverty abroad:** night shifts, crowded shared rooms and stress wear down health, and the money is tighter than the headline wage suggests. Take a care worker in London on about £12 an hour: full time that is roughly £1,700 a month after tax, and a room in a shared house can cost £900, more than half of it. Visa and health-surcharge fees and the agent's debt come next, so what is left to send home can be small.
- **Brain waste:** a qualified teacher or doctor whose qualification is not recognised ends up cleaning or driving a taxi.
- **Discrimination and isolation:** racism, abuse, language barriers, no vote and few rights; years apart from family, and a hard return home.

The debate: who benefits?

Perspective	Who benefits	Key thinkers
Neoliberal	Everyone: a "triple win" for migrants, sending and receiving countries, through free labour markets and growth	Bhagwati; the World Bank
Functionalist (assimilation)	Everyone, once migrants adopt the host culture; tension is a temporary stage	Park; Patterson
Marxist and world systems	The capitalist class and rich core countries	Castles and Kosack; Sassen; Wallerstein
Feminist	Men more than women; rich women more than poor women	Hochschild; Ehrenreich and Hochschild; Parreñas; Anderson
Transnationalist	It depends; migrants live across two countries and gains flow both ways	Levitt; Vertovec; de Haas

Neoliberals argue that letting workers move to where they are most productive raises world output, just as free trade does. Migrants earn more, sending countries gain remittances and returning skills, and receiving countries gain workers and taxpayers. Some neoliberal economists even claim that open borders would add more to world income than any other reform, and that this growth **trickles down** to poor countries too.

Criticism: average gains hide who pays the costs, and the theory ignores power, racism and exploitation.

Functionalists stress integration. The Chicago School's **Park** (1920s) described a cycle in which newcomers meet competition and conflict, then adapt and finally **assimilate**. **Patterson's host-immigrant model** (*Dark Strangers*, 1965) saw early tension in Britain as a matter of strangers not yet knowing each other's ways, to fade as migrants adopted British norms. On this view migration benefits everyone as long as migrants integrate. **Criticism:** it puts the burden on migrants, assumes the host culture is one fixed thing, and plays down racism, which can last for generations whatever migrants do.

Marxists argue that capital gains most. **Castles and Kosack** said migrant workers form a lower layer of the working class who do the worst jobs for the least pay. Employers gain cheap, flexible workers who can be laid off or deported; the presence of migrants also keeps **local workers** from pressing for higher wages, and racism **divides** the working class so that workers blame migrants instead of employers. The **middle and upper classes** enjoy cheap nannies, cleaners, gardeners and restaurant meals (Sassen's global cities). On a world scale, the **core** takes the **periphery's** trained, healthy workers. **Criticism**: many migrants and their families clearly gain. Backlash against migration (populism, Brexit) can disrupt business, which is hardly in the capitalist class's interest. And the giant corporations Marxists usually picture rely least on low-paid migrants, since a bank or carmaker can move work offshore instead. The employers that depend most on migrants are those tied to one place, such as restaurants, hotels and public hospitals, many of them family firms or state services rather than big capital. Hiring from abroad is not free either: sponsorship licences and visa levies add costs, which suggests employers recruit migrants to fill gaps more than to boost profits.

Feminists show that migration is gendered. Women are concentrated in **care and domestic work** inside private homes, where labour laws are weakest and abuse is hidden (**Anderson**, *Doing the Dirty Work?*, 2000). **Parreñas** (*Servants of Globalization*, 2001) studied Filipina domestic workers in Rome and Los Angeles who were often college-educated but did cleaning and childcare, sending wages home while missing their own children's lives. **Ehrenreich and Hochschild** (*Global Woman*, 2002) argued that rich women's careers in the North are made possible by poor women's care work, so the gains go to well-off families. Women and girls are also most of the victims of **sex trafficking**. **But**: many women migrants gain an income of their own, independence from husbands and in-laws, and more say in family decisions; the remittances they send often pay for daughters' schooling.

Transnationalists argue that migrants do not simply leave one country for another but live **across** both, through phones, money transfers and visits (**Levitt; Vertovec**). Gains and losses flow both ways, so asking whether migration is "good" or "bad" for one country misses the point. **de Haas** sees migration as **part of** development: it neither ruins poor countries nor saves them, and its effects depend on the conditions in both places.

