A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF REMITTANCES AS A NEOLIBERAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY:
THE BURDEN OF DEVELOPMENT ON AN EXPLOITABLE MIGRANT WORKFORCE

by

Alison Stanley, BSocSc, University of Ottawa, 2011

A Major Research Paper
presented to Ryerson University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in the Program of
Immigration and Settlement Studies

Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2014

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION FOR ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF A MAJOR RESEARCH PAPER (MRP)

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this Major Research Paper. This is a true copy of the MRP, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I authorize Ryerson University to lend this MRP to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I further authorize Ryerson University to reproduce this MRP by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I understand that my MRP may be made electronically available to the public.

Alison Stanley

A Critical Examination of Remittances as a Neoliberal Development Strategy:
The Burden of Development on an Exploitable Migrant Workforce

Alison Stanley
Master of Arts 2014
Immigration and Settlement Studies
Ryerson University

ABSTRACT

In recent years, the migration and development framework has shifted to a focus on the role of diasporas and migrant remittances in homeland development. Using criticality and particularly political economy as a methodology, this research paper sheds light on how the so-called migration-development nexus is embedded within a context of unequal neoliberal economic globalization. The research paper demonstrates that current approaches are a resurgence of modernization theories of development, which ignore the structural and historic conditions within which international migration from the Global South to the Global North is embedded. The research paper puts forward that the current focus on remittances as a source of development places the burden of a country's development onto an exploitable migrant workforce.

Key words: development; migration; neoliberalism; remittances

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my MRP supervisor Professor Tariq Amin-Khan for overseeing my research project and for providing significant encouragement, support, and input. The support provided has been invaluable. I would also like to thank my second reader Professor Harald Bauder for his input and encouragement. Both professors were sources of knowledge and inspiration for me during my time at Ryerson University. I would also like to thank the other professors associated with the ISS program, my family, my friends, and my colleagues who have supported me over the past year; the support of those close to me has allowed me the opportunity to produce this major research paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION

Within a context of neoliberal globalization, approaches focussing on the role of migration in development took precedence and a new development paradigm, known as the 'migration-development nexus', emerged; this paradigm began to looks towards migration as a tool for homeland development, as opposed to earlier views of migration as a possible hindrance to development. Within this migration-development nexus, remittances are being hailed as a strong funding mechanism for development, with both international organizations and national governments turning towards these monetary flows as potential stimulators for both economic and social development. Yet, as this research paper will show, such an approach relegates the responsibility for development onto an exploitable migrant workforce.

The development of this research paper stemmed out of the following research question: Are transnational migrants agents or deterrents of long-term development in their home countries? This research paper is grounded in the recognition that theories of migration and theories of development have been developed mainly in isolation from each other, and that in-depth analyses of the underlying roots of migration and development are largely lacking in existing research. Theoretical frameworks on the role of migration in development have shifted over the years; this research paper examines the underlying conditions that have contributed to today's dominant focus on the role of migrants and their remittances in homeland development.

Given that the majority of remittances flow from the Global North to the Global South, and given that this research paper is being written in the context of graduate study at a Canadian university, the focus will remain on remittances stemming from migration from the Global South to the Global North. As such, a limitation of the paper is the unexamined issue of the impacts of remittances received through South-South migration. Focussing on South-North migration in this context will allow for a more detailed analysis, which is highly relevant given increasingly restrictive immigration policies promoted by Western governments. It is also important to note that in no way is this research paper an attempt to outline how a country should undertake its development programs; rather, this research paper is meant to simply draw attention to the implications of the current migration-development nexus. However, the main argument of the paper is that the current focus on migration and development, with remittances at the forefront, is a resurgence of modernization theories of development and migration, which ignore the structural and historical conditions that cause migration to begin with, such as uneven neoliberal globalization.

This research paper is divided into the following parts: first, I outline the methodology that will be used to develop the paper's main arguments. Critical research and modern political economy have been utilized as guiding methodologies. The paper then presents a literature review on international migration and migrant remittances, which discusses remittance statistics, remittance channels, the impacts and effects of remittances, as well as source country government remittance policies. The research paper then presents a discussion and examination of the shifting perspectives on migration and remittances, highlighting the current global enthusiasm on the power of remittances as a source of development financing. In the analysis section, the paper will highlight that the current focus on migration as a form of development places the burden of a country's development failures on the shoulders of an exploitable migrant workforce.

METHODOLOGY: CRITICALITY AND MODERN POLITICAL ECONOMY

In order to examine the research question presented, this research paper will make use of critical methodology and a political economy approach. The major areas within critical research are the Frankfurt School, Critical Race Theory, Marxism, Feminism, Disability Studies, and Queer Theory, among others, making it a very diverse field of research (Gomm, 2008, 19). As highlighted by Cannella and Lincoln, "critical perspectives are profoundly engaged with issues of race, gender, and socioeconomic levels as major shapers as well as components of historically reified structures of oppression" (2009, 55). Critical research methodology recognizes issues of power and seeks to "understand how unjust and oppressive social conditions came to be reified as historical 'givens'" (Cannella & Lincoln, 2009, 54). Critical methodologies seek to answer two major questions: who or what is helped or privileged and who or what is harmed and oppressed (Cannella & Lincoln, 2009, 54).

The purpose of critical research is to uncover the historical origins of social contracts and to understand how marginalized populations accept the status quo (Cannella & Lincoln, 2009, 55). While for many other research methodologies the goal is to simply produce knowledge, critical methodologies aim to make a difference through a focus on issues of inequities within society. As noted by Gomm, critical methodologies use the publication of research as "a way of publicizing how unfair social arrangements are, and how they might be improved" (2008, 388). Critical methodology is tasked with giving voice to the voiceless (Gomm, 2008, 388). Furthermore, the goal is to "unearth, disrupt, and transform existing ideological and/or institutional arrangements" (Mertens, 2005, 30). The purpose of critical methodology is to critique and to advocate. A common critique of critical methodology is that publications are read mostly by researchers with common beliefs and interests, thus limiting the potential for action; however, the value of critical research is its challenge to both perceived wisdom and mainstream views by pointing out how exclusion and marginalization occur, and how the mainstream liberal perspectives' preoccupation with objectivity may not account for liberalism's ideological biases.

Along with criticality, the most fitting methodology to analyze the issues of this research paper, namely the role of remittances in the migration-development nexus, is modern political economy, given its intersecting analyses between economic and social factors. Simply put, "political economy is the study of the economy from a social science perspective" (Stilwell, 2006, 8). It is a recognition that "the economic is not separable from the political" (Stilwell, 2006, 362). Furthermore, "political economy addresses real-world concerns in a way that emphasizes the connections between economic problems, social structures, and political processes" (Stilwell, 2006, 10). Political economy incorporates geography, history, social science and political science, among others (Stilwell, 2006, 4); the interdisciplinary nature of a political economy approach is its biggest strength. Utilizing a political economy approach is especially useful in studying remittances since "integrating considerations of class, gender, and ethnicity also illuminates the dynamics of capital accumulation as well as the distribution of income, wealth, and economic opportunities" (Stilwell, 2006, 353).

A political economy approach recognizes that "individuals' economic decisions affect and are affected by broader political economic forces" (Stilwell, 2006, 13). Political economy allows us to "step back from the minutiae of individual choices and short-term decisions to see the bigger picture" (Stilwell, 2006, 13). Socioeconomic inequalities are at the heart of a political economy framework (Stilwell, 2006, 342). As noted by Stilwell, "the challenge for modern political economy is threefold: to develop the critique of orthodox economics, to combine the currents flowing against the mainstream in a more coherent alternative, and to use that analysis to contribute to progressive social change" (2006, 315). A political economy framework recognizes that economic inequalities are not conducive for social and economic development on either a national or global scale. This framework recognizes that neoclassical economics have dominated analysis and policy creation to date, and as Stilwell notes "modern political economy seeks to break free of this straightjacket by directly confronting the current political economic problems and policy issues" (2006, 4). As such, this framework is highly relevant for a critical analysis of current approaches to migration and development.

A political economy framework is highly relevant to analyzing the interconnections between migration and development since "political economy allows us to critically reconstruct the links between development, migration and remittances from a historical, structural and strategic perspective" (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 192). Utilizing political economy as a research methodology will provide the analytical avenues to "reveal the underlying meaning of remittances beyond their monetary manifestation" (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 65). Using this approach, research can be centered around different areas such as capitalist restructuring, the precarity of labour markets, the increasing gap between developed and underdeveloped countries, and the structural conditions that cause migration (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 190). Furthermore, a political economy approach allows for research on migration and development to be centered around issues of underdevelopment, forced migration, and labour exploitation, instead of viewing it through traditional cost-benefit analyses (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 57). The use of political economy as the methodology of this research paper, alongside criticality, will allow for the exposure of the underlying root causes of migration, which is often ignored in current approaches to migration and development.

Political economy research involves asking questions such as: What is happening? Why is it happening? Who gains and who loses? Why does it matter? What can be changed, and who can change it? (Stilwell, 2006, 4). Through a critical analysis of existing literature, these questions will be the focus of this research paper. Given the role of political economy in critiquing dominant neoclassical approaches to migration and development, the focus on remittances as a form of development will be broken down and the root structural conditions will be examined. The purpose of this research paper is to scrutinize the structural conditions that have led to the emergence of remittances as a potential development avenue, to examine who is benefitting and who is being negatively affected, and to demonstrate that it is important to re-examine the dominant framework of the migration-development nexus. As highlighted by a political economy approach, "the future will be shaped by how we address the practical problems that dominate our concerns at this stage in the early twenty-first century" (Stilwell, 2006, 397). Stilwell highlights that the "ultimate purpose of political economy is to contribute to changing our world for the better" (2006, 397). It is the belief of this research paper that the migration-development nexus, with its focus on remittances and migration, is not sustainable and need to be challenged in order to improve the conditions faced in the Global South and to protect a vulnerable migrant workforce. It should be noted here that a longer theoretical section will be introduced further in the research paper that is both methodological and analytical.

LITERATURE REVIEW: INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION AND MIGRANT REMITTANCES

It is important to acknowledge why individuals migrate in the first place before examining the topic of remittances. Solimano notes that "international migration is a barometer that measures economic, social, and political conditions in both origin and destination countries" (2010, 24); moreover, there are both push and pull factors that contribute to a migrant's decision to move. The dominant belief as to why individuals migrate is the economic model that espouses individuals or households utilize a cost-benefit analysis given the information at their disposal, and would be expected to make the decision to migrate if the benefits outweigh the costs (Morrison, Schiff & Sjoblom, 2008). It is important to note, however, that the decision to migrate is not made in isolation; as noted by Cohen and Sirkeci, "the decision to migrate, while in the hands of the individual mover, is made in reference to and relation with many other actors and includes other people, places, processes, promises, and potential outcomes" (2011, 20). Spencer adds that explaining a decision to migrate requires an "understanding of the structural conditions in sending and destination countries that set the context in which those decisions are made" (2011, 9). This is important in the context of this research paper given that the motivations for migration and the context of the specific migrant can have a direct impact on the sending of remittances.

Remittance Statistics, Motivations, and Transfer Mechanisms

It is espoused that transnational migrants can promote development in their home countries in various ways, through a combination of remittances, the transfer of knowledge or ideas, and through diaspora-led development projects; in the current discourse on migration and development, it is the role of remittances hat dominates. Remittances are transfers of money sent by migrants to their home countries, either directly to their family members or to their communities in general. Remittances are arguably one of the most concrete and visible forms of transnationalism and as such, they have become an increasingly relevant research topic in contemporary migration studies. Furthermore, "remittance transfers are one aspect, albeit the most visible, of the growing intersection of the transnational human landscape within globalization" (Orozco, 2013, 175). As outlined by Iskander, remittances are a unique form of monetary flows as they are considered to be "economic add-ons, as integrated into mainstream economic exchanges only through the investment and consumption behaviour of migrants themselves" (2013, 160).

Given steady increases in international migration, "remittances are now nearly three times the size of official development assistance and larger than private debt and portfolio equity flows to developing countries" (World Bank, 2013, 2). Remittances exceed capital flows such as foreign direct investment in approximately one-third of developing countries (Brown, 2006, 58). In the first five years of the twenty-first century, the flow of global remittances increased by 50 percent (Koser, 2009, 416). In Canada, outward remittances grew by 73 percent between 2001 and 2005 (Unheim & Rowlands, 2012, 124). The total recorded remittances received by developing countries increased by seventeen percent between 2007 and 2008 alone, from $289 billion to $338 billion respectively (Irving, Mohaptra & Ratha, 2010, 10). According to a recent World Bank report on global remittance trends, remittance flows were expected to reach $550 billion in 2013 and over $700 billion by 2016; for developing countries this will be an amount of $414 billion in 2013 and over $540 billion by 2016 (World Bank, 2013, 1). It is important to note that official figures of remittances capture only formal remittance flows; it is expected that global remittance flows are in reality much higher, as many migrants remit through informal channels and these amounts are not recorded in official statistics.

