Both in the Global North and South, labour-related circular migration is on the rise. However, an integrated view on multilocality in both contexts is wanting. Addressing this gap and based on primary and secondary data, this paper identifies key structural factors shaping labour-related circular migration in both South and North: economic transformation, spatial structures, transportation/communication technology, societal modernisation. It ascertains the important (albeit dissimilar) role of households in motivating multilocal living arrangements at both ends. Different spatio-temporal patterns and socio-economic characteristics of the involved households in countries of the North and South are related to dissimilar effects of the structural factors in each context.

1. Introduction

Circular migration and multilocal living arrangements are on the rise both in the developing and developed world. This is reflected in an increasing body of literature about non-permanent migration and multilocality in both contexts.

For the Global South, although few national statistics capture circular migration, recent case studies have pointed towards its increasing importance particularly in Africa and Asia (e.g. Steinbrink 2009 for South Africa, Greiner 2008 for Namibia, Deshingkar and Farrington 2009 for India). In countries with fast urbanisation rural-urban migration has constantly grown throughout the last decades (Deshingkar 2005). In China, there were at least 120 million temporary migrants before the outbreak of the world economic crisis of whom many retain strong linkages to their rural areas of origin (Schmidt-Kallert 2009: 323, IOM 2008).

In Western Europe, the importance of multilocal living arrangements has been studied
with respect to several countries. For Germany it was shown that between 1996 and 2004 the number of workers with secondary residences increased by 12% to 357,000 persons (Statistisches Bundesamt 2005: 61). The most recent Survey of Income and Expenditure (EVS) suggests that the upward trend is still continuing (Braun 2009). Similar trends can be expected in other Western European countries like Britain, the Netherlands and France (e.g. Green et al. 1999, van der Klis and Mulder 2008, Bertaux-Wiame and Tripier 2006).

Although in both spatial contexts, on an aggregate national scale, circular migration applies only to a minor fraction of the working people in certain economically weak cities or regions, the quantitative incidence of circular migration is much higher. In addition, this paper shows that in both North and South the actual relevance of this type of movement reaches beyond the number of circular migrants themselves since other (non-commuting) household/family members are involved in the living arrangement.

In this article we argue that circular migration and multilocality in the South and in the North should be looked at jointly. Although there are common underlying factors, until now an integrated view linking the theoretical and empirical discussions of both research strands is still wanting. Using case study analyses from Germany and several countries in the South, mainly in Sub-Saharan Africa, we suggest that multilocational households in both South and North are invariably conditioned by (albeit contextually differing) technological innovations in the areas of transport and communication and are linked to certain features of post-industrial development, i.e. tertiarisation, economic globalisation and flexibilisation of work relations.

These commonalities notwithstanding there are also important differences between multilocality in the North and South. These pertain, for instance, to dissimilar individual or household motivations and decision-making processes and to different spatial patterns. Patterns of circular migration undoubtedly testify national space economies with distinct historical pathways former colonisers and colonies respectively underwent.

The main objective of this paper is to merge the two research strands and to develop an integrated view on labour-related multilocality and circular migration. Key structural factors of circular migration and multilocational living arrangements as well as features pertaining to the involved individuals and households will be identified. In so doing, the main commonalities and differences of circular migration and multilocational households will be pointed out.

Traditionally, in population geography circulation and circular movements have been conceived as a form of spatial mobility which does not involve a change of residence and which starts and ends at the place of residence, e.g. in connection with daily work journeys (Bähr et al. 1992: 817). Consequently, circular forms of spatial mobility that relate to long-distance trips and that induce temporary relocation were not considered. The key factors and features outlined in this paper suggest that labour-related circular migration and multilocational living arrangements form part of broader patterns of a “new geography of migration” (Hillmann 2010: 5ff.) which as yet has been predominantly related to international migration flows.

In the subsequent Section 2, after outlining the current relevance of circular migration, the methodological proceeding will be explained. In Section 3, structural factors of circular migration in the South and North will be explained. Section 4 describes spatio-temporal patterns. Then key features and functions of circular migration on the individual and household level will be outlined (Section 5).
2. Data

With regard to the Global South, research on multilocational living arrangements has hitherto mainly drawn on case studies, of which many are a result of a mix of quantitative and qualitative data (e.g. Steinbrink 2009, Greiner 2008). Also in this paper secondary data drawn from several case studies constitutes the main source of information. Complementary to these data, intensive exchange on patterns of migration and multilocality in Ghana and other African countries was undertaken during a number of seminar series and conferences since 2008 and conducted expert interviews with university staff, urban council members and city planners in the context of a field trip to Kumasi, Ghana, in 2009.