Four questions that decide who gains

The perspectives disagree partly because they look at different migrants. When you evaluate, sort the evidence with four questions:

1. **Which migrant?** A software engineer on a skilled visa and a farm worker on a seasonal contract live in different worlds. Skilled migrants with secure legal status gain most; unskilled, irregular and trafficked migrants gain least. The very poorest often cannot afford to migrate at all, so the people who go tend to come from somewhat better-off families (the migration hump).
2. **Where to, under what rules?** EU free movement gives workers the same rights as locals; the kafala system gives almost none. Some receiving countries enforce labour laws, offer language classes and a path to citizenship; others do not. The same move can be a success or a trap depending on the rules.
3. **Who in the family?** Men and women, migrants and those left behind, parents and children gain and lose differently.

4. **Over how long?** In the short run the costs (debts, separation, culture shock) are highest; over a lifetime and a generation, remittances, returning skills and children's education may outweigh them. Or the reverse: early wages may hide a later brain drain or a failed return.

Key facts and formulas

There is no formula list in Sociology. "Learn it" means you must remember it.

Key term	Status
Net migration = immigration – emigration; positive is a net gain, negative a net loss	Learn it
Dependency ratio = (people aged 0–14 + people aged 65 and over) ÷ people aged 15–64 × 100	Learn it
Economic migrant, refugee, asylum seeker, irregular migrant, diaspora, remittances, return and circular migration	Learn it
Causes: push and pull factors and intervening obstacles (Ravenstein 1885, Lee 1966); Piore's dual labour market (1979); Stark's household strategy; Massey's cumulative causation; de Haas's migration hump	Learn it
State policy: guest workers (West Germany 1955–1973), points systems (Canada 1967), EU free movement (enlargement 2004), kafala	Learn it
Global labour patterns: South to North, South to South, skilled professionals, North to South, forced; feminisation of migration (about 48% women); global care chain (Hochschild)	Learn it
Tourism: about 1.5 billion arrivals a year before COVID-19; lifestyle migration (Benson and O'Reilly); tourist gaze (Urry 1990)	Learn it
About 281 million international migrants in 2020 (about 3.6% of the world's people); remittances about 650 billion US dollars a year	Learn it
Sending countries: remittances, brain drain and brain gain (Stark), returnees (Saxenian), social remittances (Levitt 1998), dependency ratio, left-behind children	Learn it
Receiving countries: labour shortages, taxes (Dustmann and Frattini 2014), scarce resources, super-diversity (Vertovec 2007), negative perceptions (Philo, Briant and Donald 2013; Cohen's moral panics)	Learn it
Migrants: higher income, safety, freedom against exploitation, kafala, forced labour (about 27.6 million in 2021), brain waste, discrimination	Learn it
Perspectives: neoliberal (Bhagwati), functionalist assimilation (Park, Patterson 1965), Marxist (Castles and Kosack 1973, Sassen 1991), feminist (Hochschild, Parreñas 2001, Anderson 2000, Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2002), transnational (Levitt, Vertovec, de Haas)	Learn it
Paper 4: two essays from different sections, each 35 marks: AO1 9, AO2 11, AO3 15, so 9 + 11 + 15 = 35	Learn it

How to do it

We have tagged 12 questions for this topic (2021–2025), 10 different (two November questions were repeated across two papers). All 12 are 35-mark "Evaluate this view" essays from Paper 4, and each fits one type, so the counts add up to 12.

Question type	Questions
Evaluate a claim about what migrants themselves gain (essay)	4
Evaluate a claim about migration's effect on developing countries and poverty (essay)	4
Evaluate a claim about which countries or groups benefit most (essay)	3
Weigh positive against negative consequences for migrants and host countries (essay)	1

Paper 4 lasts 1 hour 45 minutes for two essays, so allow about 50 minutes for each, including 5 minutes to plan.

The plan for every essay.