The majority of remittances flow from two world regions: North America and Western Europe (Orozco, 2013); while "a disproportionate majority of remittances flow from the developed to the developing countries" (Brown, 2006, 60), remittance flows stemming from South-South migration are between 10 and 29 percent of total flows (Castles & Miller, 2009, 59). Given these facts, and given that this research paper is being produced in the context of graduate study at a Canadian University, this research paper will focus on remittances stemming from migration from the Global South to the Global North. Remittances to developing countries remain relatively concentrated; according to Solimano, "the top 20 recipient countries of worker remittances capture about 80 percent of total worker remittances to developing countries" (2010, 63). The main recipient countries are India, Mexico, the Philippines, and Morocco (Solimano, 2010; Castles & Miller, 2009). Remittance flows have become a major aspect of many economies in the Global South; for example, remittances have doubled the average household income in Somaliland and represent 80 percent of the income of rural households in Lesotho (Koser, 2009, 418).In Mexico remittances reached $26 billion in 2007, making them the country's largest source of foreign exchange revenue after petroleum (Fitzgerald, 2013, 130).

Research has not established a consensus as to why migrants send remittances; research shows that migrants may send remittances for altruistic reasons, out of self-interest, or a combination of both (Brown, 2006, 62). As Lucas explains, there tends to be two main reasons used to explain remittances: "those which focus on the circumstances of migration and the migrants' connection with the home setting, and those which focus on the macroeconomic conditions and policies in both the home and host countries" (2005, 152). Research studies have shown that remittances can be used for consumption or investment purposes but that the vast majority of remittances are used first for basic goods and services such as health care, food, education, and housing before they tend to be used for investment purposes (Eckstein, 2003; Kivisto, 2011: Brown, 2006); as Castaneda notes, after expenditures on basic goods and services "relatively little money is left to be saved, or spent on productive investments" (2012, e19). This caveat is important to recall in a critical discussion of the migration-development nexus, which will be discussed in further sections of this paper.

Remittances are sent through either formal channels, such as credit unions, banks, and money transfer agencies, or through informal channels, such as nonfinancial brokers, family or friends, and direct hand-to-hand provision (Yang, 2011, 132). While wire transfers and money orders through organizations such as Western Union dominate remittance channels, there is growing interest in alternative methods such as money transfer cards, debit cards, and internet payments (Orozco, 2013, 66). As Orozco highlights, "remittance trends do not emerge from a vacuum, but are shaped in part by the regulations that govern these flows and the marketplace in which they take place" (2013, 57); moreover, in regions such as Latin America and the Caribbean, the predominate remittance channels used are formal ones whereas in Africa, due to poor financial and telecommunication infrastructure, levels of informal channel use are high (Orozco, 2013, 65). In the Philippines, for example, the Philippine National Bank is the dominant player in remittance transfers, controlling 60 percent of the market (Orozco, 2013, 71).

Migrants may choose informal channels due to trust issues and cost issues; moreover, "the more costly it is to send money through a formal provider, the more likely it is that people use informal transfers" (Orozco, 2013, 65). There appears to be inconsistency in the literature on the costs associated with remitting; while Orozco shows the cost of remitting ranged from two to ten percent in 2011 (2013, 65), Brown highlights that some non-bank financial transfer agencies charge between ten and twenty percent of the transaction value (2006, 68). In a 2013 World Bank report, concerns were expressed regarding the persistently high costs of remittance transfers regardless of falling global technological costs and that many agencies are now beginning to enact additional charges on the recipients of remittance transfers (World Bank, 2013, 7). These concerns are important given that the costs of sending remittances may limit the amount that can be sent, and thus presumably, their potential for positive impacts.

The Mixed Effects of Remittances

The vast majority of research on remittances focuses on the positive impacts for migrants and their families such as the poverty reduction potential of the monetary flows and the economic benefits for the home countries. It is thought that remittances can help contribute to a country's economic growth as they "may increase investment, facilitate human capital formation, enhance total factor productivity, and may have a favourable effect on the financial system" (Abdih et al., 2012, 664). The counter-cyclical nature of remittances is often highlighted in the research; for example, during the recent financial crisis, remittance flows remained relatively stable and decreased only 5.2 percent between 2008 and 2009 whereas foreign direct investment dropped over 39.7 percent between 2008 and 2009 (Yang, 2011, 129). As Brown highlights, "remittances constitute a more stable, counter-cyclical, and countervailing resource flow to often volatile, disruptive, private capital flows" (2006, 56).

Proponents argue that it is due to the informal nature of remittances, the fact that they are provided through families, not through foreign direct investment or traditional government funding mechanisms, that they are able to reach areas in countries that are most in need and that they are channelled to areas which are otherwise ignored by traditional mechanisms (Jennings & Clarke, 2005, 689). Research supporting this argument notes poverty reduction that has been attributed to the receipt of remittances; for example, World Bank research conducted in the 1990s shows that remittances played a role in the reduction of poverty levels in Uganda by eleven percentage points, in Bangladesh by six percentage points, and in Ghana by five percentage points (Ratha, 2005, 42). Research on remittances in Haiti demonstrates that 55 percent of remittance-receiving families have no other income and the receipt of remittances exceeds the average annual income for Haitians, thus "for those with no income, these earnings are a lifeline that enables them access to basic goods and services" (Orozco, 2013, 47).

Remittances provide an alternative source of income, which offers families increased insurance against risk (Koser, 2009, 418). The process of sending a family member away for work is often used as a way to enhance family income and "in financial terms, this strategy is equivalent to risk diversification" (Solimano, 2010, 66). As noted by Orozco, "in most countries, recipient families exhibit a positive relationship between receiving remittances and financial activities: transfers increase disposable income and in turn increase savings within the household" (2013, 7). Furthermore, research highlights that "remittances contribute to asset building, both liquid and fixed... In general, remittance senders tend to consider investment options and remit for savings or investment in the household. As a result, recipients tend to have a higher ability to save, invest, and open bank accounts" (Orozco, 2013, 9).

It is posited that remittances can help contribute to a country's economic growth as they "may increase investment, facilitate human capital formation, enhance total factor productivity, and may have a favourable effect on the financial system" (Abdih et al., 2012, 664). Remittances may also have a positive impact on local economies given potential increases in demand for local goods and services (Morrison, Schiff & Sjoblom, 2008. 33). Given that remittances are monetary flows that enter a country through investments and expenditures, they can impact a country's financial system by providing revenues to banking institutions; Orozco highlights the fact that in many developing countries, banks receive a significant amount of revenue from remittances and notes that "the inflow of money not only has a positive macroeconomic effect in sustaining foreign exchange shortfalls to facilitate imports of goods and services, but also helps financial institutions operate day-to-day activities" (2013, 104). Researchers note that remittances can contribute to foreign currency reserves and can raise government revenues through sales taxes given increased consumption (Orozco, 2013, 16). Remittances can also help local infrastructure development; as put forward by Solimano, "no electrical power plant or highway will be financed directly from remittances, but local public works, education, and micro- and small enterprises are helped by this extra flow of funding from abroad" (2010, 66).

There is, however, debate on the effects remittances can have on migrants, their families, and their home countries. Discussions on the negative impacts of remittances tend to focus on the high transfer costs migrants are subject to; transfer fees can be quite high, and there is growing international concern that these fees are hindering the amount of remittances being transferred. As previously mentioned, transfer costs are inconsistent; in Canada, the average cost for remitting money is higher than in other developed countries, at an average of 11.1 percent (Bhushnan, 2013, 27). In a recent report, the World Bank has indicated that there is increasing evidence that banks and credit unions are now charging an additional service fee to recipients called a 'lifting fee' (World Bank, 2013, 7). Studies estimate that a reduction in transfer fees costs could save migrants up to $16 billion a year (Bhushan, 2013, 27), which would presumably increase the flow of remittances.

Ngoma and Ismail synthesized research on remittances and found that the positive impacts include alleviation of poverty, improvement of income distribution, compensation for economic risks, improved balance of payment for sending countries, and the funding of microenterprises, whereas negative impacts include negative economic growth, upward pressures on the local currency, high-skilled labour migration, and potential moral hazards of a weakened motivation to work (2013, 106-107). Iskander did a similar review and found that positive impacts of remittances include income assistance, insurance against shocks, and increased investments in housing and education, whereas negative effects include a limited impact on growth, positive impacts being limited to certain groups and areas, and dampened labour market participation (2013, 160). Certain authors have demonstrated that there is a lack of consistent evidence and data on remittances to truly determine their impact; as Unheim and Rowlands note, "the lack of consistent, reliable and large sample data has constrained aspects of our understanding of the micro-level determinants of remittances" (2012, 135). As Yang notes, "aggregate analyses of the relationship between remittances and economic performance at the country level are inconclusive, with some studies finding a positive relationship between remittances and economic growth and others finding no relationship or a negative relationship" (2011, 136).

If the proper financial channels are not in place in the receiving country, remittances can cause inflation and have a negative impact on the real exchange rate (Orozco, 2013, 39). Remittances may also undermine the motivation to work, fuel increased consumption in lieu of investments and savings, and increase the consumption of luxury foreign goods, which diverts currency away from local economies and can drive up local prices for goods and services (Eckstein, 2013, 20). In addition, research on remittances tends to ignore the costs of migration that individuals and families must cope with; moreover, "migrating also entails several monetary costs that are very relevant for poor immigrants: air or train tickets, shipping costs, legal costs, the costs of job search, and the opportunity cost of foregone earnings in the home country" (Solimano, 2010, 39). Despite research that examines the negative consequences of remittances and the mixed impacts on home countries, many source country governments have been incorporating remittances into official policies as a recognition of the importance of these monetary flows in their economies

Source Country Government Policies

It is important to note that source countries treat their diasporas differently; as outlined by Brinkerhoff, some source countries, such as India , Mexico and the Philippines, actively encourage the participation of diaspora groups and international migrants as a recognition of their role in social and economic development, whereas other countries such as Cuba do not participate with their diaspora populations (2008, 153). In recent years, there has been an increased emphasis placed on the role diaspora groups can play in home country development. As noted by Castles and Miller, "a core idea in current debates on migration and development is that governments and international agencies should work with diasporas. Diasporas are seen as having the potential to channel remittances, technology transfer and circulation of skills" (2009, 70). Many source country governments have begun to see remittances as positive economic inputs for their countries; moreover, many governments have begun to acknowledge the role of remittances in their own economies for the purposes of sustaining economic policies or assisting the country with balancing its debts. As a result, sending-country governments are increasingly touting their migrant populations as "heroes" (Eckstein, 2013; Martin, 2013) for their economic contributions to their countries.

As noted by Eckstein, "some governments in developing countries...have managed not to be passive bystanders to the forces behind today's world on the move. Governments in the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, and China, for example, have actively sought contracts for their labour force in Gulf states....They do so for their own institutional reasons: often to earn hard currency to repay their foreign loans" (2013, 11). Some governments have established national agencies to incorporate remittances into national development strategies (Yang, 2011, 131). Increasingly, as noted by Brinkerhoff, "home governments are soliciting remittances and offering policy incentives (e.g., dual citizenship, tax-free investment opportunities, and matching grants) and investment options (e.g., remittance-backed bonds and foreign-currency accounts) to encourage diaspora contributions" (2008, 153).

Certain countries dominate as areas of focus in existing research on government policies surrounding remittances; two of these countries will be highlighted in this research paper: Mexico and the Philippines. The Mexican government has taken an active role in fostering remittances and the involvement of its diaspora groups, given the extent of emigration from the country. In order to foster remittances, "the Mexican government has sponsored several initiatives to lower transaction costs, to channel remittances to community projects, to undertake job-creating investments, and to discourage emigrants' dissimilation" (Fitzgerald, 2013, 130). An example of an initiative undertaken by the Mexican government to encourage remittances is that "to minimize the costs of international transfers, in the late 1990s the Mexican government began to encourage the use of automated teller machines in Mexico linked to U.S. bank accounts" (Fitzgerald, 2013, 131). The Mexican government also encourages diaspora remittances through what are called hometown associations (HTAs); through the government's Three for One matching program, ever dollar remitted to the country through HTAs is matched by an additional $3 contributed through federal, state and local funds (Fitzgerald, 2013; Martin, 2013).