For investigating characteristics of job-induced multilocality in the Global North, this paper draws on information related to Germany due to data availability. The empirical findings are based on a survey on in-movers in four cities: Munich, Stuttgart, Dusseldorf and Berlin (see Reuschke 2010a). The population of the random sample consisted of persons who, at the time of the drawing of the sample, were aged 25 to 59 and who had moved to the study areas during the previous five years. Altogether, about 10,500 persons were contacted, about 1,700 of them at their secondary residence. Out of a total of 2,007 valid questionnaires, 226 persons could be classified as circular migrants who commute between two residences for work reasons. It has to be noted that, firstly, persons working in the study areas without an official secondary residence and those who had been living in job-related secondary residences in the respective study areas for six years and longer were not included in the sample. Secondly, only core cities of metropolitan regions were selected. Consequently, the survey analysis allows no general statement about the spatial patterns of multilocality in Germany.

The findings of the quantitative data analysis were cross-checked and complemented by semi-structured telephone interviews which were conducted with 20 circular migrants in 2009. We shall refer to this survey as ‘in-movers survey’ in the following; for a more detailed discussion of the sample design and its restrictions see Reuschke 2010a, b.

3. A Structural Perspective on Circular Migration

Both the Global North and South have a long tradition of circular migration. Also, in both spatial contexts circular migration has undergone important changes in terms of its quantitative significance and personal features over time. The reasons why individuals are involved in circular migration both in the North and South through different periods of time are closely linked to the following key structural factors:

- Economic transformations;
- Spatial structures;
- Improvements in transportation and communication technology;
- Societal modernisation.

These factors are also essential in Zelinsky’s (1971) concept of mobility transformation. However, they play out quite differently in the respective spatial contexts. Moreover, as will be shown, the analysis of the context factors of circular migration also reveals that multilocational householding in the Global South stands in contrast to Zelinsky’s notion of circular mobility as a product of modernisation, urbanisation and industrialisation. The structural factors and their differing impact in the Global South and North are summarised in Table 1 and will be described in greater detail in the following sub-sections.
3.1 Economic transformations

Circular migration is related to very different economic transformation and development processes in the Global North and South. In the South, the primary sector has always been a major force for multilocal household structures, whilst the influence of the secondary sector was confined to a few spatial and sectoral niches, except in some of the emerging economies such as China, India and Brazil. In contrast, in the North circular migration was largely shaped by industrialisation and industrial work relations. Here, industrialisation and the rise of coal and related heavy industries prompted significant numbers of circular migrants at the end of the 19th cen-
tury/beginning of the 20th century, predominantly poor workers from the countryside. For most of the migrants’ households, agricultural home production was crucial for their survival (Niethammer and Brüggemeier 1976). It is assumed that in Germany, especially in the Ruhr Area, mining and related heavy industries triggered extremely high numbers of, for example, Polish workers with temporary shared accommodation (Oltmer 2010).

In contrast, in the Global South constraints related to agriculture-based economies have led to large circular population movements since pre-colonial times. These at times long-distance movements primarily occurred on a seasonal basis, with people following livestock and crops in search for new land and pastures (Lynch 2005: 103). Circular migration continued to play an important role in the spatial economy of colonial times in which “the economic lives of the people of Africa, Asia and Latin America began to revolve around the European-controlled mines, plantations and port-cities on the coast” (Lynch 2005: 98f.). In South Africa, from the 1920s onwards and reinforced during the apartheid period, a circular labour migration system was imposed preventing non-white people to settle in the urban areas outside of a work contract (Steinbrink 2009: 163ff.). In West and East Africa the development of agricultural ‘cash crop’ production in the 1960s, such as cocoa in Ghana, prompted large flows of internal as well as cross-border labour migration including circular migrants (Konseiga 2005: 2, Sawers 1989: 842f.).

Tertiarisation and globalisation have contributed to the recent rise of circular migration in both spatial contexts, although they have materialised very differently. In the Global North during Fordism/First Modernity circular migration lost its quantitative importance although it has continued to be an income-generating strategy in structurally weak regions in Germany and Austria (e.g. Vielhaber 1987, Junker 1992). Its resurgence during recent years relates to the development of a globalised knowledge-based economy and related trends towards the flexibilisation of work. Both internal and external flexibilisation (e.g. relocation of branches, fixed-term and temporary contracts) have contributed to higher geographical mobility demands in the labour market (Beck 1999; Hardill and Wheatley 2010). Moreover, the globalisation of the economy contributes to growing numbers of expatriates who commute back and forth between firm’s headquarters and branch plants abroad (Kreutzer and Roth 2006).