1. **Introduction** (3–4 sentences): define global migration and the key words in the quotation (who are "migrants", "developing countries", "the rich"?), and name the perspectives on each side.
2. **Set out the view in the question** (AO1/AO2) with named perspectives, studies and real examples of migration routes, countries and jobs.
3. **Evaluate** (AO3) with the other side, paragraph by paragraph, and use the **four questions** (which migrant, where to, who in the family, over how long) to show where the view holds and where it fails.
4. **Conclusion**: answer the exact words ("rarely", "only", "most", "poorer", "more positive than negative") and say for which migrants or countries it is most and least true.

1. Evaluate a claim about what migrants themselves gain (essay) (4 questions)

Asked as: migrants from poor countries rarely gain from working in rich countries (1); entirely negative consequences for migrant groups (1); more freedom and better life chances for people in developing countries (2, one a repeat).

1. **Pin down "migrants"**. The question is about the people who move (and sometimes their families), not about whole countries. Examiners mark down answers that drift into the effects on sending or host countries without bringing them back to migrants.
2. **Make the pessimists' case through the stages of a migrant's journey**, so it reads as a story rather than a list:
 - **Before leaving**: debts to recruitment agents; trafficking networks that prey on the poorest.
 - **At work**: Castles and Kosack's lower layer of the working class; the kafala system; forced labour; brain waste.
 - **At home in the new country**: high rents and poor housing; discrimination and hostile media (Philo, Briant and Donald); loneliness.

- **Back home:** years away from children (Parreñas); a return with fewer savings than hoped, and a family that has changed.
- 3. **Make the optimists' case through what migrants can gain**, starting with what money cannot buy: safety for refugees and freedom from caste, forced marriage or repression; then the next generation's schooling; then the pay packet, from a labourer's multiplied wage to a surgeon's career and the minority who build their own firms. Frame it with the neoliberal "triple win" and the assimilation view that integration pays off.
- 4. **Sort with the four questions.** The decisive differences are skill, legal status and the destination's rules: a nurse moving to Canada and a domestic worker under kafala are both "migrants".
- 5. **Judge.** For example: "rarely" and "entirely" are too strong, since millions gain income and freedom, but the gains are uneven, and the least skilled, women in domestic work and irregular migrants often pay a heavy price.

Variants.

- **"Freedom and better life chances":** give life chances its parts (income, health, education, safety) and freedom its own section (escape from caste, patriarchal control, persecution); feminists both support (independence) and challenge (trafficking, hidden domestic work) the claim.
- **"Rarely gain any benefit":** the word "any" is easy to disprove with one group (skilled professionals, or families living on remittances); spend most of your evaluation on how big and how widely shared the gains are.

2. Evaluate a claim about migration's effect on developing countries and poverty (essay) (4 questions)

Asked as: global migration makes developing countries poorer (2, one a repeat); only negative consequences for developing countries (1); global migration is creating more poverty (1).

1. **Define the poverty or harm** the question means: poorer countries as a whole, poorer households, or more people in poverty anywhere (including migrants and low-paid workers in rich countries)?
2. **Use the four flows** (money, skills and ideas, people, ties) as your paragraph plan. For each flow, give the loss and then the gain:
 - **Money:** remittances and diaspora projects (3x1) against spending on consumption, dependence and inequality between households.
 - **Skills and ideas:** brain drain of doctors and nurses against brain gain, returnees (Saxenian) and social remittances (Levitt).
 - **People:** the rising dependency ratio and left-behind children against eased unemployment.
 - **Ties:** split families and hard returns against transnational links and investment.
3. **Add the theory:** Marxist and world systems writers see the periphery subsidising the core; neoliberals see a triple win; de Haas sees migration as part of development, not its cause or cure.
4. **For "creating more poverty",** also cover rich countries: migrants trapped in low pay, and the Marxist claim that migrant labour keeps local wages down, against evidence that wage effects are small and that migrants mostly take jobs locals avoid (Piore).

5. **Judge.** For example: migration does not make developing countries poorer overall (remittances alone outweigh aid), but it can deepen some losses, such as skilled health workers, and the gains go unevenly to households with a migrant.

Variants.

- **"Only negative":** one solid benefit (remittances in Nepal or Mexico, returnee entrepreneurs) disproves "only"; go on to weigh how large the benefits are against the brain drain.
- **Different kinds of migration:** examiners praise answers that separate skilled from unskilled, temporary from permanent, and South–North from South–South movement, since each affects poverty differently.

