Article scientifique　**Article**　**2023**　　　　**Published version**　**Open Access**

- -

Infrastructures of migration and the ordering of privilege in mobility

- -

Cranston, Sophie; Duplan, Karine

Infrastructures of migration and the ordering of privilege in mobility

Sophie Cranston 🆔 *,† and Karine Duplan‡

†Geography and Environment, Loughborough University, Loughborough, Leicestershire LE11 3TU, UK, ‡Geography and Environment, University of Geneva, Geneva CH-1205, Switzerland
*Corresponding author: Email: s.cranston@lboro.ac.uk

Abstract

This article explores privilege in migration. Rather than focus on practices of privilege at micro-scales, the article examines how privilege in migration is ordered and disciplined through meso- and macro-level infrastructures (transnational organisations, higher education institutes, and governmental visa policies). The article questions where a pervasive discourse of mobility as achievement comes from and how it becomes materialised in the promotion and facilitation of forms of mobility. It argues that privilege in mobility becomes disciplined through neoliberal discourses of globalisation that idealise mobility as cosmopolitanism, whilst simultaneously producing this as an elite subject positioning.

Keywords: privilege, privileged migration, migration infrastructures, mobility, neoliberal globalisation

1. Introduction

Privilege commonly refers to social advantages that benefit and/or support some people's profitable position in society. Privilege works as a derivative effect of structures of power, such as being a member of a privileged group, which is described as wearing an invisible backpack (McIntosh 1992, 2012). Research on privilege explores how power works to advantage some and disadvantage others at both its spectacular and banal levels (including Savage and Williams 2008; Hay and Beaverstock 2016; Thurlow and Jaworski 2006; Twine and Gardener 2013). However, privilege is 'not just about who you are, but is about where you are' (Housel 2009: 134). The socio-spatial dimension of privilege highlights how it is deeply intertwined with issues of power, through the special right(s) or advantage(s) some may have in terms of particular, reserved or exclusive access to certain places or processes at a given time and location. Setting an agenda for research on privilege, Twine and Gardener (2013) argue that 'studying privilege is a complex pathway to understanding the forms of social inequality that are often masked by ideologies' (p. xix). Taking up

this charge, this article explores the (re)production of privilege as an inequality in migration which is shaped and masked through ideologies of neoliberal globalisation.

In migration studies, research that explores privileged forms of migration is interdisciplinary and examines different types of migrants including skilled workers and investors, students, lifestyle migrants, sojourners, and retirees (Croucher 2012). Research that explicitly names privilege explores the manifestation and practice of privilege as a socio-spatial condition in migrants' lives by highlighting that transnational mobility can only be accessed depending on an individuals' position within the matrix of power (overviews include Amit 2007; Croucher 2012; Benson 2014; Benson and O'Reilly 2016; Kunz 2016) and focusing on the experiences and practices of privilege in migrants lives abroad (including Cranston and Lloyd, 2019; Fechter 2007; Knowles and Harper 2009; Leonard 2010; Lundström 2014; Botterill 2017; Maher and Lafferty 2014; Hayes and Carlson 2018; Walsh 2018; Scuzzarello 2020). Privilege in migration is therefore defined both in terms of relative ease of access to migration itself and through the embodied and everyday practices of migration (Khan 2014; Benson 2019). However, whilst exploring how structures of power such as capitalism and colonialism create the conditions for privileged migration, the majority of research explores a micro perspective that focuses on experiences of migration (Duplan and Cranston, forthcoming). Less attention is paid directly to the meso and macro levels through which privileged migration is facilitated (see also Koh and Wissink 2018). Let us be clear that we are not suggesting that the micro-scale is unimportant in exploring privilege in migration, rather that more attention needs to be paid to 'all' scales and processes through which privilege in migration is ordered and produced.

The 'infrastructure turn' in migration research has shifted a focus away from migrants and their experiences to exploring how mobility is both facilitated and prevented at meso and macroscales (Shire 2020; Collins 2021). Previously described as a 'black box' in migration studies, research on infrastructures highlights that people do not simply move but rather they are moved through intermediary infrastructures which discipline their mobility (Lindquist, Xiang and Yeoh 2012). Infrastructures are therefore theorised as the organising structures of mobility: 'physical and organisational architectures, responsible for structuring, mobilising and giving meaning to movements through their particular arrangements' (Lin et al. 2017: 169). Infrastructures are both socio-material themselves and produce migration in socio-material ways (Xiang and Lindquist 2014; Paul and Yeoh 2020). Previous research, focusing on illicit migration or precarious labour migration, has rightly emphasised the role that infrastructures play in producing unequal migrant mobilities and experiences (including special issues by Shrestha and Yeoh 2018; Deshingkar 2019; Kathiravelu 2021). In a critical intervention to these debates, Kathiravelu (2021) argues that infrastructures act as 'collusive actors' in the production of inequality and injustice for migrants. By extension, this article argues that infrastructures at meso and macro levels act as 'collusive' actors in producing privilege in migration.

This is not straightforward because as Xiang and Lindquist (2014) highlight, infrastructures may not necessarily be designed specifically to facilitate migration (see also Collins 2020), but they do shape how people migrate through their operation. In this article, we focus on transnational organisations, higher education institutions, and government visa policies because they are three distinct, yet interrelated, examples of meso and macro infrastructures of privileged migration. The desire in transnational organisations to have

a global workforce shapes migration, both through representations of mobility and through the active orchestration of mobility through international assignments and the sponsorship of visas. Higher education institutions operate in similar ways, as preparatory paths to transnational organisations. Transnational organisations and higher education institutions coalesce with infrastructures of governments, specifically visa policies which shape who can migrate and for how long. Therefore, these infrastructures are not those which always directly facilitate migration, but they shape how people migrate through their promotion of certain types of mobility and their 'organisational architectures' which create and enable opportunities for migration. As infrastructures, they can be clearly situated within the context and ideologies of neoliberal globalisation, the increased flexibility of financial systems and global flows, that lead to a market-oriented approach of governance towards capital accumulation at the global scale (Duplan 2022). Given the context of neoliberalism, transnational organisations are positioned as powerful actors in channelling capital (Mitchell 2016). Higher education institutions can also be positioned within global neoliberal regimes. The retrenchment of state funding for universities results in them competing on a global stage for additional revenue—often financed through international students (Findlay, McCollum and Packwood 2017; Beech 2018). The OECD, WTO, and World Bank, institutions with long histories of promoting neoliberal agendas, all work to actively encourage international student mobility (Deuel 2021).