In many African and Asian countries precarious tertiarisation, e.g. urban informal petty-trade linked with a declining importance of agriculture for people’s subsistence, has formed an economic background condition of circular migration. The latter has thus continued to form a necessary means for people’s and household’s survival. A few countries in East and Southeast Asia (e.g. China, Vietnam, Thailand) have become key locations for export-based manufacturing attracting large circular migrant populations from the rural areas. Some of these transnational industries, but also globalised (e.g. domestic or tourist) services have prompted an increasing demand for female workforce, often circular migrants from rural areas (Deshingkar 2005: 10).

3.2 Spatial structures

Historically, both in the Global North and South the evolution of circular migration was related to processes of urbanisation. However, while in the Global North in the second half of the 19th century circular migration and urbanisation were by-products of industrialisation, in the Global South the opposite is true: Urbanisation without industrialisation has constituted the key structural framework for persisting circular migration flows which contradicts Zelinsky’s mobility scenario.
Since the 1950s and 1960s, following independence in most African and Asian countries, urbanisation accelerated, which in many countries was associated with import substitution strategies (Sawers 1989: 843, Schmidt-Kallert 1994: 44). Many national governments pursued growth pole policies attempting to decentralise industrial growth towards secondary cities (Douglass 1998: 2). However, in most countries the dominating (often mega-)cities remained the principal employment centres and thus attracted the largest population movements (Lynch 2005: 104, Sawers 1989: 849). Thus, in spatial terms, strong interregional – mostly rural-urban – disparities have strongly influenced mobility patterns. In the context of urbanisation without (industrial) growth and urban informalisation maintaining a ‘foothold on the farm’ through circular migration has come out to be vital for people’s survival (de Haan 1999: 13). This is also true for countries in, for example, Southeast Asia in which growing export-led industries are attracting rural migrants, but limited work contracts or residence regulations forestall permanent urban residence (IOM 2008). Living in informal urban settlements in Southern metropolises can be considered a further enabling factor for the maintenance of (social, economic, cultural) rural-urban connectedness since in these settlements family- and home-town-related networks converge (e.g. Steinbrink 2009).

While in the South precarious urbanisation shaped (and partly enabled) multilocal living arrangements, in the Global North cities’ specialisation towards leading economic sectors plays a more important role. Here, tertiarisation and the transformation from an industrial to a knowledge-based economy have contributed to the concentration of white-collar jobs and high-skilled jobs in post-industrial core cities and regions during the past decade (Florida 2002, Granato et al. 2009). These post-industrial spatial trends are underpinned by location policies on different scales that support the development of clusters, e.g. enterprise zones in Britain. As a consequence, economic specialisation of regions and the concentration of certain occupations, e.g. media in Hamburg and Berlin or banking and consulting in Frankfurt, have grown as in other Western economies (Jones and Green 2009: 2475). It can be assumed that this, in turn, contributes to circular migration in certain high-skilled occupations.

3.3 Transportation and communication technology

Transformations in information and communication technologies (e.g. mobile phone, internet) as well as improvements in road and electricity networks constituted important facilitators of circular labour migration in Asia and Africa (e.g. Douglass 2006). Similarly, the steep rise of virtual mobility of the broader public connected with ‘time-space-compression’ due to the vast extension of high-speed transportation connections have strongly impacted on individuals’ mobility behaviour in the Global North (Harvey 1989).

Improvement of road infrastructure and transport connections has spurred geographic mobility in Africa and Asia in general. Moreover, decentralisation processes have promoted increased infrastructure investments in more peripheral regions, favouring short-term and short-distance migration to these regions (IOM 2008: 180, Owusu 2005: 56). It can be assumed that a large part of this migration is circular. Moreover, communication and exchange relations between spatially split family members have been facilitated by the extension of telephone and electricity grids in this same context (IOM 2008).