Hometown associations consist of a group of migrants from a town or community that remit collectively to target funds at public infrastructure projects (Brown, 2006, 64). While the exact number of HTAs is unknown, it is estimated that there are at least 3,000 Mexican HTAs, at least 1,000 Filipino HTAs, and at least 500 Ghanaian HTAs (Orozco, 2013, 87). It is estimated that Mexican HTAs sent between $5,000 and $25,000 back to their communities each year, money which is used to build schools. clinics, and to fund other infrastructure projects (Brown, 2006, 65). There is a growing level of enthusiasm surrounding the role that HTAs can play in homeland development. As advocated by Orozco, "international organizations, foundations, and governments have the potential to link their development priorities to the work of the diaspora, helping HTAs to define their goals and better operationalize their strategies" (2013, 200). As noted by Brinkerhoff, by providing advice and expertise on development policies "diaspora organizations can act as important intermediaries between traditional development actors, and diasporas and local communities" (2008, 13) by providing advice and expertise on development projects.

Stasiulus and Bakan highlight that "since 1974, with the formulation of the Philippine Labour Code, the Philippines government has vigorously pursued overseas employment as a means of alleviating chronic unemployment and balance of payment problems" (2003, 59). The country has become heavily reliant on remittances and as such, the government considers its migrants to be modern-day heroes (Matejowsky, 2012; Stasiulus & Bakan, 2003). The Philippine government has implemented a number of policies to encourage remittances, including government-run duty-free shops and in the opening of Filipino banks in major migrant destinations (Lucas, 2005, 180). Despite the fact that many source country governments have implemented policies to attempt to foster the receipt of remittances, there remains debate on whether or not these policies have been or can be successful. Orozco highlights that "there is often a lack of awareness and even neglect about actual regional engagement. Many governments have yet to adequately manage these migration flows, much less develop innovative policy solutions to leverage the migration" (2013, 55-56). Brinkerhoff furthers this notion by stating that "a lack of understanding of the nature of these contributions, how to mobilize them, and the circumstances that are most likely to yield positive results hamper policymakers' ability to maximize this expanding resource" (2008, 1).

Examining the Perspectives on Migration and Migrant Remittances

The Migration-Development Nexus

In the 1990s, a new framework on migration and development emerged dubbed the "migration-development nexus", which shifted the discourse on migration from being seen as an problem for source countries to being seen as a tool for development (Kunz, 2008, 1392). It is important to note that interest in the intersections between migration and development also existed in the 1960s and 1980s (Faist & Fauser, 2011, 1), but not to the extent that is has since the 1990s. As noted by Castles, "after years of seeing South-North migrants as a problem for national identity and social cohesion, and more recently even as a threat to national security, politicians and officials now emphasize the potential of international migration to bring about economic and social development in the countries of origin" (2009, 5); researchers and international organizations have also begun to emphasize similar attitudes and policies.

As noted by Faist and Fauser, "the current enthusiasm around migrants as agents of development reflects a paradigm that holds that migration can produce beneficial outcomes for both emigration and immigration countries" (2011, 1). The migration-development nexus has emerged around a growing emphasis on the effects of globalization and the increasing recognition of global interconnectedness; as Orozco notes, "as the reality of globalization reaches more people than ever before, the role and impact of diasporas and development are becoming increasingly critical considerations in policy and politics" (2008, 207). Moreover, "with the growing integration of foreign labour into global markets, migrants have become substantively more directly involved in economic and social activities in their countries of origin. One reason is the dynamics of globalization" (Orozco, 2013, 2).

It is important here to define what is meant by "development". The term "development" first emerged in 1949 in a speech by American president Harry Truman who referred to "undeveloped areas" (Schafer, Haslam & Beaudet, 2009). The terms used when discussing the idea of development have shifted over the years, from referring to underdeveloped areas, to the Third World, to developing countries; today, the term 'Global South' is favoured as it is "better able to incorporate the centrality of historical and contemporary patterns of wealth and power into a loosely geographically defined concept" (Schafer, Haslam & Beaudet, 2009, 9).

There is no single agreed upon definition of development; moreover, "it remains difficult to consisely define what 'development' is and how exactly to measure it" (Schafer, Haslam & Beaudet, 2009, 10). Development, specific to economic development, is noted by Orozco as "a condition by which individuals and society at large enjoy a good quality of life, are free, have opportunities for upward mobility, and are able to improve their material circumstances. Three areas that enable these conditions are health, education, and material asset accumulation" (2008, 207). The study of international development, in which this research paper is partly grounded, "aims to explain both the diversity evident in the world in relation to human well-being and the patterns that emerge when comparing people, social groups, nations, economic and politic systems, and regions of the world" (Schafer, Haslam & Beaudet, 2009, 4).The definition of "development" will be reintroduced in the theoretical analysis section of this research paper.

Research on migration and development highlights the various ways in which migration is believed to bring about development to the source country, including through the positive economic impacts of remittances, the transfer of skills and attitudes, known as social remittances, the increase in brain circulation as opposed to brain drain, temporary or circular labour migration, and through the reduced need for emigration as economic development in the source country is stimulated by remittances (Castles & Miller, 2009, 58). As highlighted by Orozco, "the relationship of migration and development is an organic one, in which the determinants of labour mobility and migrant economic engagement intersect with the factors that lead to development" (2013, 5). There is significant emphasis on the role of diaspora groups in development, which can be seen through Eckstein's comment that "immigrants have never had as great and diverse an impact in their home economies as they do now" (2013, 11).

When the migration-development nexus first emerged, the most contentious issue was that of brain drain and the fear of the emigration of a country's brightest citizens and the effects this could have on the country's development. The concern over brain drain has diminished in recent years, however, as there has been a growing emphasis on brain circulation, which reinforces the skills migrants bring back with them as they return to their own country given increases in circular and temporary migration. As posited by Spencer, "migration can in turn be part of the development process. It can hinder development through the loss of highly skilled people ('brain drain') but can also make a vital contribution through acquisition of skills, trading and investment connections" (2011, 9). Spencer goes on to note that the relationship between migration and development goes much deeper than simply issues of brain drain, one must also account for what is known as social remittances, the transfer of skills and knowledge back to the source country, along with the remittances sent home for economic development.

Research shows that while migration can have positive impacts on source country development through remittances, migration can also negatively impact source countries through increasing dependency and through the creation of unsustainable lifestyles; in addition, there is a risk that source country governments may become dependent on remittance revenue, which can negatively impact long-term economic and social development. As Levitt and Lamba-Nieves argue, "the migration-development nexus, while long studied, is still not well-understood....Clearly the impact of migration varies by country and group, over time, and according to whether remittances are used individually or collectively" (2013, 67). The impact of remittances needs to be contextualized within the specifics of the receiving country, given differences in race, class, and gender profiles of remittance senders and receivers.

Migration and Development: Theoretical Perspectives

The migration-development nexus cannot be understood without examining the theoretical perspectives that have led to its emergence, and the dominant theoretical paradigms that reign today. As noted by Castaneda,

> the debate on the relation between migration and development has tended to swing back and forth like a pendulum: from developmentalist optimism in the 1950s and 1960s, to structuralist and neo-Marxist pessimism and scepticism in the 1970s and 1980s, and to more nuanced views, influenced by the new economics of labour migration, 'livelihood' approaches, and the transnational turn in migration studies in the 1990s (2012, e16).

There have been three phases of the migration-development nexus, moving from neoclassical and modernization theories, to structural and dependency theories, to present day ideas of cooperative development and transnationalism (Faist & Fauser, 2011).

The first phase of the migration-development nexus emerged during the 1950s and 1960s, and was dominated by neoclassical viewpoints and modernization theories of development. In this phase, there was a "belief that state capacity could shape economic growth as well as control migration according to national needs" (Faist & Fauser, 2011, 5). Key modernization theorists include Rostow, Shils, Almond, and Huntington. As explained by Kivisto, neoclassical economic theories were premised on the belief that "out-migration was beneficial to the sending country because it provided a solution to surplus labour, while meeting the labour demands of receiving nations" (2011, 211), a situation which would organically foster both increased productivity in sending countries and increased wages in the receiving countries, and which would eventually lead to a lessened need for migration.

The development field at the time was dominated by modernization theories, which emphasized the importance of labour migration in development; moreover, modernization theories emphasized that "the reduction of labour surpluses (and hence unemployment) in areas of origin and the inflow of capital through migrant remittances could improve productivity and incomes" (Castles & Miller, 2009, 50). The neoclassical migration approach emphasizes that migration is caused by an imbalance of resources and productivity between areas and that "the outflow of labour migrants from the underdeveloped and rural regions is beneficial because it will lead to more balanced distribution of capital and labour that furthers economic development in the out-migration region" (van Naerssen, Spaan & Zoomers, 2008, 4). This framework referred to the "migration hump", which posits that voluntary migration is a common characteristic in early stages of development, but that migration will cease as there is a convergence of wages in sending and receiving countries as the sending country's economy develops (Martin, 2013; Solimano, 2010).

During the 1970s and 1980s, there was a growing critique of neoclassical and modernization theories. As van Naerssen, Spaan, and Zoomers note, "in short, neoclassical theories are too economic in nature and leave out social, cultural and policy dimensions" (2008, 5). The neoclassical framework was critiqued due its assumptions that migration was voluntary, while in reality there was growing recognition that many underlying conditions led to the decision to migrate, and that migrants were often ill-prepared to make the decision to migrate due to incomplete information (van Naerssen, Spaan & Zoomers, 2008, 5). Thus, in the second phase of the migration-development nexus, the dominant theoretical framework revolved around structuralist and dependency theories. Key dependency theorists included Cardoso, Frank, and Wallerstein. As noted by Faist and Fauser, "the term 'development' came to be replaced by 'dependency' as a structural condition of the periphery dominated by the centre, and 'underdevelopment' was seen as its inevitable result...Rather than working from migration to development the assumed causality moved from underdevelopment to migration" (2011, 6). Furthermore, "the historical-structural approach, including dependency theories, centre-periphery models, and world system theory, focus on the macro level and emphasize the unequal distribution and exchange of resources, including human capital. In this view...international labour migration is part of a process of historical socioeconomic transformation" (van Naerssen, Spaan & Zoomers, 2008, 5).

Dependency theorists highlighted the negative impacts migration had on home countries, and focussed on root causes and historical conditions of migration. This framework recognized that "unequal power relations within the systems of neo-colonialism cause the unbalanced distribution of benefits and resources. Far from leading to a new equilibrium, it is argued that the loss of the young, healthy, and skilled people will lead to a decrease in productivity, labour and skill shortages, and even a deterioration of social cohesion" (van Naerssen, Spaan & Zoomers, 2008, 6). As noted by Kivisto, "dependency theorists...portray the linkage between migration and development as a 'vicious circle'. Dependency not only retards development, it facilitates the development of underdevelopment, which in turn serves as a trigger for migration" (2011, 212). Neo-Marxist dependency theory, for example, highlights that "labour migration is stimulated by the uneven spatial development resulting from colonial and neo-colonial political and economic relationships between the developed capitalist economies and the underdeveloped peripheries" (Mahmud, Sabur & Tamanna, 2009, 149). The three main critiques put forward by dependency theory were that "the consumption of remittances distorts local economies; second, that remittance use intensifies social conflict and local inequality; and third, that rural sending households find themselves trapped in an endless cycle of repeat moves to national and international destinations" (Cohen, 2005, 94).

The migration-development theoretical framework shifted again in the 1990s. This third, and current, phase revolves around what has been referred to as 'co-development', as coined by policy makers in France; furthermore, this new framework "puts the migrant at the centre of attention identifying him or her as the development agent....In this phase the migrant has been constituted as an element of development cooperation" (Faist & Fauser, 2011, 7). As Faist and Fauser note, we are again seeing "a reversal of the nexus taking us back to a more optimistic view, akin to the 1960s. Again, nowadays, international migration is supposed to fuel development. Most emphasis is placed on financial remittances" (2011, 7), as received through increasingly circular migration movements. As van Naerssen, Spaan and Zoomers posit, "the current discourse calls for attention to the mobilization of migrants' skills and networks for development purposes at home" (2008, 7). It is in this phase of the migration-development nexus that the focus on transnationalism and remittances has come to the forefront.