Our focus in this article on the examples of transnational organisations, higher education institutes, and government visa policies is derived from 20 years of combined research experience in examining privileged migration through these infrastructures in different national contexts. To examine how these infrastructures order privilege in migration, we review examples from interdisciplinary research that explores forms of migration that can be considered privileged (highly skilled work migration, international student mobility, and investment migration). We argue that infrastructures at meso- and macroscales are 'organisational architectures' that shape and 'collude' in how privilege in migration is ordered and facilitated. To achieve this, in Section 2, we explore meso-level infrastructures focusing on celebratory representations of mobility in transnational organisations and higher education institutions which produce mobility as aspirational for the successful neoliberal citizen. In Section 3, we examine visa systems as macro-level infrastructure which control how access to migration is materialised. In the discussion, we argue that a focus on infrastructures emphasises the idealisation and practice of certain types of mobility, but without equal access. We argue that infrastructures mediate access to migration that can be considered privileged and, in order to contest privilege in migration, we need to expose the operations of power in the infrastructures that facilitate these types of migration.

2. Meso-level: organisations and the cosmopolitan imaginary

This section maps out imaginaries of mobility that are produced through transnational organisations and higher education institutions as infrastructures of privileged migration.

Imaginaries refer to imagined geographies, as systems of socially and culturally relevant representations that allow for giving meaning to a geographical object (Staszak 2012), although representations can become materialised (Gregory 2004). These imaginaries contribute to how mobility is given meaning (Cresswell 2006; Lin et al. 2017). We look first at celebratory discourses of globalisation and how these discourses become materialised within 'global mindset' skill sets required for the workforce in transnational organisations. Secondly, we explore how the development of a global mindset is linked to global mobility. Thirdly, and drawing upon theorisations from Bourdieu (1986), we examine how a global mindset becomes a form of cultural capital. Last, we emphasise an unequal access to a global mindset. Therefore, through this section, we demonstrate how celebratory representations of migration produce transnational mobility as aspirational and shape the practice of mobility within transnational organisations and higher education institutes. However, even within these celebratory accounts of global mobility, it is seen as a form of distinction which is reinforced by its limited access.

2.1 Celebratory discourses of globalisation

In the 1990s, the celebratory discourse of globalisation posited the frictionless movement of capital, people, and ideas around the world. Optimism for a 'new world order' (Oswin 2020) fed into tropes of cosmopolitanism, that people's values and identities were based on what is best for humanity, without national, cultural, or racial delimitation. A celebratory imaginary of mobility was a key tenant in the discussion of the 'new world order' that was promoted through the acceleration of neoliberal globalisation. A common-sense relationship between mobility and cosmopolitanism was assumed: openness to travel was seen as a vocation, as 'a willingness to engage with the Other' (Hannerz 1990: 243), driving you towards a global outlook through experiencing other cultures, which are considered to be emplaced elsewhere. Others have described mobility as a 'building block, the raw material, of the cosmopolitan experience' (Skrbis et al. 2014: 615). Whilst the relationship between cosmopolitanism and mobility has been subject to significant academic critique (including Vertovec and Cohen 2002), in the popular imagination a discussion of cosmopolitan values remains intertwined with the physical act of going elsewhere. This celebratory imaginary of mobility is institutionalised within transnational organisations. Previous research on imaginaries has highlighted how imaginings of, for example, a better way of life in a location are translated into practice through individual's decision to move to that location (Benson 2012). A celebratory representation of mobility is translated into practice through the representations and operations of transnational organisations in their discussions of transnational mobility. The idea of a 'war for talent' (Michaels et al. 2001) that countries and companies would need to fight to attract and retain human capital is a discourse that promotes mobility (Harvey and Beaverstock 2016; Duplan, 2021). With increased connections associated with globalisation, part of the war for talent is associated with having a labour force who can work across countries and cultures: 'Multinational companies are especially concerned with how they will assure themselves of future leaders capable of understanding and managing complex operations flung across the world and serving diverse markets' (Becker 2004 in McDonnell et al. 2010: 152). Wider ideas about cosmopolitanism are institutionalised in transnational organisations as

the 'global mindset' or 'intercultural competencies' (Cranston, 2016; Cranston et al., 2021). In these imaginaries, national cultures are viewed as shaping working practices. Intercultural competencies are those which enable the individual to effectively work both in different national contexts and with people from different national contexts. A global mindset is imagined as a skill that prevents culture from impeding the effective circulation of people and capital. The individual who possesses intercultural competencies is seen as being 'open,' 'flexible', and 'adaptable' to different cultural contexts (Deardorff 2015). These characteristics speak to a wider 'ethos of flexibility' within neoliberal globalisation (Elliott 2014) where openness, flexibility, and adaptability are identified as required skills to navigate the upper hierarchies of neoliberal capitalism (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005).

2.2 The global mindset

Although soft skills like the global mindset are difficult to evidence, one way this becomes materialised is through global mobility. For example, Faulconbridge et al. (2009) demonstrate how headhunters actively look for candidates with a global mindset: 'even clients operating in only one country often want a "worldly" executive that can bring with them experience from multiple countries' (p. 805). Within organisational discourses, a way in which 'talent' is developed is through mobility, with having lived and worked in a different country becoming a key methodology through which intercultural competencies can be developed/demonstrated (Cranston, 2016). Whilst having a global mindset is positioned as a requirement for the very success of the organisation itself, it is also positioned as being a requirement for the success of the individual. For example, one transnational professional services firm looks to recruit individuals with the following values 'I operate with a global mindset and take a "one firm" approach. I demonstrate cultural awareness and sensitivity.' Representations of mobility suggest that to become a leader within some global neoliberal capitalist organisations, you need to demonstrate a global mindset. This representation shapes mobility practices within transnational organisations. McDonnell et al. (2010) highlight that for multinational organisations, the development of global talent is enacted through short-term and long-term international assignments. Others looking at 'effective' global talent management position suggest the importance of international employee mobility (Stahl et al. 2012), with research by Gallup (2019) arguing that multicountry and multicultural experiences are essential. Therefore, as part of employee training programmes, some transnational organisations actively deploy their workforce abroad for international assignments, what we can describe as corporate expatriation (Faulconbridge et al. 2009; Cranston, 2016). The corporate expatriate is produced through the organisational architectures of the transnational organisation—HR departments, interactions with global mobility firms, visa applications, and so on. The celebratory imaginary of mobility is part of this 'organisational architecture' which actively produces the justification and practice of this form of privileged migration.