While in the South, there seems to be a positive association between the extension and improvement of transportation and communication technology and circular migration, the effects on peo-
ple’s mobility patterns in the Global North are less clear. Mass motorisation in the 1950s and 1960s led to the remarkable geographical expansion of daily work trips at the expense of circu-
lar and permanent migration. Since most of the countries in the Global North are undergoing considerable economic and social change, however, technological improvements in the area of communication (email, mobile phones, skype etc.) and transportation (dense networks of high-
speed trains/highways, low-cost carrier etc.) fa-
cilitate long-distance travel, circular population movements and fast communication not only in some hubs but also in the periphery. Like in the South, cheap and fast communication enables ‘close’ connections to the place of origin thereby favouring decisions for circular migration and multilocational householding.

3.4 Societal modernisation

Given Zelinsky’s intention to link mobility transition to the theory of the demographic transition, he emphasised the significance of fertility and mortality trends for the transfor-
mation of individuals’ geographical mobili-
ty. To explain the current rise of multiloca-
tional household structures in both the Glo-
bal North and South, however, changing so-
cial norms and attitudes regarding female roles, mobility and employment can be con-
sidered as key factors (Hardill 2002, Reuschke 2010a). In Western industrialised countries the rising female participation in higher education and qualified work has con-
tributed to changing work patterns of house-
holds (dual-earner households, dual-career households). There is ample empirical evi-
dence that the growing number of dual-earn-
er couples hampers interregional migration (e.g. Jürges 2006, Jarvis 1999). Under these conditions, circular migration between two residences emerges as an alternative to permanent migration and spatial immobility. In the Global South, an increased labour partic-
ipation of women has been a major driver for the increasing feminisation of migration. The latter is associated with a departure from perma-
nent migration patterns (IOM 2008: 184). Sim-
ilar to the North, the enhanced participation of women in the labour market has been stimulat-
ed by their improved access to education and enhanced autonomy (Beauchemin 2011: 57). However, in many cases the increase of the number of dual breadwinner households is con-
straint-driven, for example, by the need to sup-
plement the income raised by male household members through work in the informal sector (IOM 2008: 184). Employment opportunities in global manufacturing plants, domestic services or tourist resorts have also incited women’s cir-
cular migration between city and countryside (Deshingkar 2005, IOM 2008: 185). In post-
Apartheid South Africa, circular migration has permitted female and male migrants to recon-
cile ambitions for urban and more modern life-
styles and assets with traditional norms of collectivism (Collinson et al. 2006: 195).

4. Spatio-Temporal Patterns

Data limitations notwithstanding, it can be said that both in the developing and developed world labour-related circular migration is directed to-
wards urban employment centres. In Southeast Asian countries and China, with fast urbanisa-
tion and increased manufacturing, rural-urban circular migration constitutes the fastest grow-
ing type of migration (Deshingkar 2005: 10). But also in countries with less industrialisation, circular movements to and from the largest cit-
ties are important, since these cities offer most (often informal) job opportunities (IOM 2008, Owusu 2005). Once arrived in urban destina-
tion areas, rural-urban migrants tend to move to the disadvantaged and often informal neighbour-
bhoods at or beyond the urban edge (Greiner 2008: 155, Landau 2010: 7).
Several countries have witnessed increased, also circular, population flows towards small- and medium-sized cities (Satterthwaite and Tacoli 2005, Lynch 2005). In a number of countries infrastructure investments have enhanced the accessibility of these cities and improved options for their economic development, e.g. as regional market places for agricultural produce (IOM 2008: 180, Owusu 2005: 56).

In contrast, urban-urban circular migration seems to be of greater importance in the case of Germany. However, due the high level of urbanisation in Germany compared to, for example, countries like Britain and France with a large share of rural areas, no general conclusions can be drawn for the Global North in this respect. In Germany circular migrants primarily work in the economically stronger regions in the Southwest (Statistisches Bundesamt 2005: 61). According to the conducted own survey (Reuschke 2010a) labour-related multilocality shows a diverse picture regarding the size of the circular migrants’ place of origin measured by the number of inhabitants (Fig. 1) and the settlement structure (Fig. 2). It should be recalled that the study areas – which are the circular migrants’ place of work in the vast majority of the investigated cases – are cities with 500,000 inhabitants and more at the time of data collection. Despite this limitation, the empirical findings clearly demonstrate a differentiation of circular migration patterns in spatial terms compared to the dominant rural-urban circulation flows in the Global South. About half of the respondents in the sample commute between two agglomerations, and more than one in three respondents live at either residence in a city with 100,000 inhabitants and more.