We are seeing the emergence of new theories such as the New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM) which "challenges both the neoclassical approach and historical structural models. NELM focuses on the household, rather than the individual, and theorizes that migration forms part of household livelihood strategies" (van Naerssen, Spaan & Zoomers, 2008, 6). This shift has followed similar shifts in the focus on the role of civil society; while the modernization period focussed on the developmental state, there has been a growing emphasis starting in the 1970s, but taking ground in the 1990s, that has focussed on the role of migrants in civil society, noting them as community agents through their remittance-sending actions (Faist & Fauser, 2011, 15).

The New Economics of Labour Migration emerged in the late 1980s as an alternative theoretical framework for the determinants of migration (Albreu, 2012). This theoretical framework has been "presented as a 'structurationist' and 'more nuanced' third way between the agency orientation of the equilibrium theories and the structural emphasis of the historical-structural approaches" (Abreu, 2012, 48). The NELM framework has been supported by theorists as a new framework due to its perceived ability to better account for the reality of migrant agency and its way of balancing agency and structure (Albreu, 2012). This framework has also been supported due to its emphasis on the role of remittances, which was not captured in traditional neoclassical theoretical frameworks (Albreu, 2012). NELM highlights the role of remittances as both a form of income insurance for families and a way for families to overcome market failures by gaining financial liquidity to finance new production technologies and activities (Taylor, 1999).

It is important here to note the critiques of the New Economics of Labour Migration framework, which has been argued to be simply a revival of modernization theory through a slightly different lens. As highlighted by Abreu, "NELM is characterized by the same fundamental flaws as the standard neoclassical theoretical account, albeit in a more sophisticated information-theoretic clothing" (2012, 47-48). Abreu argues that NELM retains the neoclassical focus on individualistic choices, ignoring the structural conditions shaping migration (Albreu, 2012). He furthers this argument by nothing that "NELM has in fact been little more than an avatar of the neoclassical approach in which only marginal concessions and changes were made, while the core (rationality, methodological individualism, lack of regard for structural trends and constraints) remained untouched" (Albreu, 2012, 64). In addition, the idea of social remittances has been criticized as a return to modernization theory; Castles and Miller argue that this focus on social remittances "bear disturbing echoes of the modernization theories of the 1950s and 1960s: that transfer of the 'right' (i.e. Western) values and attitudes can overcome the backwardness of the cultures of postcolonial nations" (2009, 76).

The New Global Remittance Trend

Of importance for this research paper is the increasing emphasis that is being placed on the role of remittances in development efforts, by both source and receiving governments and by international organizations. Kunz highlights that while remittances are not new, over the past few years a new trend, which he calls the "global remittance trend" (2008, 1389), has emerged. Kunz explains that this "global remittance trend" is "the process whereby government institutions, international (financial) organizations, non-governmental organizations and private sector actors have become interested in migration and remittances and in their potential for poverty reduction and development' (2008, 1389). As Castles and Miller note, this heavily positive emphasis on the role of remittances has led to what has been called "the remittance mantra" (2009, 75). de Haas posits that "after decades of pessimism and concerns about brain drain and disbelief in the development role of remittances, since 2000 there has been a truly remarkable renaissance in optimism and the overall interest in the issue of migration and development" (2013, 169). An example of this enthusiasm can be seen in the writings of Sutherland, who notes that "no other force- not trade, not capital flows- has the potential to transform lives in the sustainable, positive ways and on the scale that migration does" (2013, 152).

The timing of this global remittance trend is not a coincidence: it is a reflection of the international trends, goals, and challenges at the time. The heightened interest in remittances and their role in international development was partly a product of "a renewed global policy effort to accelerate the reduction of poverty incidence worldwide" (Brown, 2006, 56); moreover, especially with the declaration of the United Nations Millennium Development goals for development and poverty reduction, to be achieved by 2015, there was a recognition of the development funding shortfall and that "traditional financial approaches- such as development assistance- [were] likely to be insufficient" (Brown, 2006, 56). The focus on remittances increased with different global financial crises, such as the one in 2007, as the development budgets of many countries were either stagnating or declining, forcing the search for new sources of funding; as Vammen and Bronden highlight, this "put the wind in the sails of the promotion of remittances as an additional, stable and growing alternative source of financing" (2012, 28).

The global remittance trend can be viewed in prevailing research on remittances, which presents the role of remittances in development in an optimistic light. International financial organizations, such as the World Bank, have produced numerous reports on the positive impacts of global remittances and place significant emphasis on their importance and power to produce development in source countries. In a 2010 World Bank report, for example, the organization stated that "migrant remittances provide the most tangible and perhaps the least controversial link between migration and development, having the potential to contribute significantly to poverty reduction" (Irving, Mohaptra & Ratha, 2010, 1). Recent World Bank reports even go so far as to refer to remittances as "beautiful" (Kunz, 2008, 1396). The World Bank has also "proclaimed migrant remitters as the new agents of international development" (Schiller, 2011, 29). It is important to note here that "organizations and institutions have framed the migration and development buzz according to their own overall goals" (Vammen & Bronden, 2012, 28); moreover, this belief that migrant remittances can lead to development is based on neoclassical economic assumptions and "portrays the orthodox view on the nexus between migration and development" (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 59). This framing cannot be ignored, and will be re-introduced in the forthcoming theoretical analysis section of this research paper.

This remittance mantra has not been lost on the Canadian government; the Canadian government, especially in recent years, has increasingly emphasized the potential of remittances in international development efforts. A 2004 Citizenship and Immigration Canada report noted the importance of remittances for developing countries and expressed the belief that there is a clear positive development impact of remittances, that "remittances spent on goods or services domestically generate positive multiplier effects on an economy...[and] the value added for improved nutrition, education and health care is a long term investment which will increase social and economic benefits to a country" (Monzon & Tudakovic, 2004, 10). The same report stated that "emerging as the most reliable source of foreign money and capital for developing countries, remittances are of increasing interest to government foundations, multilateral institutions, researchers and banks" (Monzon & Tudakovic, 2004, 3). It is important to note that the report acknowledges the fact that the Canadian government does not monitor remittances, and that in conducting the research the authors contacted various different institutions such as Finance Canada, Statistics Canada, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Development Research Centre, and none of the organizations collected official statistics on the flow of remittances from Canada (Monzon & Tudakovic, 2004, 9).

Remittances have increasingly become incorporated into Canada's development policy focus, as evidenced in recent speeches by former Minister of International Cooperation, Julian Fantino, and by the current Minister of International Development, Christian Paradis. In speeches in February and March of 2013, Minister Fantino stated that the "reality is that private flows- including foreign direct investment, portfolio investment, and remittances- to many developing countries are now far greater than foreign aid. This shift is welcomed and to be encouraged" (Fantino, February 2013); furthermore, Minister Fantino noted that the Canadian government was looking to these new flows, especially in regards to remittances, as tools in poverty reduction (Fantino, March 2013). In a position piece explaining why the government merged the former Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) with the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), Minister Fantino highlighted the fact that "the bulk of the capital from Canada to the developing world no longer flows through CIDA" (Fantino, March 2013) ; referring to the increasing flow of remittances, he noted that "our government is keeping our eyes firmly on these trends, and are looking to leverage them to move more people from poverty to prosperity in the developing world" (Fantino, March 2013).

In a December 2013 speech, Minister of International Development Paradis highlighted the importance of diasporas and their remittances and noted that he believed that "the Department has not taken advantage of all the opportunities that are offered by the presence of so many diasporas in our country" (Paradis, December 2013). This approach of moving away from official development assistance and focussing on private monetary flows has arguably played a significant role in the reincorporation of what was formerly CIDA into the newly formed Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD) in June of 2013. However substantiating this claim would require further background research while, and while not the aim of this research paper, it is a significant area for further research.

Synthesizing the Discussion on Remittances

This "remittance mantra" has not come without criticism, however; in recent years, there has been growing pessimism on the role that remittances are playing, and on the migration-development nexus itself. Vammen and Bronden highlight that there is growing recognition that the links between migration and development are weak and not well-documented, and that some academics are beginning to question "the assumption that a focus on this nexus can arm development with a new 'silver bullet'" (2012, 27). They go further to argue that the focus on remittances as a form of development through migration is characterized by "naive enthusiasm" (Vammen & Bronden, 2012, 31). The remittance enthusiasm has been primarily centered around economic arguments; however, a focus solely on the economic impacts is highly problematic "because it evades delving into the complex and varied human, social, political and economic realities within which remittances are embedded" (Kunz, 2008, 1398). Kunz furthers his argument by noting that "portraying remittances as a powerful force to solve the problems of poverty and development in migrant sending countries draws our attention away from the negative impact of remittances" (2008, 1398). However, as Kunz notes, in the current migration-development nexus "optimism about the development potential of remittances predominates, and the challenges of migration and remittances are seen to be outweighed by their positive impacts" (2008, 1396-1397).

It is important to recall that there is no general consensus on why migrants remit and what the effects of remittances are. As previously noted, "the lack of consistent, reliable and large sample data has constrained aspects of our understanding of the micro-level determinants of remittances" (2012, 125). Ngoma and Ismail would agree, noting that "data availability has often hindered the ability to effectively examine the impact of migrant remittances on key macroeconomic variables in developing countries" (2013, 10). Different studies have been conducted on remittances and their impacts, many looking at specific communities or countries, however there is a significant shortfall in in-depth, comprehensive, global studies; arguably, the data presented in the research thus far has only touched the surface of attempting to understand the impacts of remittances. The following analysis section of this research paper will attempt to further the understanding of remittances and how they are embedded within the current migration-development nexus.

EXAMINING THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF CRITICAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES: A CRITIQUE OF THE MIGRATION-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

Critical Development Studies

In order to analyze the implications of a remittance-centered migration-development nexus, this research paper will rely upon critical development studies for its theoretical framework. A critical development studies approach highlights the theoretical separation that has plagued migration and development studies; moreover, "theoretical accounts of development and migration on a global scale have for the most part been elaborated independently of one another" (DeWind & Ergun, 2013, 21). As Castles notes, both migration specialists and development specialists "have tended to be isolated from each other and from mainstream social theory" (2009, 15). As a result, theoretical frameworks put forward on migration and development have been lacking in coherence, are limited, and have failed to take current capitalist conditions into account (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 189). As a result of the theoretical disconnect, research documenting migration and development does "not capture the context within which migration and the fundamental connections involving processes of global, national, regional and local development are inscribed" (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 188). Critical development studies criticizes dominant macro-level theories of migration since they have been unable to "answer why and how specific groups migrate from one specific place to another at a particular time" (DeWind & Ergun, 2013, 37).

A critical development studies framework highlights that "it is necessary to problematize and contextualize the notion of development to break through normative frameworks that, failing to consider the need for structural and institutional change, limit the formulation of any socioeconomic improvement to abstract terms" (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 188). A critical development studies framework highlights that "development connotes substantive improvements in the human condition for an ever larger part of the world's population and the institutional and structural change needed to bring about these developments" (Veltmeyer, 2011, 33). In order to achieve development, it is crucial that social justice and equity are extended to all those currently excluded from such liberties (Veltmeyer, 2011, 33). Veltmeyer further highlights that development in a "meaningful sense implies a social and economic transformation to eradicate injustices of the past whether of imperialist or traditional origin. Development is a process from within. It cannot be programmed or externally imposed" (Veltmeyer, 2011, 13). As such, a critical development studies framework is highly critical of the current ideology of the migration-development nexus given that it does not take the structural conditions of migration into account.

Critical development studies highlights that "the great paradox of the migration-development agenda is that it leaves intact the principles that underpin the current process of global capital restructuring and does not affect the specific way in which neoliberal policies are applied in migrant-sending countries. At most, it offers superficial strategies" (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 187). From a critical development studies perspective, "the current explosion of migration is viewed as a party of the intricate machinery of the current capital restructuring process" (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 189). This framework argues that international organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund have their own interests implicated within policies of migration and development, even if such interests negatively impact those affected by uneven development (Berberoglu, 2011, 94). As noted by Wise and Covarrubias, "it is evident that the impact of structural adjustment programs, promoted by the World Bank and the IMF, is the root cause of the upsurge in North-South migration and remittance flows" (2011, 187). In addition, as Vasapollo notes, "what is seldom mentioned is the central part debt plays for the Western powers in dictating how Third World economies are organized" (2011, 85).