2.3 Global mindset as cultural capital

Other institutions utilise representations of global mobility as aspirational. Significant research on privileged forms of mobility draws upon Bourdieu (1986) which examines the

relationship between capitals, class reproduction, and social stratification. For example, within the international student mobility literature, student migration is often conceptualised as a form of cultural capital (Waters 2006; Beech 2018; Prazeres 2019). Intercultural competencies therefore become institutionalised as a form of cultural capital that helps the individual get ahead by acting as a form of distinction (Igarashi and Saito 2014; Cranston et al., 2021). University bodies actively draw upon ideas of the global mindset to promote international student mobility, as a means through which to prepare students for the (neoliberalised) labour market (Cranston et al., 2020). Courtois (2020) examining the institutional promotion of study abroad shows how Universities encourage study abroad through events and returnees as a means of distinction on the CV, working to normalise this type of mobility as distinction. Findlay, McCollum and Packwood (2017) highlight how universities actively market themselves as producing global citizens, as part of a product that they sell to prospective international students. The promotion of global mobility as aspirational is created through the 'organisational architectures' of higher education institutions, through international offices, agents and higher education recruitment fairs, to academics supporting international placements. These architectures present international student mobility as an aspirational form of mobility to which the middle classes should aspire, whilst promoting access to international student mobility through financial support (such as Erasmus) and visa sponsorship. However, as Courtois (2020) argues, the hypermobility imagined within programmes such as Erasmus is a way through which the flexible, entrepreneurial subject promoted in neoliberal societies is constructed and disciplined. Mobility is once again linked to notions of success and becomes aspirational.

2.4 Unequal access to a global mindset

Celebratory discussions of mobility in transnational organisations and higher education institutions contribute to producing a connection between transnational mobility, cosmopolitan values and success, and cosmopolitan imaginaries of globalisation. This connection relies on the idea of unrestricted transnational movement. A key logic built into the war for talent is the 'liberalization of the global movement of high-skill labour' (Li and Lowe 2016: 13)—the supposed unfettered movement of people. Li and Lowe (2016) demonstrate how this type of neoliberal agenda becomes reproduced in higher education institutions, how universities become spaces in which the 'best' internationally mobile students are trained to become the 'best' internationally skilled workers. This neoliberal competition materialises also in various systems of rankings, from ideas of the 'best' universities (Jöns and Hoyler 2013) to the global rankings of the 'best' cities in which to live as a migrant (Harvey and Beaverstock 2016; Duplan, 2021). Therefore, although considered to be a homogeneous discourse and open to all, the neoliberal representation of mobility and cosmopolitanism is always selective. As Kothari (2008) argues, whilst highly skilled white professionals were symbols of the 'new world order' of cosmopolitanism, other mobile subjects such as migrant street peddlers were not, despite drawing upon similar skills of flexibility and cross-cultural negotiation. In the celebratory imaginary of globalisation is a clear portrayal of who cosmopolitans are—the people often referred to as 'elite'. Hall (2019) shows that 'elite' migration constitutes those who are

powerful in both economic and political terms. These are the people whose presence is seen to be an essential part of key global financial centres and world cities (Friedmann 1986; Beaverstock 2002), those places which act as the lynchpin within the circulation and promotion of neoliberal global capital. This type of highly skilled migrant was often portrayed as being emblematic of globalisation and cosmopolitan values (Ley 2004). For example, Beaverstock (2002) argued that British citizens in Singapore were key agents in the circulation of the financial knowledge economy, embedded in global–local networks in the workplace. Others have conceptualised a transnational capitalist class (Sklair 2000), a group of people assumed to be in control of globalising processes, and labelled as citizens of the world, an identity enacted and revealed through their mobility. The transnational capitalist class is presented as a success story within neoliberal globalisation, heroic figure of the new world order (Duplan 2022) with free-floating elites becoming an ideal model to imitate: 'the fast-moving businessman is thus seen to deserve the perks of unfettered movement as he embodies (quite literally) the values of the entrepreneurial market society' (Mitchell 2016: 121). Therefore, framed within a neoliberal approach of individual responsibility and flexibility, transnational mobility is produced as a social marker of success (Elliott 2014; Duplan 2022). The imaginary of cosmopolitanism through global mobility is celebrated within neoliberal discourse, but is a subject position that is not open to all and cannot be accessed by all.

As highlighted above, infrastructures give meaning to mobility through their arrangements. Transnational organisations and higher education institutions are powerful actors in the representation of global mobility flows. Promoting a relationship between a global mindset and success means that global mobility becomes a form of cultural capital, a way to evidence a required skill set for leadership. Imaginaries of free-floating movement promoted through infrastructures of privileged migration suggest that global mobility is a quest that all can take part in. This normative dimension of mobility renders it difficult to contest or resist. However, privilege is produced through the unequal way in which cosmopolitanism is attributed. In addition, these organisations and institutions work to discipline mobility: higher education institutions filter who is able to attend, transnational companies decide who will work for them and how they will move their workforce between different national contexts. Whilst these meso-level infrastructures may be presented as open to all, the 'ideologies of neoliberal growth support and perpetuate this mobility-as-usual' (Birthnell and Caletrìo 2014: 6–7), producing a systematic stratification of mobility and privilege in migration. Whilst the imaginaries of mobility promoted through transnational organisations and higher education institutes suggest equal access, the way in which mobility is materialised and filtered through them is unequal.

3. Macro-level: governments and the ordering of access to migration

Whilst organisations promote imaginaries of free-moving cosmopolitans and can filter who can access them, governmental infrastructures control who can legally migrate and stay in a country (Lan 2011). It is through governmental policies that we can further see

how privilege in migration is both ordered and materialised, in both work-led forms of migration that intersect with organisational imaginaries, but also in wider forms of lifestyle-led migration. This section examines visa policies, exposing how privilege is understood through how borders are negotiated. Government migration policies and their material expression in passports and visas are migration infrastructures (Lin et al. 2017) and become a way in which privilege in migration is ordered. In this context, privilege is understood in relation to the amount of government checks and bureaucracy that an individual is subject to before visiting a location, and its outcomes—that reflect the ease of movement (Khan 2014; Benson 2019; Cranston and Tan 2023). In thinking about governmental infrastructures for privileged migration the passport as a document can be seen as a material manifestation of countries relative wealth and political/diplomatic standing, policies, and so on (Cho 2014). Visa policies can also be viewed as infrastructure, enabling someone to cross the border by giving them temporary membership of that community (Salter 2006). Whilst passports and visas enable privileged migration to occur, they also contribute to produce it. For example, in the context of South African migration to the UK, Andrucki (2010) illustrates how the visa system acts as a neo-colonial machine that sorts which bodies can be where. In reference to ancestry visas, he illustrates how some white bodies are given the material privilege to move that is denied to others. This illustrates one of the many different visa systems that privileged migrants utilise, including citizenship acquisition (Ong 1999), in which different practices and imaginaries of privilege are produced and enacted. In the rest of this section, we examine different visa policies as privileged migration infrastructures to demonstrate how they rely on selectivity in terms of nationality and economic means.