In terms of spatio-temporality, a significant number of the investigated circular migrants in Germany commute on a weekly basis over a relatively short distance between the two domiciles which, in turn, makes weekly commuting possible. This can be explained by the importance of social ties to partners, children and/or parent/s (see Section 5). In fact, half of the commuters of the in-movers sample commute over a distance like between Stuttgart and Munich (median = 218 km). A quarter of the sample commute ca. 100 km. Correspondingly,
this type of circulation often takes place within the same federal state.

In the Global South circular migration involves movements of both short and longer distances (IOM 2008: 176). In case studies on rural-urban migration and translocality in South Africa and on migrant networks in Namibia the distance between the rural home villages and the urban (informal) places of residence is often more than 1000 km (Steinbrink 2009, Greiner 2008). Against this background and also due to the limited economic means of the studied circular migrants, visits back home by bus occur rather rarely, usually once a year (e.g. during the Christmas holidays). According to Steinbrink (2009: 394ff.), these visits ‘back home’, however, form a constitutive element of both material and symbolic engagement towards the rural-based family members and community, hence of the entire multilocational living arrangement. In many countries circular migration continues to follow seasonal patterns, e.g. with urban-based household members returning to their home areas in peak agricultural seasons (Schmidt-Kallert 2009).

The recent literature suggests that living practices of a rising number of people and households have become progressively transnational (e.g. Brickell and Datta 2011, Glorius 2007). Douglass (2006) suggests that a new phenomenon of ‘global householding’ has emerged that stretches much larger, overseas distances than ‘traditional’ patterns of (e.g. West African) regional cross-border migration. This trend is particularly relevant for certain world regions (e.g. Latin America, Southeast Asia) and corroborated by large and increasing amounts of international migrant remittances. For instance, remittances of Filipino workers have constantly increased since the 1990s and in 2010 totalled US$ 21 billion (The World Bank 2011).

In contrast, cross-country commuting can hardly be found in the German survey. This corresponds to the importance of frequent journeys to the main residence for the living arrangements. Whether this is a peculiarity of the German case or a bias of the sample design and whether transnational residential multilocality is a more significant phenomenon in other Western European countries could not be corroborated in the context of this survey.
5. Individual and Household-Related Aspects of Circular Migration

The following section will complement the former structural perspective by investigating characteristics of individuals and households involved in circular migration, as well as the functions of this mobility form in both North (principally drawing on the Germany case) and South. Table 2 summarises the key features.

5.1 Personal and household characteristics

Table 3 displays the main features of circular migrants for Germany in comparison to other population groups. It reveals distinct characteristics of persons who practice multilocational living arrangements in Germany: Male, young and highly-skilled workers have a high propensity to circulate between two residences for job reasons. The overrepresentation of men relates to the fact that women circulate less frequently than men when they have dependent children (not shown in Tab. 3).

In terms of gender, newer studies in Africa provide a complex picture of female circular migra-
tion in the South. Steinbrink’s study in South Africa corroborates general patterns identifying a large increase of women who moved within his case study area in the ten years prior to his study (Steinbrink 2009: 253, 279). Yet in terms of the evolution of the circular migration process in time, young male villagers looking for work seem to act as migration pioneers. Female migrants tend to first move a few years later and have more varied motivations, e.g. reunify with their partners, study or also search employment (Steinbrink 2009: 336). For females as much as males moving to the city however does not lead to a permanent stay there, but is rather interposed by shorter or longer moves back to the home village. In Burkina Faso, Beauchemin (2011: 57) has noted a strong increase in the circular migration of young single females who work in urban households for a few years and then return to their home villages.

With respect to social status, both Microcensus and primary data suggest for Germany that persons who circulate between two households for job reasons are a highly selective group (see Tab. 3). Within the context of the in-movers survey, the majority of circular migrants have a tertiary education degree.
Correspondingly, they work predominantly in highly qualified positions. Male circular migrants often work in finance, consulting and IT, while female circular migrants more frequently work in science and research than other female in-movers do. Also Microcensus data show that commuters with job-used secondary residences work more frequently in higher positions than daily commuters. At the same time, both datasets reveal that labour-related circular migration is not restricted to the highly qualified workforce and that the circulation of low qualified workers is also important in post-industrial/postmodern contexts.