Critical development studies highlights that instead of focussing on the root causes of migration, the predominant focus of both international organizations and governments has been to focus on the role of remittances in promoting development, an approach which revolves around the export of cheap labour (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 191). The critical development studies framework highlights the challenges that migrant labourers are faced with; moreover, "despite their valuable contribution to the economies of developed, labour-importing nations, migrants are subject to labour precarization, social exclusion and political marginalization" (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 191). Due to the desire for remittances, many governments are focused on encouraging their diaspora populations to remit instead of focussing on workers' rights (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 191). Critical development studies puts forward that "migrants should not be held responsible for the promotion of development in their places of origin" (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 189), given that development involves complex issues of global inequality, asymmetric relations between governments of the North and South, and precarious labour markets, among others (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 188).

As previously noted, with the increasing debate on the effects of migration and development, certain negative consequences of remittances are occasionally acknowledged; critiques of remittances often focus on the negative consequences of family separation and the closely connected gendered implications of migration or on the potential for remittances to increase inequality in sending communities. While each of these consequences is important to acknowledge, and can have significant negative impacts on migrants, their families, and their communities, there is one aspect of the migration-development nexus that is too often ignored: the structural conditions of underdevelopment and migration and the precarious status international migrants increasingly face. Using critical development studies as a framework, the following analysis section will attempt to demonstrate this.

The following analysis section will examine in detail the structural conditions that have led to a reliance on remittances for development, and will argue that utilizing remittances as a form of development downloads the responsibility for a country's development on exploited and vulnerable members of society, that is international migrants, and takes the responsibility for social and economic development away from both source country governments and also from governments of the Global North that, through policies of temporary and restricted immigration, continue to benefit from the underdevelopment of the Global South.

Family Separation and Gendered Implications of Migration

Family separation is often acknowledged as an implication of international migration, yet it is generally posited as part of a cost-benefit analysis for migrant households. This can be seen in the comments Dreby makes on Mexican migrant families, as he notes that "migration is a gamble; by leaving their children, migrant parents hope to better provide for them. Their migration and hard work represent a sacrifice of everyday comforts for the sake of their children and their children's future" (2010, 2). There is a recognition within the research on remittances and development that while remittances have the potential to provide some benefits to a community, "such benefits come at considerable human sacrifice and have especially negative consequences for children left behind" (de la Garza, 2013, 50). The promotion of migration for development means that children are growing up without their parents; in the Philippines, for example, it is estimated that twenty-seven percent of the youth population, or nine million children, are growing up with at least one migrant parent (Parrenãs, 2013, 191); in Mexico, one in eleven children are expected to experience the migration of their father by the age of fifteen (Nobles, 2011, 729).

What is often not highlighted in the research, however, is the fact that these children are being denied basic human rights by growing up without their parents, given restrictive immigration policies such as Canada's Live-In Caregiver Program which does not allow for family members to accompany the migrant woman; furthermore, referring to a child growing up in the Philippines whose mother had migrated, Parrenãs makes the important observation that "we should remain mindful that the choice for Isabelle to live in close proximity of her mother is a human right that is denied to her and most other children of migrant workers" (2013, 208-209).Too often, studies focus on the positive aspects of migration and few studies "have considered the trade-off between increased material resources from migration on one hand, and negative consequences resulting from parental absence on the other" (Kandel & Kao, 2001, 1206). Another area of research that does not receive enough attention is the promotion of the benefits of migration to children, and the potential for the development of the motivation to migrate at a young age; furthermore, de la Garza highlights that there is a growing trend that children of migrants "increasingly emphasize consumption of consumer goods and learn to define opportunities in terms of emigration rather than in terms of prospects to be found at home" (2013, 56). This trend has implications for both the migrant themselves, but also has significant implications on the country as a whole as new generations of youth aspire to emigrate from the country, meaning the loss of the next generation workforce. In general, the impacts of parental migration on child development has not received enough focus in the research on migration and development; moreover, research tends to focus on the resilience of children and families, which ignores the root causes of family separation.

Often, discussions on transnational families highlight the ways in which parents are able to maintain connections to their children and spouses through various technological means. Yet what is often not acknowledged in discussions on transnational families is the emerging divide between wealthy and poorer nations; as Dreby posits, "transnational families are not new; international separations were also common in earlier periods. Yet today this migration pattern is most common among those moving from less wealthy to more prosperous nations" (2010, 5). Dreby furthers this point by noting that when parents migrate to more industrialized nations, leaving their children and families behind, "inequalities between contemporary wealthy and poor nations are reproduced and reinforced in individual households" (2010, 5). Focussing on the decision to migrate as a cost-benefit analysis for parents ignores the fact that often the disparity in domestic and international wages is the justification for parents to migrate, even if it means "creating their own vacuum in the families they leave behind" (Pagaduan, 2006, 81). As posited by Pagaduan, "marital separations, child delinquencies, and dysfunctional families, the psycho-social stresses on the families left behind as well as the migrant worker, are still unvalued and neglected costs of overseas work" (2006, 80-81). The impacts of family separation cannot be separated from another trend: the increasing feminization of international labour migration.

Since the 1970s, there has been a significant increase in the participation of women in international labour migration. Traditionally envisioned as a male-dominated process, the increasing participation of women challenged how researchers understood migration. This sudden increase in the participation of women in migration has been referred to as the "feminization of migration". Women currently represent around half of the world's migrant population, representing more than half of migrants to the developed world (Ghosh, 2009; Kofman, 2004). Numerous factors are associated with the increase in the migration of women, including the global integration of economic markets, increased education levels of women, women's rural-urban mobility, and differential wages for professions across countries (Gaye & Jha, 2011; Oishi, 2002). Research presents certain gains of female migration such as an increased role in household decision making, an increased role in household expenditures, and increased spatial mobility (Pessar, 2005, 7). Research on the feminization of migration often focuses on the empowerment of women and the agency and autonomy of women gained and expressed through the decision to migrate (Asis, Huang & Yeoh, 2004, 204). Women are increasingly being hailed as agents of development through the remittances they send back to their families; in the Philippines, for example, the majority of international migrants are female, and are considered heroines for development by the Filipino government.

However, despite their increased participation in international migration, female migrants cannot be seen as experiencing empowerment as they remain burdened by traditional gender roles. Using a feminist standpoint, empowerment must be understood as the fulfilment of rights and of socio-economic development (Piper & Yamanaka, 2008, 159). Furthermore, "feminist scholarship has demonstrated that economic independence and security of livelihoods are of vital importance for women to be empowered and to claim their rights" (Piper & Yamanaka, 2008, 159). Women cannot be seen to be empowered by international migration since "it is in the most oppressive niches that women have tended to be 'favoured' as migrant workers" (Stasiulus & Bakan, 2003, 61).

The feminization of migration remains in the realm of traditionally gendered occupations. Moreover, female labour migration has continued to remain within a traditionally feminine domain, for occupations such as live-in maids, caregivers, entertainers, and other service sector positions (Piper & Yamanaka, 2008, 161). As Stasiulus and Bakan argue, the term "'feminization of (im)migrant labour' risks distorting the actual implications of this trend. Rather than seeing increasing opportunities for migrant women workers relative to male workers, in fact tightening controls on poor, Third World immigrant labour...have created a decline in opportunities" (2003, 61). Furthermore, Parrenãs highlights that "forces of patriarchy encourage the feminization of labour and migration, as it is the demand for women's work, low-wage labour, and a docile workforce that pushes the labour and migration of women in globalization" (2008, 17).

The increased demand for migrant labour to alleviate the domestic needs in more developed nations has resulted in what Hochschild introduced as the "global care chain" and what Parrenãs has further developed into the concept of the "international division of reproductive labour". The recruitment of foreign domestic workers in the North has contributed to the emergence of a multi-tiered division of labour in which women in the more advanced economies hire migrant workers for a lower wage, who then themselves hire women in their country, paying an even lower wage (Parrenãs, 2000, 561). In the multi-tiered division of labour, "on the top tier are middle- and upper-class women in advanced economies who hire migrant workers to mother their children; on the bottom are local women who pick up domestic duties transferred to migrant workers in the middle tier" (Lan, 2003, 195). As noted by Parrenãs, "the advancement of one group of women comes at the cost of the ghettoization of another group of women into low-wage service work" (2008, 42). Furthermore, "the rise of neoliberalism in poor countries pushes women into migrant domestic work, and the similar rise of neoliberalism directs their flow" (Parrenãs, 2008, 61). The emergence of global care chains not only represent an area which highlights the role of capitalism in the mobility of reproductive labour (Yeates, 2009, 176), but also highlights an area that demands for an analysis of the relations of power between women of different races and classes (Weir, 2008, 166).

Overall, the migration-development nexus has neglected the role of gender. Moreover, "while much work has been done to ascertain the role of gender on migration and development as separate fields of inquiry, not enough attention has been paid to assessing the impact of female migration on development as a unique paradigm" (Cortina & Ochoa-Reza, 2013, 141). It is crucial to incorporate a gendered analysis since "the gender composition of world migration reflects a complex interaction among social, political, and economic conditions, migration histories, labour demands in destination countries, and household and community dynamics" (Morrison, Schiff & Sjoblom, 2008, 13). An examination of the increased feminization of labour migration, and the fact that the majority of labour migration remains within traditionally gendered roles such as domestic and care work, demonstrates "how the uneven impacts of globalization have intruded into the micro-world of families and households" (Asis, Huang & Yeoh, 2004, 199). Domestic work in the context of globalization has taken on a contradictory role since "at the same time as being the most spurned occupation for those who are entitled to the right of labour mobility, it is one of the most coveted for those with no other employment or migratory options" (Stasiulus & Bakan, 2003, 46). Stasiulus and Bakan further their argument by stating that "the process of recruitment of migrant workers to perform paid domestic labour in developed capitalist states is structurally linked to the uneven process of international economic development...as well as racially and ethnically specific ideologies" (2003, 43-44).

Inequality and Dependency

Research on remittances acknowledges that the flow of money may have the unintended consequence of promoting inequality within the receiving community. As posited by Eckstein, "migrants, their families, their home communities, and their home governments do not necessarily benefit equally from remittances, and remittances may generate unintended and undesirable consequences from both a state and societal vantage point" (2013, 16). Castles argues that "where political and economic reform is absent, remittances are more likely to lead to inflation and greater inequality than to positive change" (2009, 22). While remittances do have the power to lift individual families out of poverty, through investments in food, housing, and education, this is on an individual level, not on a societal or community level; instead of promoting development as a whole, remittances can increase inequality between households as divides between remittance-receiving and non-remittance receiving households emerge. It is crucial to recognize that migration requires resources and thus more often than not, it is not the poorest who migrate and receive remittances, but instead members of the middle-class (de la Garza, 2013, 48). As Arya and Roy posit, "it is not the poorest who migrate, but those who have some means to invest, or an available network enabling them to migrate" (2006, 24).

Remittances can increase divisions between the haves and the have-nots. As noted by Dreby, there may be a growing divide between those who have access to remittances and those who do not, thereby producing a form of "remittance bourgeoisie" (2010, 6). Research on remittances and development in Morocco has shown that "migration and the associated access to remittance income has also accelerated the social stratifications in migrant-sending communities, with international migrant households forming a new kind of 'migration elite'" (de Haas, 2013, 184). Castaneda argues that remittances create a situation of "keeping up with the neighbours" given theories of relative deprivation (2012, e27). Research on the Philippines points to this stratification introduced by remittances; for example, Matejowsky highlights that "most [overseas foreign worker] OFW homes stand in appreciable contrast to those of their neighbours in terms of architectural character and material trappings...These larger domiciles are typically set behind privacy walls and feature modern amenities" (2012, 317). It is difficult to imagine inequality between households leading to a situation of increased development.

Increased consumption through remittances, other than causing inequality between households, can also lead to a situation of dependence on remittance earnings; as Castaneda highlights, "once the family increases its level of consumption of foreign goods..it is hard to cut back on these expenditures..In this way, what started as a socially available strategy for the diversification of household income often ends up as permanent or long-run migration" (2012, e29). It can also increase a cycle of migration for non-remittance receiving households as they develop an increased desire for consumption. Moreover, "although remittances improve the migrant household's living standards, they create a greater urge among the non-receiving households, ultimately causing further migration. A sustained rise in migration and remittances therefore has the potential to develop into a vicious dependency cycle" (Mughal, 2013, 589). As households increase resources for expenditures on basic social services such as health and education, there is a risk that there may be an incentive for home country governments to reduce investments in social services since remittance-receiving households can survive without assistance; however, reduced government investment would also increase the dependency cycle as households would require increased income, primarily through migration, for their daily lives (Mughal, 2013, 589). Mughal argues that if governments began to invest less, "remittances may thereby unwittingly help shift the burden for ensuring economic security onto the most insecure groups in society" (2013, 593).