3. Evaluate a claim about which countries or groups benefit most (essay) (3 questions)

Asked as: only rich countries benefit (1); only rich people benefit (1); poor people in developing countries benefit most (1).

1. **List the possible winners** first, so the comparison is clear: rich countries; employers and the capitalist class; middle-class households using cheap services; consumers; skilled migrants; unskilled migrants; families receiving remittances; sending countries; poor non-migrants left behind; men and women.
2. **Make the case for the named group** with the right theory: Marxist and world systems for rich countries and rich people (Castles and Kosack, Sassen, the core draining the periphery); neoliberal and transnational ideas for poor people (remittances, wages, freedom).
3. **Show other groups gaining too**, which is the core of your evaluation:
 - **Poor people:** migrants' higher earnings; families living on remittances; children's schooling.
 - **Sending countries:** brain gain, returnees, diaspora investment.
 - **Ordinary people in rich countries:** young taxpaying workers for ageing populations; cultural diversity; filled vacancies in health and care.
 - **People moving the other way:** managers, aid workers and lifestyle migrants from rich countries who live well in poorer ones.
4. **Question the Marxist case:** populist backlash disrupts business; the employers most reliant on migrants (restaurants, hotels, public hospitals) are tied to one place and are seldom big capital; and sponsorship costs cut what employers save.
5. **Use feminist and class differences:** men may gain more than women; among migrants, those from better-off backgrounds gain most, which challenges "poor people benefit most" (the migration hump).
6. **Judge.** For example: rich countries and employers gain reliably, but migrants and their families often gain too; the people who gain least are the poorest, who cannot afford to move, and the least protected migrants.

4. Weigh positive against negative consequences for migrants and host countries (essay) (1 question)

Asked as: global migration has more positive than negative consequences for both migrants and host countries (1).

1. **Cover both groups** named in the question: examiners rewarded answers balanced between migrants and host countries.
2. **Cover several kinds of consequence:** economic (jobs, taxes, wages), social (services, scarce resources, integration), cultural (diversity, hybridity, tension) and political (populism, negative perceptions), and where you can environmental (crowded cities).
3. **For host countries:** labour shortages filled, younger taxpayers, Dustmann and Frattini, super-diversity, against scarce resources, negative perceptions and moral panics, and populist politics.
4. **For migrants:** use the gains and costs from type 1.
5. **Weigh** rather than count: say which consequences are largest and longest-lasting, and for whom.
6. **Judge.** "More positive than negative" is a balance question, so your conclusion must say which way the balance tips and why.

Worked examples

Each example is a new 35-mark essay. The marks are given the way the levels mark scheme works: by assessment objective and level, not by points. In the exam, write each bullet as a full paragraph.

Example 1

'Remittances are the main benefit of global migration for developing countries.' Evaluate this view. [35]

Introduction. Remittances are money that migrants send home. Neoliberals and the World Bank see them as migration's biggest gift to poor countries; others point to skills, ideas and investment, or argue that migration's costs outweigh any money sent.

For the view (AO1/AO2).

- **Size:** about 650 billion US dollars a year reach low- and middle-income countries, several times all aid, and a fifth or more of national income in Nepal and Tajikistan.
- **Reach:** the money goes straight to households for food, schooling and medicine, without passing through governments; it supports the household strategy Stark describes.
- **Resilience:** it keeps coming after floods or harvest failures, when other income stops.

Against the view (AO3).

- **Other benefits may matter more in the long run:** returnee engineers building India's IT industry (Saxenian); social remittances of ideas about girls' schooling and health (Levitt); diaspora projects such as Mexico's 3x1 programme.
- **Limits of remittances:** spent on consumption and houses more than on job-creating businesses; widen gaps between households with and without a migrant; fall when rich economies slump.
- **A benefit bought at a cost:** Marxists and world systems writers argue that the money is a small return on the trained, healthy young workers the periphery loses (the brain drain, a rising dependency ratio); feminists add that it is often earned by women in hidden domestic work (Parreñas).

Conclusion. Remittances are the largest and most widely shared benefit in money terms, but whether they are the "main" benefit depends on the time scale: over a generation, returning skills and ideas may do more for development, and for some countries the brain drain outweighs both.