In many countries of the Global South, too, circular migration is linked to employment in the service sector, however, most frequently in informal occupations. In Steinbrink’s South African case study the employment profile of circular migrants in working age shows that the large majority is occupied in the informal sector (30 %) and piece work (40 %), usually involving irregular and insecure working arrangements and very low income levels (Steinbrink 2009: 280). In some Asian countries export-led manufacturing sectors provide an important source of employment to circular migrants, albeit also predominantly in the low-income range.

5.2 Duration

Multilocalational living arrangements for job reasons tend to be rather of a transitional nature in Germany. In fact, the investigated circular migrants in the in-movers survey have been leading a multilocalational life for a median time of three years. Moreover, the circular migrants’ evaluation of the duration of their multilocalational living clearly shows that multilocalational household structures are considered as temporary arrangements. However, for some (especially men in a family household), circular migration is meant to be a longer-lasting period primarily due to the place attachment of the children.

In contrast to these findings, many authors have highlighted the long-term character of circular migration in Africa and Asia (e.g. de Haan 1999: 12, Schmidt-Kallert 2009: 330). In this respect, long-term means several decades up to a whole working life. The reasons are – again – structural constraints to make ends meet by concentrating on urban or rural livelihoods only with the consequence that circular migration is often practiced until a person’s retirement (Greiner 2008, Lynch 2005).

5.3 Motivations and functions

Both in the Global North and South, household relationships play an important role in multilocalational living arrangements. They are constitutive for people’s mobility decisions and motivations, as well as for the functioning of multilocality. While in the Global North partnership and core family relationships are most relevant, in the Global South extended family networks also play an instrumental role. These may not constitute ‘households’ in the sense of single production and consumption units (Greiner and Schnegg 2009: 255), but rather as reproduction unions tied together through mutual trust and obligations (Schmidt-Kallert 1994: 170).

In the Global South, multilocalational householding can be conceived as a strategy to enhance income accumulation and risk resilience (Lynch 2005: 102). It forms part of, and is made possible by, reciprocity relations between core and extended family members. For instance, urban household members support rural ones with sending money to purchase seeds, and, by migrating on a seasonal basis, with planting them. After the harvest, rural household members may assist the urban side of the family by sending food to the city (Schmidt-Kallert 2009). Apart from material exchange relations, also non-material ones play an important role. For instance, household members based in the (usually rural) home areas often fulfil an important social function for rearing small children and care for the
sick and elderly (Steinbrink 2009, Greiner 2008). Furthermore, transfers of knowledge and beliefs occur, as evidenced in Inkoom’s study on migrant networks and multilocality in Ghana. Here, the example of ‘successful’ migrants to the city of Kumasi incited villagers back home to undergo literacy training (Inkoom 2010).

While in the Global South socio-economic risk mitigation represents the main motivation, in Germany and in other countries of the Global North professional career paths and aspirations of highly skilled workers are the principal driving force for multilocality. Thus, in the South multilocational households are often the result of a lack of opportunities in the area of origin and help reducing family expenditures (e.g. with respect to urban life of an entire household). In contrast, in the North they rather raise living costs while accommodating the willingness/need of people in qualified and low professional positions to maintain their social status. Unlike in Africa and Asia, where the extended family forms part of the multilocational living arrangements, in Germany it is rather the partner or core family who stand behind decisions in favour of multilocational living arrangements. The same can be expected for other Western capitalist countries (e.g. Green et al. 1999, van der Klis and Mulder 2008). However, in Germany multilocational household structures also involve many single persons (see Tab. 3). For circular migrants in couple, family and single households alike, the attachment to the place of origin is intensified by home ownership. In the in-movers survey, the attachment to the place can only be attributed in the minority of the sample to the fact of being born at this place. A significant number of the investigated circular migrants have changed the places they call ‘home’ several times during the past years. Most importantly, the place of origin tends to be the former place of (higher) education or the former workplace where the circular migrants had already shared residence with their partners. On the contrary, case studies from the Global South suggest that the qualifier ‘home’ tends to be linked to family lineages, e.g. in Ghana to the mother’s or the father’s place of birth respectively.1

In Germany, also in view of the usual short-term duration of multilocational household organisation, circular migration frequently serves as ‘springboard for migration’ (Hunt 2006) or as transitional solution until an appropriate job close to the main place of residence can be found. On the contrary, case studies in the Global South suggest that only a fraction of rural-urban circular migrants manage to find formal employment and thereby secure a permanent stay in the city. Return migration leading to prolonged periods back ‘home’ or onward migration to third places constitute more likely scenarios (e.g. Beauchemin 2011).