Remittance dependency is an issue that has not been problematized to the fullest extent in theoretical approaches to migration and development. As previously noted, many migrant sending countries are beginning to adopt policies to encourage migration for the purposes of remittances. As a result, we are seeing what Castaneda has referred to as "remittance economies..communities that are both socially and economically dependent on remittances" (2012, e17). Castaneda further develops this point by highlighting that "remittance economies represent the emergence of transnational migrant-sending towns caught somewhere on the continuum between dependency and development" (2012, e17). Many smaller countries such as Tonga, Moldova, Lesotho and Haiti have a high level of reliance on remittances, with emigration being a normal occurrence for young workers (Castles & Miller, 2009, 59-60). Often, migration is used as a last resort for those who are facing a lack of opportunity within their own country, yet migrating for employment can result in a cycle of dependence since the migration can become self-fulfilling (Lucas, 2005, 294).

The country that exudes a dependence on emigration to the deepest extent is the Philippines, where labour migration has become an increasingly predominant characteristic of the economy since 1974. The export of labour is used by the Filipino government as a way to reduce unemployment, to improve human capital within the country, to promote development, and to reduce balance of payment problems (Tyner, 1999, 679). Matejowsky highlights that this policy of labour emigration "has done much to keep the national economy afloat and ameliorate socioeconomic conditions by alleviating chronic under- and unemployment problems and contributing to the rise of a consumer-oriented middle class" (2012, 315). However, labour emigration has remained a major factor in the economy since it has been favoured over local job creation by policy makers (Matejowsky, 2012, 315). Due to a lack of investment, domestic employment opportunities remain low-wage and limited. As a result, the country has become increasingly reliant on emigration and remittances for survival; furthermore, "families are becoming dependent on remittances for sustenance. The temporary work arrangement becomes more or less permanent as migrants keep on renewing their contracts or find another job/employer to continue supporting their families" (Baggio & Asis, 2008, 132). As previously noted, the Philippine government has touted its migrants as national heroes and heroines for their contributions to the country through remittances (Stasiulus & Bakan, 2003, 103); this praise is unfounded however since the country remains plagued with issues of debt and high unemployment.

There is a growing body of research that focuses on the culture of migration forming in many remittance-dependent countries. In Mexico, given high levels of emigration, research has shown that "an undeniable orientation towards *el norte* permeates communities where many children's parents have migrated" (Dreby, 2010, 18), where *el norte* means "the North". In the Philippines, a culture of migration is encouraged on various different levels, with "labour migration [being] called a 'civil religion', with teens considering where to go abroad, TV shows exploring the tensions associated with family separation, and the Central Bank displaying remittance numbers on a billboard at Christmas" (Martin, 2013, 292). When migrants are being praised by their governments for their contributions to the country, when policies are enacted in order to facilitate the ease of migration, and when there is a lack of opportunity within a country's borders, a tendency towards emigration is not surprising. As emigration continues and networks are built from the home to receiving country, a culture of migration is sustained (Cohen & Sirkeci, 2011, 116).

While the risk of dependency has been acknowledged, it is rarely acknowledged in connection to a government's failure to provide for its citizens. As Mughal notes, "migration for economic reasons is a consequence of a government's failure to give its population ample development opportunities" (2013, 589). As Cohen and Sirkeci put forward, "it is best to think of migration and remittances practices as the outcomes of the failures of national economic policy to address public needs" (2012, 16). Matejowsky presents an analysis of emigration from the Philippines through this government failure lens, highlighting the government's inability to provide domestic employment opportunities (2012, 316). Furthermore, Matejowsky notes that "Filipinos are willing to take on the risks of working abroad because it remains one of the few avenues available to natives toward generating income and upward mobility" (2012, 317).

This dependency on migration and remittances for development is not sustainable in the long term. Firstly, remittances cannot be seen as anything other than private monetary flows; as noted by Castles and Miller, "remittances are the private property of migrants- the fruit of their hard labour and a reward for the high risks they often have to take" (2009, 60). As de la Garza notes, remittances are "completely dependent on individual decisions that are in almost all cases beyond the state's control" (2013, 53). Thus, there is no way for states, other than taxation, to incorporate remittance flows into development strategies long term; as a result, "the typical approach is narrow, economic, and short-term. Little attention is being paid to the effects on sustainable development, equity and long-term poverty reduction" (Mitchell, 2006, 3). While remittances may provide temporary relief for individual families, it is not a long-term strategy (Orozco, 2008, 212). Remittances are heavily dependent on global economic forces, which means that they can be unpredictable; moreover, recent World Bank research has predicted that remittance flows to Mexico will have declined by almost three percent in 2013 due to restrictions within the American economy and tightening border controls (2013, 18). Yet, the current migration and development nexus tends to ignore such issues.

Neoliberalism, Underdevelopment and Remittances

While there has been some light shed on the potential negative implications of remittances and of migration and development in general, as this research paper has shown, what is too often neglected are the structural conditions that have led to the emergence of a remittance doctrine in the first place. The institutional focus on remittances and migrants as agents of development neglects to account for forced economic migration; moreover, focussing on remittances as a form of development ignores the reasons that cause migration in the first place, that of underdevelopment and a lack of economic opportunity. Neoliberal policies, global capitalist restructuring and economic globalization, and increasingly restrictive immigration policies of the Global North each play a role in international migration; the idea of focussing on migrants as agents of development through remittances places the responsibility of development on exploited and vulnerable members of global society, while relieving those responsible for the conditions of underdevelopment from any accountability.

Conditions of underdevelopment and development cannot be examined without looking at the structural conditions created by neoliberalism and global capitalist restructuring. It is important to note that "although developing countries have long lacked adequate employment options for low-skilled labourers, the problem, following neoliberal restructuring, exploded" (Eckstein, 2013, 14). Many developing country economies adopted neoliberal policies following debt crises in the 1980s, as a way to deepen their integration into the world economy ; however, as a result of the restructuring, many have fallen victim to growing exploitation, poverty, and inequality (Bauder & Gilbert, 2009, 280). Neoliberal restructuring in developing countries has caused a reduction in productivity, the shrinking of internal markets, the destruction of social services, unemployment and underemployment, and growing poverty, which has resulted in forced migration for economic purposes as "millions of workers and their families are driven to abandon their places of origin and emigrate elsewhere within their country or to developed countries demanding cheap labour" (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 59). As noted by Orozco, "global capitalism has increased international migration out of necessity, as global competition makes countries struggle to grow and properly tend to the welfare of their societies" (2013, 203). As countries in the Global North increase demand for cheap labour, this issue is exacerbated.

A major economic adjustment implemented through global capitalist restructuring, led by the countries of the West through organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, are structural adjustment programs (SAPs); structural adjustment programs have played a major role in the perpetuation of underdevelopment and have led to forced economic migration, a fact which cannot be ignored when examining the migration-development nexus and the role of remittances in development. As argued by Wise and Covarrubias, "the impact of the implementation of structural adjustment programmes as a key element of neoliberal policy promoted by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund is at the root of the upsurge in South-North migration and remittance flows" (2011, 59). Structural adjustment programs "are centered on the precepts of privatization, deregulation, and liberalization and have been a tool with which to insert less developed economies into the dynamic of globalization" (Wise & Covarrubias, 2011, 435). The neoliberal restructuring of the 1980s increased the debt levels of many developing countries, and under persuasion from the international financial organizations led by the West, many countries adopted structural adjustment programs; these policies created the conditions seen today, which have caused citizens to view emigration as their only economic opportunity (Eckstein, 2013, 8). Essentially, it can be argued that "the World Bank and the IMF have insisted that in return for the service of debts, Third World governments pursue policies which induce their citizens to seek jobs and money elsewhere" (Stasiulus & Bakan, 2003, 40).

The extent of emigration from the Philippines can be seen as a direct result of capitalist economic policies imposed on the country. The Philippines began borrowing money from the World Bank in 1958 due to poor economic conditions stemming from colonial era effects, and the country has been faced with increasing debt levels ever since. Moreover, in 1986 the country's debt was $28.6 billion, with this amount having increased to $52.2 billion in 1999 (Stasiulus & Bakan, 2003, 58). The country was persuaded to adopt a structural adjustment program through the World Bank, led by American imperial interests; the structural adjustment policies led to "a devaluation of the peso, import liberalization, export-oriented development, wage restraints, no-strike measures, cuts in social services and further concessions for foreign investors" (Stasiulus & Bakan, 2003, 58).

The structural adjustment policies imposed on the Philippines have had resounding impacts for the citizens of the country, who have been faced with declining employment opportunities and cuts in social services. As Stasiulus and Bakan note, "the consistent decline in the value of the peso that has accompanied structural adjustment has made it difficult for Filipinas to meet the daily basic needs of their families as real incomes have decreased while prices of goods and services have increased" (2003, 59).The poverty and underdevelopment created by structural adjustment programs, and encouraged by government policies, in the Philippines has resulted in producing the large numbers of migrant workers (Stasiulus & Bakan, 2003, 60).

Simply put, the spread of neoliberalism, led by countries of the global North, has perpetuated the increasing debt of less developed countries, resulting in increasing poverty and unemployment levels within the countries, which in turn leads citizens to emigrate as an economic survival strategy as their governments are unable to provide them with opportunities. As Stasiulus and Bakan posit, "globalization expresses and has exacerbated an imperialistic hierarchy of states on a world scale" (2003, 1). The rapid economic globalization of the past few decades has resulted in levels of inequality never before seen; moreover, "a main concern of current globalization is the contrasting disparities in income levels, living standards, and economic potential across nations. These international disparities create power incentives for international migrations" (Solimano, 2010, 10). Castles, noting the effects economic globalization has had on many underdeveloped countries, highlights that "the recent upsurge in South-North migration can be best understood through examination of these complementary changes and their complex linkages" (2009, 17). It is within the context of neoliberal globalization that the current migration and development paradigm is embedded. Moreover, "neoliberal globalization theory has argued that Western models of privatization and entrepreneurship are crucial to development, yet such approaches have so far led to greater inequality..We need to examine the relationship between such apparently bottom-up development approaches and macro-level relationships of unequal economic and political power" (Castles, 2009, 20).

The current framework of migration and development cannot ignore that the increase in international migration stems from inequality and underdevelopment. As noted by Arya and Roy, "transnational migration when uncritically acknowledged as a distinctive aspect of globalization disregards the uneven and hierarchical relationships within the international system which inform population flows" (2006, 21). They further their argument by noting that "the processes of uneven development set in motion by colonization continue to unfold with the integration of post-colonial societies into the world economy as dependent and subordinate partners" (Arya & Roy, 2006, 21).

What the current approaches to migration and development ignore is that diasporas are essentially a response to underdevelopment (Orozco, 2008, 208). It is conditions associated with underdevelopment that force migration, since "people are literally expelled from their places of origin as they search for better livelihoods and social mobility opportunities" (Wise, Covarrubias & Puentes, 2013, 435). As Faist and Fauser put forward, "there is a consensus regarding the consequences of migration on development at least among economists: while the economic impacts undoubtedly 'have positive effects' for receiving countries, and most powerfully for OECD countries, it is also agreed that the benefits for sending countries are less clear cut" (2011, 4).

It is through high levels of indebtedness, perpetuated through Western-led capitalist restructuring endeavours, that the increase in international migration, and thus the increase in the receipt of remittances, has emerged; furthermore, it can be argued that "the legacy of imperialism, has combined with modern conditions of indebtedness to generate large pools of Third World migrant labour" (Stasiulus & Bakan, 2003, 44). A focus on the role of remittances is a downloading of the responsibility for development onto vulnerable members of global society, as they are forced to enter into international work agreements through which they are denied their rights and placed in a precarious situation. As Stasiulis and Bakan note, "while pressures to migrate from poor sending countries have increased, opportunities for legal immigration are directly tied to occupation demand in the receiving countries" (2003, 44). Moreover, while capital has been free to move globally during economic globalization, restrictions on the movement of people have intensified; Stasiulus and Bakan highlight that "while the designated 'rights' of capital to travel freely across borders have increased, the citizenship rights of people, particularly the most vulnerable people, have tended to decline" (2003, 1).