How it would be marked. Accurate knowledge of remittances, brain gain and social remittances with named studies and figures (AO1 7–9), consistently tied to "main benefit" and to developing countries (AO2 10–11), and a sustained comparison of different benefits and their costs leading to a reasoned verdict (AO3 12–15).

Example 2

'Receiving countries gain more from global migration than migrants do.' Evaluate this view. [35]

Introduction. Receiving countries are the countries migrants move to. The view fits Marxist and world systems theory; neoliberal and transnational perspectives see gains for both sides, and the evidence differs sharply by type of migrant.

For the view (AO1/AO2).

- **Cheap, flexible labour:** Piore's secondary sector and Sassen's global cities show rich economies built on migrants doing low-paid work; employers and middle-class households gain most (Castles and Kosack).
- **Public finances:** young migrant workers pay taxes for ageing populations (Dustmann and Frattini).
- **Migrants' costs:** kafala, forced labour, brain waste and discrimination leave many migrants with little to show.

Against the view (AO3).

- **Migrants' gains:** wages several times higher, safety for refugees, careers for skilled professionals, freedom from restrictive traditions.
- **Receiving countries' costs:** pressure on housing and services in fast-growing areas, social tension, negative perceptions and populism that divide societies.
- **Sorting the evidence:** skilled migrants with secure status may gain more than the country does; irregular and trafficked migrants gain far less (the four questions).

Conclusion. Receiving countries gain reliably and at little risk, while migrants' gains are larger for some but far less certain; the view is most true for the least protected migrants and least true for skilled ones.

How it would be marked. Both sides of the comparison explained with theory and examples (AO1 7–9), applied throughout to "more than" (AO2 10–11), and a sustained weighing that distinguishes between types of migrant (AO3 12–15).

Example 3

'Women gain little from global migration.' Evaluate this view. [35]

This is the hardest kind: the question names one group, so every paragraph must be about women, while still bringing in theory and contrasting views.

Introduction. Women are now nearly half of the world's international migrants. Feminist sociologists stress how migration exploits women; neoliberal and transnational writers, and some feminists, point to the independence and income it brings.

For the view (AO1/AO2).

- **Hidden work:** domestic and care jobs inside homes, where labour laws are weakest (Anderson); Filipina graduates working as maids (Parreñas).
- **Global care chains:** rich women's careers rest on poor women's care, while migrant mothers miss their own children's lives (Hochschild; Ehrenreich and Hochschild).
- **Trafficking:** women and girls are most of the victims of sex trafficking, often linked to sex tourism.

Against the view (AO3).

- **Income and independence:** a wage of their own, more say in family decisions, escape from controlling in-laws or forced marriage.
- **Feeding back home:** remittances from women often pay for daughters' schooling; social remittances carry ideas about women's rights (Levitt).
- **Which women?** Women doctors, nurses and engineers on skilled visas gain much more than domestic workers; the destination's rules matter.
- **A Marxist feminist view:** the problem is low-paid capitalist work as much as gender, since migrant men also face exploitation.

Conclusion. "Little" overstates the case: many women gain income and freedom, but the gains are often paid for with hidden exploitation and family separation, and depend heavily on skill and on the destination's rules.

How it would be marked. Feminist studies and contrasting perspectives explained in detail (AO1 7–9), every point applied to women (AO2 10–11), and an evaluation that separates groups of women and weighs gains against costs (AO3 12–15).

Common mistakes

- **Drifting away from the group in the question.** A question about migrants needs the effects on migrants; examiners report answers that describe consequences in general without saying whether migrants themselves gained. Check each paragraph names the group the question is about.
- **A list with no sociology.** Examiners see answers that list consequences of migration with no concepts, theories or studies. Each point needs a perspective (Marxist, neoliberal, feminist, functionalist) or a named study behind it.
- **Only a few simple points.** Weak answers say little more than "migrants earn more money". Strong answers cover economic, social, cultural and political consequences, and different kinds of migration.
- **Missing the key word.** In "only rich people benefit", describing migrants' experiences is not enough; you must ask whether it is **only** the rich. In "creating more poverty", every paragraph must link back to poverty.
- **One-sided essays.** Many middle-mark answers support the view and add a short paragraph of counter-arguments at the end. AO3 is worth 15 of the 35 marks: evaluate throughout.