3.1 Highly skilled migration visa policies

For work-based forms of migration, governmental migration policies are closely linked with economic policies. Associated with neoliberal globalisation, some governments have promoted policies to develop and maintain a knowledge-based or creative economy, which relies upon a highly skilled workforce. The so-called global war for talent is argued not to be present solely within the domain of transnational organisations, but between countries who need to compete in order to attract and retain the most highly skilled individuals. Governmental rhetoric around highly skilled visa policies is often framed around discourses of attracting the 'best and the brightest' (Harvey and Beaverstock 2016; Lo, Li and Yu 2019; Cerna and Czaika 2020; Duplan, 2021). This can go hand in hand with wider cosmopolitan imaginaries which seek to promote the global credentials of a nation in attempts to attract further transnational capital (Yeoh 2004; Harvey and Beaverstock 2016). Highly skilled migration policies become 'organisational architectures' which shape the ability to be mobile. What skill is and who is seen to have that skill are not neutral, but actively shaped by government departments and civil servants, in consultation with wider actors (Raghuram 2021). There is an unequal material realisation in who is seen to have the skills to be allowed to move. Governmental skills-based visa regimes produce understandings of 'desirable' or 'good' migrants (Montison 2012; Simon-Kumar 2015; Cranston, 2017; Guðjónsdóttir and Loftsdóttir 2017; Parsons et al. 2020). These understandings often draw upon skills that are imagined as valuable within the neoliberal

economy, such as working in financial centres associated with globalisation or the creative economy. Organisations actively campaign and lobby governments to try and ensure that they can obtain the skills for the workforce they need—including consulting on visa policies. With skills-based visa systems, organisations also sponsor the visa themselves, selecting who can be mobile and who cannot. As Simon-Kumar (2015: 1178) notes, skills-based regimes individualise the ability to migrate through an interventionist mechanism that identifies economically salient migrants. Privilege therefore becomes manifest in how skilled visa categories can become embodied, reflecting wider global hierarchies of power (Glick-Schiller and Salazar 2013). For example, Le Renard (2019) demonstrates in Dubai how highly skilled becomes constructed as Western passport holders. Others illustrate how visa categories are embodied differently depending on colonial and economic legacies. Oommen (2021) explores the youth mobility scheme in the UK and argues that privilege is a positionality created by the state and local relations, with race, nationality, and first language influencing the types of labour market positions that individuals can access. Being from a British settler colony (Australia, New Zealand, and Canada) provided these migrants with an advantage of familiarity in the labour market—one that is often racialised. Therefore, the practice of skilled migration visa policies exposes how these policies order who has access to mobility along with the embeddedness of power relations of class, nationality, and race within them. Whilst migration policies are often presented as meritocratic, in their arrangements they discipline who can access these forms of mobility. Their easy access can be defined as privilege.

Government visa policies not only shape the ability of someone to access migration, they also impact their longer-term settlement in a country. Citizenship policies also act as governmental infrastructures through which privilege is promoted and produced for migrants. For example, Singapore has a bifurcated migration regime where migrants who are deemed 'foreign talent,' those in highly skilled professions, are able to bring their dependents and move towards permanent residency (Yeoh 2006). Less skilled migrants, such as domestic and construction workers, cannot migrate with their families and have no rights to residency within the city state—they must remain temporary. As this illustrates, immigration and citizenship policies are often reflective of wider state ideologies towards integration and citizenship. As Simon-Kumar (2015: 1174) notes, neoliberal government policies should include 'inclusionary frameworks of multiculturalism, interculturalism, diversity, cosmopolitanism'. However, in practice, who is seen to belong is filtered by nationality, race, and class, but also by sexual norms such as family status or sexual orientation (Oswin 2014; Walsh 2018; Duplan, 2021, 2023). These imbricated regimes of constraints lead to a tension between neoliberal ideas of movement and governmental and popular discourses of belonging (Mitchell 2004; Ley 2011). Halvorsund's (2019) research on South Africans in the UK argues that 'desirability' needs to be understood in terms of the ability to assimilate. This said, privilege is also manifest in the assumed temporariness of some migrants. Cai and Su (2021) argue that Western expatriates in China are privileged through their temporary status, assumed to only be moving through Guangzhou. The wider literature on Western 'expatriates' often brings out that rather being subject to discourses of assimilation, these migrants attempt to recreate their home lives abroad (Knowles and Harper 2009; Lundström 2014). Therefore, they are placed outside of wider immigration discourses, with their lifestyles abroad being

perceived as adding global or cosmopolitan character to the places that they inhabit (Beaverstock 2002; Beaverstock 2005). These practices are created not only through the practices of the migrants themselves, but through the wider infrastructures, including government visa and settlement policies, which enable them.

3.2 Residency and citizenship by investment

Other visas are directly accessed through capital investment. Some countries offer special-ised residency visas for individuals who: first, invest a set amount of money in a bank in the country; secondly, have set monthly income; and lastly, have a set amount of liquid assets. For countries like Malaysia, there are no nationality restrictions on this form of visa (MM2H 2020). Other countries require less initial capital, such as in Mexico where a person only has to demonstrate a set monthly income to obtain a 'vistante rentista' visa, but these visas are only obtainable by people who are 'Western' passport holders (Mexexperience 2020). Other countries not only offer residency, but also citizenship. Surak (2021a, b) looks at the citizenship industries—how wealthy would-be migrants ef-fectively buy citizenship in certain countries through investment. As research has demon-strated, citizenship by investment is neoliberal migration management, where states seek to 'harness the economic potential offered by investor citizens…to shape its development through financial investments' (Peck and Hammett 2022: 1137). Citizenship by invest-ment enables wealthy individuals to purchase a passport in one country and is often used to facilitate migration and mobility elsewhere (Surak 2021a). One organisation that sup-ports individuals in residence and citizenship by investment provide support in 'how to create the ultimate portfolio of complementary residence and citizenship options to se-cure the greatest possible global access for you.' This 'global access' is akin to the unfet-tered global mobility in cosmopolitan imaginaries of globalisation. Another organisation that supports citizenship by investment suggests in their advertising that 'a modern cosmopolitan is a person who freely crosses the borders of different countries.' In these representations, cosmopolitanism can be bought by the wealthy. Similar to work-based forms of migration, access to residency and citizenship in other countries is imagined through discourses of desirability, framed in terms of capital investment or in the ability to spend a certain income on consumption within a country. These visa and citizenship types are facilitated by governments and by organisations that promote these programmes and actively want to attract the transnational capitalist class. Surak's (2021b) research highlights how the residency migration/citizenship industry influences governments, pro-ducing this migration pathway: 'International service providers proactively craft policy templates and advise governments, pushing the industry forward' (p. 303). As such, the residency migration and citizenship industry work to actively shape discourses of desir-ability as capital. Their operations are also targeted to would-be migrants, advertising and offering support in applying for visas and citizenship by investment through events adver-tised at 'high-worth' individuals. As such, there is an active co-production of privileged migration between industries that support investment migration and governments in visa policies. Critically then, these 'organisational architectures' not only produce investment migration, they actively filter who can access migration through producing notions of de-sirability as capital.