Solimano notes that "high-income countries, via their internal economic agendas, tend to push for liberal investment regimes along with trade liberalization in the south, but their stance becomes less liberal in the case of immigration regimes for migrants coming from emerging and developing countries" (2010, 12). Governments of the Global North have tightened immigration policies over the past years, which has meant that "peoples in developing countries are not free to decide for themselves whether to emigrate, where to move, and for how long" (Eckstein, 2013, 8). Receiving countries have restricted their immigration policies to create different categories of migrants as a way to maximize the economic benefits of migration (Solimano, 2010). This securitization of migration has been one of the greatest paradoxes of neoliberal globalization; furthermore, Solimano notes that there is a "people's paradox" of globalization, which recognizes that "people are the least mobile component of globalization when compared with goods, capital and money" (2010, 12).

A key element of the new global economic structure has been "the emergence of a new international division of labour where the exploitation of the workforce has become a central factor" (Wise, Covarrubias & Puentes, 2013, 435). Global capitalism has focused on the protection of capital and the erosion of labour laws and workers' rights in both the developed and the developing world, but for the developing world "surviving international competition has meant dispensing with the rights of workers, especially labour standards, and the insistence that labour standards be de-linked from trade issues" (Arya & Roy, 2006, 22). The weakening of labour rights of migrants from the developing world has been linked to the desire for cheap labour that is central to capitalism, however it is crucial to note that "the 'need' for low-skilled labour in northern countries is socially constructed by the poor wages, conditions and social status in certain sectors" (Castles & Miller, 2009, 222).

What is often ignored in the current migration-development framework is the extent of the exploitation of migrant workers, those very migrants that are praised for sending remittances (Stasiulus & Bakan, 2003). Receiving states are focussed on solving labour market shortages and origin countries are focussed on reducing unemployment and harnessing remittances, and through this situation there tends to be a lack of attention paid to the needs and rights of migrant workers (Piper & Yamanaka, 2008). Migrant workers tend to be overrepresented in informal sectors which are prone to abuse and inequality and are subject to poor working conditions, low wages, and inadequate social services (Leighton, 2013). Despite their contributions to the receiving country, which helps to enable to the social welfare system accessible by the receiving country's citizens, "the same rights are mostly denied to migrant workers" (Arya & Roy, 2006, 41). As noted by Leighton, "development strategies and labour policies tend not to focus on the needs of migrant workers- how to better enable them to support their families and communities. Yet, these issues are directly related to improved development outcomes" (2013, 19).

Global capitalist expansion has occurred simultaneously with the increasingly restrictive immigration and citizenship policies of the more developed countries. Countries from the Global North, such as Canada, have been increasingly focussing on more temporary and circular forms of economic migration, instead of on policies of family reunification or on the refugee determination system. Economic globalization has increased global inequality and has created an increasingly segmented international labour market, which is perpetuated by restrictive immigration policies of receiving nations (Solimano, 2010, 11). Receiving countries are benefitting from underdevelopment of the Global South, as they are able to extract and produce the most vulnerable labour through restrictive immigration systems; receiving countries benefit from the migration of vulnerable migrants, since "the more vulnerable migrants are, the more their employers benefit; their social exclusion leads to increased profits and fiscal gains for both employers and host governments" (Wise, Covarrubias & Puentes, 2013, 434). It is through this desire for cheap labour that temporary labour schemes have come to dominate many Northern immigration systems, including that of Canada.

Temporary labour schemes often highlight remittances as a positive aspect of the policies. For example, a 2013 Parliamentary Report highlights that benefits of Canada's temporary foreign worker programs for source countries include the receipt of remittances and the transfer of knowledge (Pang, 2013). Many foreign worker programs highlight that they assist migrants from escaping poverty in their own countries through the receipt of higher wages and through the ability to send remittances to their families and communities (Stasiulus & Bakan, 2003, 60). Yet, "the ability to send remittances, however, does not mean that migrants are working in the upper segments of the labour market...Before and after migration, workers from the global south who migrate to the north constitute a subordinate labour force" (Bauder & Gilbert, 2009, 281). Essentially, the re-emergence of an emphasis on temporary worker programs, with their touted benefits for source countries, "are discursive tools to justify an agenda of marginalizing and depriving migrants of their rights and to forcibly expel irregular immigrants and rejected asylum seekers" (de Haas, 2013, 190). Furthermore, "the depersonalization of labour as contractual services allows for labour policy statements in which the separation of workers from home and family, without rights of settlement and family reunion, becomes good economic policy" (Schiller, 2011, 47). Countries such as Canada, through temporary worker programs, are benefitting from the structural exploitation of migrants from the global South (Stasiulus&Bakan, 2003, 62).

It is in this structure of migrant exploitation that the global remittance trend has emerged. Moreover, "international financial institutions have made migrant remittances a growing industry just at the moment when migrants may be less interested in transnational strategies and yet less able to choose to settle permanently in a new land" (Schiller, 2011, 46). It is in the intersectionality of migration, development, and workers' rights, where migrants are being forced to migrate for economic reasons but are faced with increasingly restrictive immigration systems. As such, migrants are emerging "as one of the direst victims of the systemic violence generated by neoliberal globalization" (Wise, Covarrubias & Puentes, 2013, 434).

It is in a system of labour exploitation that the power of remittances for development is being encouraged; yet, as argued by de Haas, "such policies are misguided because they not only fail to stop migration but will also considerably decrease the potential of migration for development in origin counties" (2013, 190). The labour of migrant workers is undervalued and taken for granted, and these workers are being placed in precarious working situations where they are denied their rights; specifically referring to migrant women, Piper and Yamanaka highlight that "with many migrant women's economic and social contributions being undervalued and their work being legally not recognized, their full potential or ability to secure livelihoods and their chances for personal socioeconomic empowerment are somewhat limited" (2008, 180).

Synthesis of the Analysis

Overall, an analysis of the current migration and development framework has demonstrated the significant downfalls and implications associated with this approach. The following quote from the work of Wise, Covarrubias and Puentes aptly demonstrates the of the current migration-development nexus:

> [It] is a very limited approach. On the one hand, it ignores the context of neoliberal globalization. On the other, it fails to consider critical aspects of the relationship between

migration and development. It disregards the root causes of migration, it ignores the human rights of migrants and migrants' contributions to receiving societies, and it overlooks the risks and adversities faced by migrants in countries of transit. It also fails to address the living and working conditions of migrants in receiving countries and the high socioeconomic costs migration has on sending countries (2013, 433).

The current migration-development nexus is failing to take into account the global structural conditions associated with modern day migration, such as the impacts of neoliberal globalization. Wise, Covarrubias and Puentes present four crucial effects neoliberal globalization has had on migration and development. Moreover, they highlight that uneven global economic development has caused forced migration, immigrants contribute to the development of receiving countries but are faced with labour precarity and social exclusion, the emigration of citizens contributes to the source country's unemployment issues and precarious stability in the short-term, and that most importantly, the promotion of development through other facets instead of migration can prevent this situation of forced migration (Wise, Covarrubias & Puentes, 2013, 438-439).

Neoliberal globalization is characterized by "(i) a strong pressure to emigrate given the lack of job opportunities in sending areas and (ii) the growing vulnerability and extreme exploitation of migrant workers in origin, transit and destination countries" (Wise, Covarrubias & Puentes, 2013, 432). It is within this context that the focus on remittances as a development source exists, an idea that, as this research paper has shown, essentially means that "some of the world's most exploited workers should provide the capital for development, where official aid programmes have failed" (Castles & Miller, 2009, 58). It is the idea that the most vulnerable members of global society must "carry the burden of their countries' failed development policies" (de Haas, 2013, 170).

As has been alluded to throughout this research paper, the current migration-development nexus is arguably a resurgence of modernization theories of development. Moreover, current approaches to migration and development are demonstrating a resurgence of the optimism present during the neoclassical and modernization phase of the migration-development nexus during the 1960s (Faist & Fauser, 2011, 7). To recall, modernization theories are premised on the belief that "the outflow of labour migrants from the underdeveloped and rural regions is beneficial because it will lead to more balanced distribution of capital and labour that furthers economic development in the out-migration region" (van Naerssen, Spaan & Zoomers, 2008, 4). This framework is based on the belief that migration is voluntary. It can be argued that the current migration-development nexus, with its enthusiasm towards diasporas and remittances, is a resurgence of the neoclassical underpinnings of modernization theory, given that governments and international organizations encourage migration to solve both issues of unemployment in the Global South and the need for labour in the Global North. This resurgence of neoclassical and modernization approaches to migration and development is concerning, given that these frameworks ignore the structural conditions that underpin international migration such as underdevelopment and unequal power relations. This resurgence is also concerning given that modernization theories were premised on the belief that underdeveloped countries were a result of "backwards" or "traditional" ideas, and that countries could modernize by adopting practices and policies of the Global North; this is argued by Castles and Miller to be seen in the idea of social remittances, since they promote the dissemination of knowledge and values from the Global North to the Global South (2009, 76).

CONCLUSIONS: THE NEED TO REFRAME THE MIGRATION-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

It is important to critically examine how current approaches to migration and development are embedded within wider issues of poverty, underdevelopment, and inequality. Through a critical development studies framework, this research paper has highlighted the implications of the disconnect between theories of migration and theories of development. Furthermore, this research paper has demonstrated that the current approach to migration and development, which puts a significant emphasis on the power of remittances, has been developed without accounting for the structural conditions created by unequal neoliberal globalization that have caused the extent of international migration we are seeing in today's global economy. Focussing on the power of diasporas and their remittances as a form of development ignores the forced dislocation migrants face, given the lack of development, both social and economic, within their own countries. Given increasing restrictive immigration policies of the Global North, migrants then enter into the global workforce as a vulnerable and highly exploitable labour force.

It was the goal of this research paper to demonstrate the implications of the current migration-development nexus and to highlight the need for the migration-development nexus to be reframed in order to promote equitable and sustainable global development. While remittances are an increasing global monetary flow, "their singular significance should not be exaggerated" (Brown, 2006, 73). Remittances alone cannot stimulate development, be it social or economic development (Brinkerhoff, 2008; de Haas, 2013; Mitchell, 2006). As de Haas highlights, "the extent to which migrants will spend in, invest in, and return to their origin countries depends on general investment conditions, political stability, and overall trust in future development. Paradoxically, development is therefore a *prerequisite* for investment" (2013, 188). de Haas aptly illustrates this argument by stating that "governments of sending and receiving countries have become overly obsessed with maximizing remittances while generally ignoring the basic necessity to first create a fertile soil where the remittance seeds can be sown" (2013, 189). In order for remittances to have any long-term, compounded effects in source countries, the proper social and economic conditions need to be in place to facilitate the investment of remittances (Martin, 2013).

The key issue with the current approach to migration and development is that migration and development are being seen "in isolation from wider issues of global, power, wealth and inequality" (Castles, 2009, 23). Migration and development have not been theorized in connection to human-rights based approaches to labour migration (Piper & Yamanaka, 2008). Unless a human rights approach is adopted, "the root causes of forced migration will remain in place" (Wise, Cobarrubias & Puentes, 2013, 437). A focus on remittances neglects to promote long-term, sustainable development. In addition, current approaches to migration tend to focus more on the benefits and impacts for receiving countries, not for source countries (Portes, 2013); this is indicative of current global inequality. Debates on migration and development to date have been dominated by major migrant-receiving Northern nations and international financial organizations (Wise, Covarrubias & Puentes, 2013); it is crucial that Southern governments and civil society organizations, such as labour organizations, take a lead role in the development of a new migration and development framework. A migration and development framework which does not account for global inequalities and power dynamics cannot lead to equitable, long-term sustainable development. As highlighted by critical development studies, development is not possible unless social justice and equity are extended to all.

REFERENCES

Abdih, Y. et al. (2012). Remittances and institutions: Are remittances a curse? *World Development, 40*(4), 657-666.

Abreu, A. (2012). The New Economics of Labour Migration: Beware of neoclassicals bearing gifts. *Forum for Social Economics*, 41(1), 46-67.

Arya, S. & Roy, A. (2006). "When Poor Women Migrate: Unravelling Issues and Concerns". In Arya, S. & Roy, A., eds. *Poverty, Gender and Migration*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Asis, M., Huang, S., & Yeoh, B. (2004). When the light of the home is abroad: Unskilled female migration and the Filipino family. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 25(2), 198-215.

Baggio, F. & Asis, M. (2008). "Global workers, Local Philanthropists: Filipinos in Italy and the Tug of Home". In van Naerssen, T., Spaan, E., & Zoomers, A., eds. *Global Migration and Development*. New York: Routledge.