6. Summary and Conclusions

In view of the increasing importance of multilocational living arrangements in the Global North and South the discussion of key influencing factors has shown that the ‘revolution’ in transport and communication technologies has decisively enlarged options for multilocational householding. Urbanisation processes at both ends have triggered circular migration in the last years. Also, economic restructuring, notably tertiarisation and economic globalisation, have accentuated and shaped circular migration processes and multilocational householding in both contexts. And finally, societal modernisation processes, most notably the feminisation of migration and female employment, provide important background factors for circular migration. Having said this, outcomes of the mentioned processes may considerably differ in the South and North. This becomes particularly clear with respect to tertiarisation and flexibilisation. In cities of the Global South both phenomena involve the persistence and at times intensification of economic informalisation. In ‘leading’ cities of the Global North we see the growth of (high-end, well-paid) formal services as
particular relevance for the increasing importance of multilocational households. Apart from structural context factors, we also see that both in the North and South households play a crucial role in decision-making processes leading to circular migration and multilocality.

At the same time, circular migration and multilocational living arrangements manifest quite differently in the South and North. Post-industrial economies show a greater variety in places and individual lifestyles involved in multilocational householding compared to the Global South. Here, circular migration predominantly connects rural and urban areas and tends to involve poor households. While in the South, multilocational householding can primarily be considered a survival and risk mitigation strategy in the North multilocational living tends to be associated with career and lifestyle aspirations of relatively well-paid and educated persons. Since multilocational household structures are much more constraints-driven in the South than in the North, the living arrangement is more likely to prompt long-distance, at times transnational, movements with associated rare commutes than in the North. Here, relatively short and weekly commutes appear to be pivotal. The household plays an important role for explaining decisions in favour of multilocality at both ends. Whereas in the North, this arrangement predominantly involves the core family or partner, in many countries of the South, certain members of both core and extended families have a say. The latter indicates the influence of organisational networks beyond the household as a production unit on (e.g. chain) migration patterns and migration-sustained social and economic reproduction in these countries.

This paper is meant as a starting point for a joint consideration of multilocational households in the North and South. In the light of the important differences between the two, it may be argued that multilocational living arrangements in the North and South are two structurally different phenomena and thus lend themselves to a comparative – rather than an integrated – study. At any rate, at both ends they can be considered key components and expressions of ‘new (global) geographies of migration’. The paper may thus serve as a point of departure for future reflections, of which the following seem to be of particular relevance:

1. With its focus on structural factors, as well as on individual or household motivations and arrangements shaping circular migration and multilocality, this paper has not considered factors at work at the (meso-)level of social organisation, in both geographic contexts. These may be formal or informal networks stretching beyond the core family shaping migration decisions and patterns (e.g. extended family, school and university friendships, home town associations, etc.).

2. By a binary consideration of multilocality in ‘the North’ versus ‘the South’, the considerable diversity of experiences within each of these contexts has not been systematically addressed. While such an endeavour encounters serious limitations due to the weak data basis it would be extremely useful for further isolating and explaining factors which lead to different outcomes in circular migration and multilocational householding at different levels of analysis. The article ought thus to be considered a starting point for more comparative studies which may look into more dimensions and might shed light on regional peculiarities both in the Global North and the Global South.