Governmental visa policies as infrastructures of mobility illustrate how understandings of privilege are materialised in individual's mobilities and lives. Privilege is materialised in terms of the desirability to the state to which the migrant moves, an imaginary that tends to be articulated through capital, 'skill', and nationality. Resources of capital and nationality can enable a person to cross a border with ease, hence enabling access to migration. It is this ease of access to migration that orders how privilege in migration can be understood and facilitates the practice of privileged forms of migration. The ordering of privileged migration in government visa policies is a manifestation of neoliberal ideologies, who can migrate is 'leveraged by economic considerations of suitability—namely, the ability to invest or fill labour shortages' (Simon-Kumar 2015: 1172). The 'desirability' of certain migrations is not simply produced through the state, but is outsourced (Surak 2021b) or co-produced by transnational organisations who seek to benefit financially from these migrations. However, the role that neoliberal capital plays in shaping 'desirability' is hidden through discourses that suggest that highly skilled visas are meritocratic and can be accessed by all with the relevant skills. Similarly, the ability for the wealthy to buy residency and citizenship and the implications of this often feel hidden amongst ordinary citizens in wider discussions over migration (Peck and Hammett 2022). Governmental visa policies directly shape who can migrate and produce stratification in migration as an outcome of neoliberal capitalism.

4. Discussion and conclusions

The celebratory representations of globalisation and cosmopolitanism have been widely critiqued in the social sciences and migration studies (including Massey 1994; Oswin 2020). However, despite these academic critiques, this imaginary remains pervasive outside of academic debate and continues to materialise as inequalities within people's lives. The sections above have provided examples of how infrastructures of privileged migration order and produce privilege in migration. Transnational organisations, higher education institutions, and government visa policies give meaning to mobility through a continued use of celebratory representations of globalisation. The article demonstrates how these representations produce norms of mobility. These norms take on three forms. First, is the norm of mobility itself. Looking at infrastructures reinforces the norm of mobility as masculinist, suggesting an ideal of a person who can move around the world with ease unencumbered by family and other responsibilities (Duplan and Cranston, forthcoming). Secondly, if you have the required background or skills then the logic suggests that you can access mobility. Framed within a neoliberal approach of individual responsibility and flexibility (Elliott 2014; Duplan 2022), transnational mobility is produced as a social marker of success with free-floating elites becoming an ideal model to imitate. This places the onus on the individual—they need to acquire the qualifications or skills in order for mobility to be accessed. Wider structures that result in barriers to accessing mobility are not mentioned. The third norm is therefore the unfettered mobility itself. Worth (2021) argues that 'typically, individuals or groups who experience oppression are set against a norm of the unoppressed' (p. 30). Meso and macro infrastructures (re)produce a norm of the unoppressed in their celebration of mobility—the norm they suggest is that which can

be defined as privileged migration. Rather than exploring barriers to mobility, these infrastructures promote an individual's responsibility to overcome barriers of access and naturalise the deservedness of those who can.

The problem is that celebratory representations of mobility, whilst appearing to be inclusive, contain a paradox. The cosmopolitan values that are seen to be formed through global mobility are argued to act as a form of distinction—a way of standing out. The visa systems operate on quotas, they are not open to all but the most 'skilled' candidates or those lucky enough to have the capital for investment migration. Therefore, whilst suggesting equality, the norm of mobility is exclusive. The exclusivity of access of mobility contributes to the reproduction of various immobility regimes imbued with power relations (Cresswell 2006; Thurlow and Jaworski 2006; Glick Schiller and Salazar 2013). As demonstrated in this article, our argument is that understanding infrastructures sheds important light on the workings of celebratory discourses of globalisation within transnational organisations and higher education institutions, and the ways in which they (re)produce cosmopolitanism for the elite. In short, it contributes to our understandings of how privilege in migration is ordered.

Infrastructures do not only produce representations of mobility which materialise in people's lives, but they also act as intermediaries in who can migrate. The article demonstrates that transnational organisations normalise and facilitate forms of mobility that come to be defined as privileged. For example, higher education institutions actively encourage both the outbound and inbound global mobility of staff and students. Along with these meso-level infrastructures, the normalisation and facilitation of specific forms of mobility are also encouraged at the macro-level. Visa systems are produced between governments and organisations. Governmental infrastructures such as immigration policy schemes and visa systems produce friction to movement—with the ability to overcome this friction becoming another way through which privilege is defined. This mostly occurs through the means of meso-levels actors, with this dynamic highlighting the entanglements of levels and actors in the regulation and management of migration, as well as in the production of what is framed as privileged migration. Exploring infrastructures of privileged migration contributes to how privilege in migration is facilitated and practised. Future research should explore the facilitation as well as practising of privileged forms of migration in their different forms. After all, how do infrastructures which facilitate the mobility of those working in international organisations differ from transnational organisations? This, and other similar questions, are going to be key to future research if we are going to develop greater depth to our understandings of the ways in which different practices of privileged migration become materialised.