- **Assertions instead of evidence.** "Migrants take jobs" or "migrants are all exploited" with no support stays in the low levels. Use real routes, countries, programmes and research.
- **Treating all migrants as the same.** A refugee, a seasonal farm worker and a surgeon are all migrants; separating them is one of the best ways to add depth.
- **Mixing up the countries.** Keep sending (origin) and receiving (host) countries apart, and get net migration's sign right: more people leaving than arriving is a **negative** figure.

How to get the marks

- **"Evaluate this view" (35 marks):** one long essay, marked by levels for each assessment objective.
- **AO1 knowledge and understanding (9):** the top level (7–9) needs a range of detailed points with good use of concepts and theory or research. Use terms such as remittances, brain drain, dependency ratio, reserve army of labour, global care chain, assimilation and moral panic, and name thinkers.
- **AO2 interpretation and application (11):** the top level (10–11) needs material that is accurate and **consistently applied to the question**. Keep using its words, and apply real examples: Filipino care workers, South Asian workers in the Gulf, Mexican migrants in the USA, Ghanaian nurses in the UK.
- **AO3 analysis and evaluation (15):** the top level (12–15) needs evaluation that is **explicit, detailed and sustained**, with contrasting views showing how complex the issue is. A brief outline of the other side stays in the 4–7 band; explicit evaluation that is not kept up reaches 8–11.
- **Avoid a simple one-word verdict.** The best answers reach a conclusion that says for whom and under what conditions the view holds.
- **Answer two questions from different sections** (Globalisation, Media, Religion); the paper is out of $2 \times 35 = 70$. Number each answer clearly.
- **Sociological material** for this topic: Ravenstein, Lee, Piore, Stark, Massey, de Haas, Castles and Kosack, Sassen, Wallerstein, Hochschild, Ehrenreich and Hochschild, Parreñas, Anderson, Benson and O'Reilly, Urry, Saxenian, Levitt, Vertovec, Dustmann and Frattini, Philo, Briant and Donald, Cohen, Park, Patterson and Bhagwati.

Quick check

1. In one year a country has 650,000 immigrants and 420,000 emigrants. Calculate its net migration and say whether it is a net gain or a net loss.
2. A developing country has 3.0 million people aged 0–14, 0.6 million aged 65 and over and 5.4 million aged 15–64. Calculate its dependency ratio, then calculate it again if 0.6 million working-age adults emigrate. What does the change mean?
3. What is the difference between a push factor and a pull factor? Give one criticism of the push–pull model.
4. Explain the global care chain and name the sociologist who described it.
5. Give one way global migration may benefit a sending country and one way it may harm it, naming a study for each.

Answers

1. Net migration = 650,000 – 420,000 = 230,000. It is positive, so a net gain of 230,000 people.
2. Before: $\frac{3.0 + 0.6}{5.4} \times 100 = 66.7$ (1 d.p.). After: $\frac{3.6}{5.4 - 0.6} \times 100 = \frac{3.6}{4.8} \times 100 = 75$. The ratio rises from about 67 to 75 dependents per 100 people of working age, so fewer workers support more children and older people, and the government collects less tax.
3. A push factor drives people out of their home country (war, unemployment); a pull factor attracts them to a destination (jobs, safety). Criticism: it describes rather than explains, treating migrants as individuals weighing pros and cons and ignoring structures such as employers' demand for labour (Piore), networks (Massey) and state rules.
4. Women from poorer countries migrate to care for richer families' children or elderly relatives, while their own children are cared for by relatives or poorer women at home, so care moves up the chain from poor to rich. Hochschild.
5. Benefit: social remittances of new ideas (Levitt) or returnees who start firms (Saxenian). Harm: the brain drain of trained health workers, which world systems theory sees as the periphery subsidising the core, or a rising dependency ratio.

Past questions to try

- **9699/42/O/N/23 Q2**: essay on whether global migration has entirely negative consequences for migrant groups.
- **9699/42/M/J/22 Q2**: essay weighing positive against negative consequences for migrants and host countries.
- **9699/42/O/N/22 Q2**: essay on whether global migration is creating more poverty.
- **9699/43/O/N/21 Q2**: essay on whether migration has given people in developing countries more freedom and better life chances.