3. And finally, by placing the focus on the assessment of features and determinants of multilocality, the paper has not looked at strategic considerations on how urban or regional policies and planning may better account for the (social, infrastructure- and service-related) needs of multilocational households. Undoubtedly, considerations related to the governance of multilocality will be of extreme importance in the area of urban and regional planning.
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Recent research has addressed labour-related circular migration both in the Global North and South. However, these research strands have been developed in isolation. This paper contributes to the literature by providing a joint consideration of multilocational households in the North and South. Using quantitative and qualitative primary data and secondary sources for Germany and several countries in the South, it investigates key influencing factors and features of circular migration and multilocational households in both contexts. It reveals four key structural factors which shape labour-related circular migration in both South and North: economic transformation; spatial structures; transportation and communication technology; and societal modernisation. Dissimilar effects of the structural factors in each context, however, result in differing spatio-temporal patterns and socio-economic characteristics of multilocational households in countries of the North and South. Furthermore, patterns of circular migration testify national space economies with distinct historical pathways. Countries in the North show a greater variety in places and individual lifestyles involved in multilocality compared to the South. Here, circular migration connects rural and urban areas and involves poor households. While in the South multilocational householding is primarily a survival and risk mitigation strategy, in the North multilocality is associated with career and lifestyle aspirations of well-paid and educated persons. In the Global South, the living arrangement is more likely to prompt long-distance, at times transnational, movements with associated more rare commutes than in the North. Here, relatively short and weekly commutes are pivotal. The key commonality at the individual level is found in the (albeit dissimilar) role of households in motivating circular migration. The paper concludes that further research on originating factors of multilocational living on the micro-, meso- and macro-levels as well as for different regional contexts would contribute to a better understanding of new global geographies of migration.
sich eine größere Varianz in der räumlichen Vertei-
lung und in den Lebensstilen multilokaler Haushalte
als im Süden, wo zirkuläre Migration in erster Linie
zwischen Stadt und Land verläuft und vorwiegend
von armen Haushalten als Strategie der sozioökono-
mischen Risikominderung verfolgt wird. Im Globalen
Norden praktizieren relativ gut bezahlte und karriere-
orientierte Personen eine multilokale Lebensweise.
Während zirkuläre Wanderungsprozesse im Global-
en Süden über weite Distanzen und oft nationale
Grenzen hinwegverlaufen und in großen zeitlichen
Abständen stattfinden, verlaufen sie im Norden über
vergleichsweise kurze Strecken und im wöchentli-
chen Rhythmus. Eine wichtige Gemeinsamkeit be-
steht in der zentralen, wenn auch unterschiedlich
ausgeprägten, Rolle von Haushalten bei der Ent-
scheidung für eine multilokale Lebensform. Der
Artikel schlussfolgert, dass weitere Untersuchungen
über Einflussfaktoren von zirkulärer Migration und
Multilokalität auf Mikro-, Meso und Makro-Ebene
und für unterschiedliche regionale Kontexte einen
wichtigen Beitrag für ein besseres Verständnis neuer
globaler Migrationsgeographien leisten würden.
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Resumé: Des foyers multi-locaux dans les pays du
Nord et du Sud au monde: importance, caracté-
ristiques et des effets spatiaux

De récentes recherches traitent du travail lié à la
migration circulaire dans les pays du Nord et du
Sud. Toutefois, ces recherches ont été menées de
manièm isolée. Cet article apporte une contribution
aux données existantes en proposant une réflexion
conjointe sur les foyers multi-locaux au Nord et au
Sud. A l’aide de données primaires quantitatives et
qualitatives et de sources secondaires pour l’Allemagne et plusieurs pays du Sud, il examine les
principaux facteurs d’influence et les caractéristi-
ques de la migration circulaire des foyers multi-
locaux dans les deux contextes. L’article met en
évidence quatre principaux facteurs structurels qui
fonctionnent la migration circulaire liée au travail au
Nord comme au Sud: la transformation écono-
mique, les structures spatiales, les transports et les
technologies de la communication, ainsi que la mo-
dernisation de la société. L’impact différent des
facteurs structurels propres à chaque contexte met
toutefois en évidence une variété des modèles spa-
tio-temporels et des caractéristiques socio-écono-
miques adoptés par les foyers multi-locaux des pays
du Nord et du Sud. En outre, les schémas de
migration circulaire témoignent d’économies spati-
ales nationales liées à des contextes historiques
distincts. En comparaison avec le Sud, les pays du
Nord affichent une plus grande variété des lieux et
des modes de vie individuels impliqués par la multi-
localité. Ici, la migration circulaire relie les zones
rurales et urbaines et concerne les foyers pauvres.
Alors qu’au Sud, l’adoption d’un mode de vie multi-
focal est essentiellement une stratégie de limitation
des risques et de survie. Au Nord, la multi-localité est
associée aux aspirations de carrière et de mode de
vie de personnes bien payées et formées. Dans les
pays du Sud, les choix concernant le mode de vie sont
plus susceptibles d’impliquer des migrations de lon-
gue distance, parfois transnationales, comportant
des trajets entre les foyers bien plus rares qu’au
Nord où des trajets relativement courts et hebdoma-
daires sont la norme. Le facteur commun essentiel
au niveau individuel se retrouve dans le rôle (quoique
dissemblable) que jouent les foyers dans la définition
des motifs de la migration circulaire. Le document
conclut que des recherches plus poussées sur les
facteurs à l’origine de l’adoption d’un mode de vie
multi-local aux niveaux micro, méso et macro dans
différents contextes régionaux contribueraient à une
meilleure compréhension des nouvelles géographies
mondiales de la migration».
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