Most important of all, we have sought to illustrate that privilege in migration is practised, ordered, and facilitated not only at the microscale, but also through the wider infrastructures at meso- and macroscales that shape the imaginaries and practices of migration itself. This is not to suggest the micro-scale perspective is not important. For example, whilst discourses of privilege in governmental infrastructures tend to reflect nationality and class, how they are embodied is racialised and sexualised. This stresses how it is the body that ultimately acts as the site through which privilege in migration is granted or

denied (Duplan and Cranston, forthcoming), despite the supposed meritocracy of discourses of movement in infrastructures. Access to privilege through mobility is coded through global histories and legacies of colonialism, where white bodies confer an advantage, both in moving and in recognition in their destination country (Benson and O'Reilly 2018). Whiteness is recognised as a resource that can be transferred or even enhanced within the migration process through a conflation with skills and goodness, whilst people coming from the Global South and non-white people continue to be the target of suspicious enquiries when moving to the Global North (Knowles and Harper 2009; Lundström 2014). However, this privilege is produced onto and practised by the body through infrastructures which translate these wider power relations into organisational architectures which shape the ability to move. Privilege is produced and defined as part of the often banal and everyday operations of governments, transnational organisations, and universities in their shaping of imaginaries and representations of migration. It is in this way that infrastructures act as 'collusive actors' (Kathiravelu 2021) in the enabling and production of privilege in migration.

As previous research on privilege has highlighted, studying privilege is a way to explore inequalities that are often masked by ideologies such as neoliberalism (Twine and Gardener 2013). Exploring the infrastructures of privileged migration is therefore an important additional contribution to discussions that contest unequal power geometries of globalisation (Massey 1994). This is because privilege in migration can be defined through an individual's ability to access transnational movement, in relation to his/her positioning within global regimes of power as well as through the relative ease and speed through which they move (Glick Schiller and Salazar 2013). As this article demonstrates, access to infrastructures that facilitate mobility, such as visa programmes, helps to explain differential access to transnational movements. Moreover, viewing infrastructures as 'collusive actors' in producing privilege in migration helps elucidate the power relations that are often hidden, and in whose interests exclusive access to mobility lies. The discourse of mobility as success is, after all, self-actualising, as 'mobility, and control over mobility both reflects and reinforce power' (Massey 1994: 150). Exclusionary access to mobility contributes to the production of inequalities since access to notions of success, cosmopolitanism, and a global elite draw on specific forms of mobility that are not widely available nor granted to all. By situating privilege away from the scale of the body we can begin to expose the wider operations of power that shape mobility practices.

To conclude, privilege in migration is not only inscribed and practised out there on the bodies of migrants, but through the representation, production, facilitation, and normalisation of certain types of mobilities. This is what makes privilege in migration such an expression of power, and so difficult to contest. In search for a social justice, exposing and labelling structures as producing unequal privileges becomes a further way to counterhegemonic tales of neoliberal globalisation (Oswin 2020), and associated narratives of inclusion and integration. Our argument is that what is currently missing, and therefore urgently needs developing in research on privilege in migration, are conceptualisations of how privilege and power are produced through the infrastructures that facilitate and constrain mobility.

Acknowledgement

References

Amit, V. (2007) 'Structures and Dispositions of Travel and Movement', in Amit, V. (ed.) *Going First Class: New Approaches to Privileged Travel and Movement*, pp. 1–14. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Andrucki, M. J. (2010) 'The Visa Whiteness Machine: Transnational Motility in Post-Apartheid South Africa', *Ethnicities*, 10/3: 358–70.

Beaverstock, J. V. (2002) 'Transnational Elites in Global Cities: British Expatriates in Singapore's Financial District', *Geoforum*, 33/4: 525–38.

—— (2005) 'Transnational Elites in the City: British Highly-Skilled Inter-Company Transferees in New York City's Financial District', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31/2: 245–68.

Beech, S. E. (2018) 'The Geographies of International Student Mobility: Spaces', *Places and Decision-Making*, London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Benson, M. (2012) 'How Culturally Significant Imaginings Are Translated into Lifestyle Migration', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38/10: 1681–96.

—— (2014) 'Negotiating Privilege in and through Lifestyle Migration', in Benson, M. and Osbaldiston, N. (eds) *Understanding Lifestyle Migration*, pp. 47–68. London: Palgrave McMillan.

—— (2019) 'Constellations of Privilege: The Racialised and Classed Formations of Britons Living in Rural France', in Pauline, L. and Katie, W. (eds) *British Migration. Privilege, Diversity and Vulnerability*, pp. 17–31. London: Routledge.

—— and O'Reilly, K. (2016) 'From Lifestyle Migration to Lifestyle in Migration: Categories, Concepts and Ways of Thinking', *Migration Studies*, 4/1: 20–37.

—— (2018) *Lifestyle Migration and Colonial Traces in Malaysia and Panama*, London: Palgrave Macmillian.

Birtchnell, T. and Caletrìo, J. (2014) 'Introduction: The Movement of the Few', in Birtchnell, T. and Caletrìo, J. (eds) *Elite Mobilities*, pp. 1–20. Abingdon: Routledge.

Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, E. (2005) *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London & New York: Verso.

Botterill, K. (2017) 'Discordant Lifestyle Mobilities in East Asia: Privilege and Precarity of British Retirement in Thailand', *Population, Space and Place*, 23/5: e2011.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) 'The Forms of Capital', in Richardson, J. (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. pp. 241–58. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Cai, X. and Su, X. (2021) 'Dwelling-in-Travelling: Western Expats and the Making of Temporary Home in Guangzhou, China', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 47/12: 2815–2832.

Cerna, L. and Czaika, M. (2020) 'Rising Stars in the Global Race for Skill? A Comparative Analysis of Brazil, India, and Malaysia', *Migration Studies*, 9/1: 21–46.

Cho, L. (2014) 'Passports', in Adey, P. et al. (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*, pp. 335–44. London: Routledge.

Collins, F.L. (2021) 'Geographies of Migration 1: Platform Migration', *Progress in Human Geography*, 45/4: 866–77.

Courtois, A. (2020) 'Study Abroad as Governmentality: The Construction of Hypermobile Subjectivities in Higher Education', *Journal of Education Policy*, 35/2: 237–57.

Cranston, S. (2016) 'Imagining Global Work: Producing Understandings of Difference in 'easy Asia', *Geoforum*, 70: 60–8.

——. (2017) 'Expatriate as a 'good' Migrant: Thinking through Skilled International Migrant Categories', *Popul. Space Place*, 23/6: e2058.

Cranston, S. and Tan, G. (2023) 'Handbook on Migration and Family', in Waters, J., (eds) *Privileged migration and the family: family matters in corporate expatriation*, pp. 279–297. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

——, Bates, E. and Pimlott-Wilson, H. (2021) 'Handbook of Youth Mobility', in Cairns, D., (ed) *International Work Placements: Developing Intercultural Skills*?. pp. 333–344. London: Routledge.

——Pimlott-Wilson, H. and Bates, E. (2020) 'International Work Placements and Hierarchies of Distinction', *Geoforum*, 108: 139–47.