Bauder, H. & Gilbert, G. (2009). Representations of labour migration in Guatemalan and American media. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 8(2), 278-303.

Berberoglu, B. (2011). "The Centrality of Class in Critical Development Studies". In Veltmeyer, H., ed. *The Critical Development Studies Handbook: Tools for Change*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Bhushan, A. (2013). Beyond Aid: Trade, investment, and remittances between Canada and developing countries. North-South Institute. Retrieved July 15, 2014, from http://www.nsi-ins.ca/publications/beyond-aid-canadas-development-framework/.

Brinkerhoff, J.M. (2008). "The Potential of Diasporas and Development". In Brinkerhoff, J.M., ed. *Diasporas & Development: Exploring the Potential*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Brown, S. (2006). Can remittances spur development? A critical survey. *International Studies Review*, 8, 55-75.

Cannella, G.S. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2009). "Deploying Qualitative Methods for Critical Social Purposes". In Denzin, N. & Giardana, M., eds. *Qualitative Inquiry and Social Justice: Towards a Politics of Hope*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Castaneda, E. (2012). Living in limbo: Transnational households, remittances, and development. *International Migration*, 51 (s1), e13-e35.

Castles, S. (2009). Development and Migration--Migration and Development: What comes first? Global perspective and African experiences. *Theoria*, 56(121), 1-31.

Castles, S. & Miller, M.J. (2009). *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World, 4th ed*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cohen, J.H. (2005). Remittance outcomes and migration: theoretical contests, real opportunities. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 40(1), 88-112.

Cohen, J.H. & Sirkeci, I. (2011). *Cultures of Migration: The Global Nature of Contemporary Mobility*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Cortina, J. & Ochoa-Reza, E. (2013). "Women, Children and Migration: Developmental Considerations". In Cortina, J. & Ochoa-Reza, E., eds. *New Perspectives on International Migration and Development*. New York: Columbia University Press.

de Haas, H. (2013). "Migration and Development: Lessons from the Moroccan Experience". In Cortina, J. & Ochoa-Reza, E., eds. *New Perspectives on International Migration and Developmen*t. New York: Columbia University Press.

de la Garza, R. O. (2013). "The Impact of Migration on Development: Explicating the Role of the State". In Cortina, J. & Ochoa-Reza, E., eds. *New Perspectives on International Migration and Developmen*t. New York: Columbia University Press.

DeWind, J. & Ergun, D. (2013). "Development and Migration: Historical Trends and Future Research". In Cortina, J. & Ochoa-Reza, E., eds. *New Perspectives on International Migration and Developmen*t. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dreby, J. (2010). *Divided by Borders: Mexican Migrants and their Children*. University of California Press: Berkeley.

Eckstein, S. (2013). "Immigrants from Developing Countries: An Overview of their Homeland Impacts". In Eckstein, S.E. & Najam, A. eds. *How Immigrants Impact Their Homelands*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Faist, T. & Fauser, M. (2011). "The Migration-Development Nexus: Toward a Transnational Perspective". In Faist, T., Fauser, M. & Kivisto, P., eds. *The Migration-Development Nexus: A Transnational Perspective*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fantino , J. (February 2013). Speaking Notes for the Honourable Julian Fantion, Minister of International Cooperation, for Saskatchewan and Global Food Security Forum. Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada. Retrieved July 29, 2014, from http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/acdi-cida.nsf/eng/NAT-269234-JVG.

Fantino, J. (March 2013). Julian Fantino: Why CIDA Merged with Foreign Affairs. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved July 29, 2014, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/julian-fantino-why-cida-merged-with-foreign-affairs/article10343567/.

Fitzgerald, D.S. (2013). "Immigrant Impacts in Mexico: A Tale of Dissimilation". In Eckstein, S.E. & Najam, A., eds. *How Immigrants Impact Their Homelands*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Gaye, A. & Jha, S. (2011). Measuring Women's Empowerment through Migration. *Diversities*, 13(1), 49-66.

Ghosh, J. (2009). "Migration and Gender Empowerment: Recent Trends and Emerging Issues". Munich Personal RePEc Archive. Retrieved July 15, 2014, from http://mrpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/19181/.

Gomm, R. (2008). *Social Research Methodology: A Critical Introduction, 2nd ed*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Irving, J., Mohapatra, S., & Ratha, D. (2010). Migrant Remittance Flows: Findings from a Global Survey of Central Banks. World Bank: Washington.

Iskander, N. (2013). "Morrocan Migrants as Unlikely Captains of Industry: Remittances, Financial Intermediation, and La Banque Centrale Populaire". In Eckstein, S.E. & Najam, A., eds. *How Immigrants Impact Their Homelands*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Jennings, A. & Clarke, M. (2005). The development impact of remittances to Nicaragua. *Development in Practice, 15*(5), 685-691.

Kandel, W., & Kao, G. (2001). The impact of temporary labor migration on Mexican children's educational aspirations and performance. *International Migration Review, 35*(4), 1205-1231.

Kivisto, P. (2011). "Modernization, Development and Migration in a Sceptical Age". In Faist, T., Fauser, M. & Kivisto, P., eds. *The Migration-Development Nexus: A Transnational Perspective*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kofman, E. (2004). Gendered global migrations. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 6(4), 643-665.

Koser, K. (2009*).* "International Migration and Development". In *Introduction to International Development: Approaches, Actors and Issues* by Haslam, P., Schafer, J., & Beaudet, P., ed. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

Kunz, R. (2008). 'Remittances are beautiful'? Gender implications of the new global remittances trend. *Third World Quarterly, 29*(7), 1389.

Lan, P. (2003). Maid or Madam? Filipina migrant workers and the continuity of domestic labour. *Gender and Society*, 17(2), 187-208.

Levitt, P. & Lamba-Nieves, D. (2013). "Bringing Culture Back In: Opportunities and Challenges for the Migration-Development Nexus". In Cortina, J. & Ochoa-Reza, E., eds. *New Perspectives on International Migration and Developmen*t. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lucas, R.E.B. (2005). *International Migration and Economic Development: Lessons from Low-Income Countries*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Mahmud, H., Sabur, A., & Tamanna, S. (2009). International migration, remittances, and development. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 2(1), 1544-1559.

Martin, P. (2013). "Asian Migration to the United States: Development Implications for Asia". In Cortina, J. & Ochoa-Reza, E., eds. *New Perspectives on International Migration and Developmen*t. New York: Columbia University Press.

Matejowsky, T. (2012). "Labour Migration, Overseas Remittances, and Local Outcomes in the Contemporary Philippines". In Sirkeci, I., Cohen, J.H., & Ratha, D. *Migration and Remittances during the Global Financial Crisis and Beyond*. Washington: The World Bank.

Mertens, D.M. (2005). *Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Mitchell, S. (2006). Migration and the remittance euphoria: Development or dependency? *New Economics Foundation*, London: United Kingdom.

Monzon, L. & Tudakovic, E. (2004). Remittances: A Canadian Perspective. Toronto: Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

Morrison, A.R., Schiff, M., & Sjöblom, M., eds. (2008). *The International Migration of Women*. New York: The World Bank and Palgrave Macmillan.

Mughal, M. (2013). Remittances as development strategy: Stepping stones or slippery slope? *Journal of International Development, 25*(4), 583-595.

Ngoma, A.L. & Ismail, N.W. (2013). Do migrant remittances promote human capital formation? Evidence from 89 developing countries. *Migration and Development*, 2(1), 106-116.

Nobles, J. (2011). Parenting from abroad: Migration, non-resident father involvement, and children's education in Mexico. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 73*(4), 729-746.

Oishi, N. (2002). *Gender and Migration: An Integrative Approach*. San Diego: University of California.

Orozco, M. (2013). *Migrant Remittances and Development in the Global Economy*. Boulder: Lynne Reinner Publishers.

Orozco, M. (2008). "Diasporas and Development: Issues and Impediments". In Brinkerhoff, J.M., ed. *Diasporas & Development: Exploring the Potential*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Pagaduan, M.C. (2006). "Leaving Home: Filipino Women Surviving Migration". In Arya, S. & Roy, A., eds. *Poverty, Gender and Migration*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Pang, M. (2013). Temporary Foreign Workers: Background Paper. Retrieved from http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/ResearchPublications/2013-11-e.htm#a17

Paradis, C. (December 2013). Statement by Minister Paradis: Development as an Integral Part of Canadian Foreign an Trade Policy. Retrieved July 29, 2014, from http://www.international.gc.ca/media/dev/speeches discours/2013/12/05a.aspx?lang=eng.

Parrenãs, R.S. (2013). "The Gender Revolution in the Philippines: Migrant Mothering and Social Transformations". In Eckstein, S.E. & Najam, A., eds. *How Immigrants Impact Their Homelands*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Parrenãs, R.S. (2008). *The Force of Domesticity: Filipina Migrants and Globalization*. New York: New York University Press.

Parrenãs, R.S. (2000). Migrant Filipina domestic workers and the international division of reproductive labour. *Gender and Society*, 14(4), 560-581.

Pessar, P.R. (2005). "Women, Gender and International Migration Across and Beyond the Americas: Inequalities and Limited Empowerment". United Nations. Retrieved online http://www.un.org/esa/population/migration/turin/Symposium_Turin_files/P08_Pessar.pdf

Piper, N. & Yamanaka, K. (2008). Feminized Migration in East and Southeast Asia and the Securing of Livelihoods. In Piper, N. (Ed.), *New Perspectives on Gender and Migration: Livelihood, Rights, and Entitlements* (pp. 159-188). London: Routledge.

Ratha, D. (2005). Remittances: A lifeline for development. *Finance & Development, 42*(4), 42-43.

Schiller, N.G. (2011). "A Global Perspective on Migration and Development". In Faist, T., Fauser, M. & Kivisto, P., eds. *The Migration-Development Nexus: A Transnational Perspective*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schafer, J., Haslam, P. & Beaudet, P. (2009). "Meaning Measurement, and Morality in International Development". In *Introduction to International Development: Approaches, Actors and Issues* by Haslam, P., Schafer, J., & Beaudet, P., ed. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

Solimano, A. (2010). *International Migration in the Age of Crisis and Globalization: Historical and Recent Experiences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spencer, S. (2011). *The Migration Debate*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Stasiulus, D. K. & Bakan, A.B. (2003). *Negotiating Citizenship: Migrant Women in Canada and the Global System*. New York: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Stilwell, F. (2006). *Political Economy: The Contest of Economic Ideas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sutherland, P. (2013). Migration is development: How migration matters to the post-2015 debate. *Migration and Development*, 2(2), 151-156.

Taylor, J.E. (1999). The New Economics of Labour Migration and the Role of Remittances in the Migration Process. *International Migration*, 37(1), 63-88.

Tyner, J. (1999). The global context of gendered labour migration from the Philippines to the United States. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 42(4), 671-689.

Unheim, P. & Rowlands, D. (2012). Micro-level determinants of remittances from recent migrants to Canada. *International Migration, 50*(4), 124-139.

Vammen, I. & Bronden, B. (2012). Donor-country responses to the Migration–Development buzz: From ambiguous concepts to ambitious policies? *International Migration, 50*(3), 26-42.

van Naerssen, T., Spaan, E., & Zoomers, A., eds. (2008). *Global Migration and Development*. New York: Routledge.

Vasapollo, L. (2011). "Aid, Debt and Trade: In the Vortex of Capitalist Development." In Veltmeyer, H., ed. *The Critical Development Studies Handbook: Tools for Change*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Veltmeyer, H., ed. (2011). *The Critical Development Studies Handbook: Tools for Change*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Weir, A. (2008). Global care chains: freedom, responsibility, and solidarity. *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 46(S1), 166-175.

Wise, R. & Covarrubias, H. (2011). "The Dialectic between Uneven Development and Forced Migration: Toward a Political Economy Framework". In Faist, T., Fauser, M. & Kivisto, P., eds. *The Migration-Development Nexus: A Transnational Perspective*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wise, R., Covarrubias, H., & Puentes, R. (2013). Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights. *Population, Space and Place*, 19, 430-443.

World Bank. (2013). Migration and Remittance Flows: Recent Trends and Outlook, 2013-2016. *Migration and Development Brief*, 21.

Yang, D. (2011). Migrant remittances. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives, 25*(3), 129-151.

Yeates, N. (2009). Production for export: the role of the state in the development and operation of global care chains. *Population, Space and Place*, 15, 175-187.