——Lloyd, J. (2019) 'Bursting the Bubble: Spatialising Safety for Privileged Migrant Women in Singapore', *Antipode*, 51/2: 478–96.

Cresswell, T. (2006) *On the Move Mobility in the Modern Western World*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Croucher, S. (2012) 'Privileged Mobility in an Age of Globality', *Societies*, 2/1: 1–13.

Deardorff, D. K. (2015) 'Intercultural Competence: Mapping the Future Research Agenda', *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 48/2015: 3–5.

Deuel, R. P. (2021) 'Governing Higher Education toward Neoliberal Governmentality: A Foucauldian Discourse Analysis of Global Policy Agendas, Globalisation', *Societies and Education* [online first].

Duplan, K. (2022) 'Expatriation and Migration: Two Faces of the Same Coin', In Beck, S. and Brill, L. (eds) *The Expatriate as Heroic Figure of Globalization? Privileged Migration and Neoliberal Ideology in Luxembourg*, pp. 157–183.

—— (2023) 'She's a Real Expat': be(Com)Ing a Woman Expatriate in Luxembourg through Everyday Performances of Heteronormativity', *Gender, Place & Culture*, 30/1: 1–27.

—— (2021) 'The Sexual Politics of Nation Branding in Creative Luxembourg', ACME: *An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, 20/3: 272–93.

——Cranston, S. (Forthcoming) 'Towards Geographies of Privileged Migration: An Intersectional Perspective', *Progress in Human Geography*.

Deshingkar, P. (2019) 'The Making and Unmaking of Precarious, Ideal Subjects–Migration Brokerage in the Global South', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45/14: 2638–54.

Elliott, A. (2014) 'Elsewhere: Tracking the Mobile Lives of Globals', in Birtchnell, T. and Caletrìo, J. (eds) *Elite Mobilities*, pp. 21–39. Abingdon: Routledge.

Faulconbridge, J. R. et al. (2009) 'The 'War for Talent': The Gatekeeper Role of Executive Search Firms in Elite Labour Markets', *Geoforum*, 40/5: 800–8.

Fechter, A. M. (2007) *Transnational Lives: Expatriates in Indonesia*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Findlay, A. et al. (1996) 'Skilled International Migration and the Global City: A Study of Expatriates in Hong Kong', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 21/1: 49–61.

Findlay, A. M., McCollum, D. and Packwood, H. (2017) 'Marketization, Marketing and the Production of International Student Migration', *International Migration*, 55/3: 139–55.

Friedmann, J. (1986) 'The World City Hypothesis', *Development and Change*, 17/1: 69–83.

Glick-Schiller, N. and Salazar, N. B. (2013) 'Regimes of Mobility across the Globe', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39/2: 183–200.

Green, P. (2015) 'Mobility Regimes in Practice: Later-Life Westerners and Visa Runs in South-East Asia', *Mobilities*, 10/5: 748–63.

Gregory, D. (2004) *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Guðjónsdóttir, G. and Loftsdóttir, K. (2017) 'Being a Desirable Migrant: Perception and Racialisation of Icelandic Migrants in Norway', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 43/5: 791–808.

Hall, S. (2019) 'Reframing Labour Market Mobility in Global Finance: Chinese Elites in London's Financial District', *Urban Geography*, 40/5: 699–718.

Halvorsund, K. (2019) 'The Maintenance of White Privilege: The Case of White South African Migrants in the UK', *Ethnicities*, 19/1: 95–116.

Hannerz, U. (1990) 'Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 7/2–3: 237–51.

Harvey, W. S. and Beaverstock, J. V. (2016) 'Diverging Experiences of Work and Social Networks Abroad: Highly Skilled British Migrants in Singapore, Vancouver, and Boston', in van Riemsdijk, M. and Wang, Q. (eds) *Rethinking International Skilled Migration*, pp. 268–92. London: Routledge.

Hay, I. and ——, eds (2016) *Handbook on Wealth and the Super-Rich*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Hayes, M. and Carlson, J. (2018) 'Good Guests and Obnoxious Gringos: Cosmopolitan Ideals among North American Migrants to Cuenca, Ecuador', *American Journal of Cultural Sociology*, 6/1: 189–211.

—— and Pérez-Gañánz, R. (2017) 'North-South Migrations and the Asymmetric Expulsions of Late Capitalism: Global Inequality, Arbitrage, and New Dynamics of North-South Transnationalism', *Migration Studies*, 5/1: 116–35.

Housel, J. A. (2009) 'Geographies of Whiteness: The Active Construction of Racialized Privilege in Buffalo, New York', *Social & Cultural Geography*, 10/2: 131–51.

Igarashi, H. and Saito, H. (2014) 'Cosmopolitanism as Cultural Capital: Exploring the Intersection of Globalization, Education and Stratification', *Cultural Sociology*, 8/3: 222–39.

Jöns, H. and Hoyler, M. (2013) 'Global Geographies of Higher Education: The Perspective of World University Rankings', *Geoforum*, 46: 45–59.

Kathiravelu, L. (2021) 'Introduction to Special Section 'Infrastructures of Injustice: Migration and Border Mobilities'', *Mobilities*, 16/5: 645–55.

Khan, S. (2014) 'The Ease of Mobility', in Birtchnell, T. and Javier, C. (eds) *Elite Mobilities*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 136–48.

Kothari, U. (2008) 'Global Peddlers and Local Networks: Migrant Cosmopolitanisms', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 26/3: 500–16.

Koh, S. Y. and Wissink, B. (2018) 'Enabling, Structuring and Creating Elite Transnational Lifestyles: Intermediaries of the Super-Rich and the Elite Mobilities Industry', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44/4: 592–609.

Knowles, C. and Harper, D. (2009) *Hong Kong: Migrant Lives, Landscapes and Journeys*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Kunz, S. (2016) 'Privileged Mobilities: Locating the Expatriate in Migration Scholarship', *Geography Compass*, 10/3: 89–101.

Lan, P. C. (2011) 'White Privilege, Language Capital and Cultural Ghettoisation: Western High-Skilled Migrants in Taiwan', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37/10: 1669–93.

Leonard, P. (2010) *Expatriate Identities in Postcolonial Organisations. Working Whiteness*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Le Renard, A. (2019) *Le privilège Occidental: travail, Intimité et Hiérarchies Postcoloniales à Dubaï*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.

Ley, D. (2004) 'Transnational Spaces and Everyday Lives', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 29/2: 151–64.

—— (2011) *Millionaire Migrants: Trans-Pacific Life Lines*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Li, Z. and Lowe, J. (2016) 'Mobile Student to Mobile Worker: The Role of Universities in the 'War for Talent'', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 37/1: 11–29.

Lin, W. et al. (2017) 'Migration Infrastructures and the Production of Migrant Mobilities', *Mobilities*, 12/2: 167–74.

Lindquist, J., Xiang, B. and Yeoh, B. S. A. (2012) 'Introduction: Opening the Black Box of Migration: Brokers, the Organisation of Transnational Mobility, and the Changing Political Economy in Asia', *Pacific Affairs*, 85/1: 7–19.

Lo, L., Li, W. and Yu, W. (2019) 'Highly-Skilled Migration from China and India to Canada and the United States', *International Migration*, 57/3: 317–33.

Lundström, C. (2014) *White Migrations: Gender, Whiteness and Privilege in Transnational Migration*. New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Maher, K. H. and Lafferty, M. (2014) 'White Migrant Masculinities in Thailand and the Paradoxes of Western Privilege', *Social & Cultural Geography*, 15/4: 427–48.

Massey, D. (1994) *Space, Place and Gender*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

McCann, E. and Ward, K., eds (2011) *Mobile Urbanism: Cities and Policymaking in the Global Age*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

McDonnell, A. et al. (2010) 'Developing Tomorrow's Leaders—Evidence of Global Talent Management in Multinational Enterprises', *Journal of World Business*, 45/2: 150–60.

McIntosh, P. (1992) 'White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack', in Schneider, B.(ed.) *An Anthology: Race in the First Person*, pp. 119–26. New York: Crown Trade Paperbacks.

—— (2012) 'Reflections and Future Directions for Privilege Studies', *Journal of Social Issues*, 68/1: 194–206.

Michaels, E. et al. (2001) *The War for Talent*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Mitchell, K. (2016) 'Neoliberalism and Citizenship', in Springer, S. et al. (eds) *Handbook of Neoliberalism*, pp. 146–57. Abingdon: Routledge.

—— (2004) *Crossing the Neoliberal Line: Pacific Rim Migration and the Metropolis*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Montison, J. M. (2012) 'When Talent Meets Mobility: Un/Desirability in Singapore's New Citizenship Project', *Citizenship Studies*, 16/3–4: 469–82.

Ong, A. (1999) *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Oommen, E. T. (2021) 'Privilege and Youth Migration: Polarised Employment Patterns of Youth Mobility Workers in London', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 47/5: 1119–1135.

Oswin, N. (2014) 'Queer Time in Global City Singapore: Neoliberal Futures and the 'Freedom to Love'', *Sexualities*, 17/4: 412–33.

—— (2020) 'An Other Geography', *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 10/1: 9–18.

Paul, A. M. and Yeoh, B. S. A. (2021) 'Studying Multinational Migrations, Speaking Back to Migration Theory', *Global Networks*, 21/1: 3–17.

Parsons, C. R. et al. (2020) 'High Skilled Migration through the Lens of Policy', *Migration Studies*, 8/3: 279–306.

Peck, S. and Hammett, D. (2022) 'Our Citizenship Is Being Prostituted': The Everyday Geographies of Economic Citizenship Regimes', *Progress in Human Geography*, 46/5: 1131–48.

Prazeres, L. (2019) 'Unpacking Distinction within Mobility: Social Prestige and International Students', *Population Space Place*, 25: e2190.

Raghuram, P. (2021) 'Interjecting the *Geographies of Skills* into International Skilled Migration Research: Political Economy and Ethics for a Renewed Research Agenda', *Population Space Place*, 27: e2463.

Salter M. B. (2006) 'The Global Visa Regime and the Political Technologies of the International Self: Borders, Bodies, Biopolitics', *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 31/2: 167–89.

Savage, M. and Williams, K. (2008) 'Elites: Remembered in Capitalism and Forgotten by Social Sciences', *The Sociological Review*, 56/1_suppl: 1–24.

Scuzzarello, S. (2020) 'Practising Privilege. How Settling in Thailand Enables Older Western Migrants to Enact Privilege over Local People', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46/8: 1606–28.

Shrestha, T. and Yeoh, B. S. (2018) 'Introduction: Practices of Brokerage and the Making of Migration Infrastructures in Asia', *Pacific Affairs*, 91/4: 663–72.

Shire, K. (2020) 'The Social Order of Transnational Migration Markets', *Global Networks*, 20/3: 434–53.

Simon-Kumar, R. (2015) 'Neoliberalism and the New Race Politics of Migration Policy: Changing Profiles of the Desirable Migrant in New Zealand', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41/7: 1172–91.

Sklair, L. (2000) 'The Transnational Capitalist Class and the Discourse of Globalization', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 14/1: 67–85.

Skrbis, Z. et al. (2014) 'Seeds of Cosmopolitan Future?', *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17/5: 614–25.

Stahl, G. et al. (2012) 'Six Principles of Effective Global Talent Management', *Sloan Management Review*, 53/2: 25–42.

Staszak, J.-F., (2012) 'L'imaginaire géographique du tourisme sexuel', *L'Information géographique*, 76/2: 16–39.

Surak, K. (2021a) 'Millionaire Mobility and the Sale of Citizenship', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 47/1: 166–89.

—— (2021b) 'Marketizing Sovereign Prerogatives: How to Sell Citizenship', *European Journal of Sociology*, 62/2: 275–308.

Thurlow, C. and Jaworski, A. (2006) 'The Alchemy of the Upwardly Mobile: Symbolic Capital and the Stylisation of Elites in Frequent-Flyer Programmes', *Discourse & Society*, 17/1: 99–135.

Twine, F. W. and Gardener, B. (2013) *Geographies of Privilege*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Vertovec, S. and Cohen, R., eds (2002) *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walsh, K. (2018) *Transnational Geographies of the Heart: Intimate Subjectivities in the Globalising City*. Oxford: RGS-IBG Book Series. Wiley.

Waters, J. (2006) 'Geographies of Cultural Capital: Education, International Migration and Family Strategies between Hong Kong and Canada', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 31/2: 179–92.

Worth, N. (2021) 'Going Back to Get Ahead? Privilege and Generational Housing Wealth', *Geoforum*, 120: 30–7.

Xiang, B. and Lindquist, J. (2014) 'Migration Infrastructure', *International Migration Review*, 8/1_suppl: 122–48.

Yeoh, B. S. (2006) 'Bifurcated Labour: The Unequal Incorporation of Transmigrants in Singapore', *Tijdschrift Voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 97/1: 26–37.

Yeoh, B. S. A. (2004) 'Cosmopolitanism and Its Exclusions in Singapore', *Urban Studies*, 41/12: 2431–45.