

Leading Models and Selected Implementations For Simulating Forced Migration:

Tyler Amos

23 April 2018

Abstract

This methodological review explores current and emergent research in simulating forced migration, with an eye to real-world applications. It examines gravity and radiation models, random walks and agent-based implementations, and provides suggestions for future research to be relevant for humanitarian practice.

The Push-Pull Paradigm

One way migration is often studied is as the result of push and pull factors. Push factors drive individuals to leave locations, while pull factors attract them to others. (Edwards 2009) Within forced migration studies, there is an abundance of qualitative and normative literature exploring these factors. However, compared to studies of commuting and econometric models of trade there are relatively few empirical, formal, and simulation-based studies of forced migration. Moreover, this area of research is currently of little use to practitioners, who require more granular results in order to make decisions.

Structure of the Review

This review proceeds in three parts. First, it outlines two leading models from migration studies and economics. Second, it explores the viability of simulation in general, as well as two specific types of simulation, in modelling and forecasting features of displacement events. Third, it concludes with an outline for how future research may judged in terms of its utility for practitioners.

The Gravity Model

The most prominent of formal migration models is the gravity model. First used to explain economic migration (See Ravenstein 1885; in Edwards 2009), it is frequently employed in econometric studies of trade, with some applications to forced migration. (Iqbal 2007; in Edwards 2009) In this model “objects” are

drawn to one or other locations by their “mass”. The attractive power (mass) of a location is determined by some characteristic, usually population. (Edwards 2009) This attraction is then limited by distance, which is assumed to have a negative relationship with attraction; closer locations are preferred to those more distant.

(1)

$$I_{i,j} = \frac{f(R_i, A_j)}{f(D_{i,j})}$$

Where I is the interaction between locations i and j , determined by R_i , repelling forces at location i and A_j , attraction at location j . $D_{i,j}$ is the distance between locations i and j . (Edwards 2009 pp 21)¹

For its robustness across a number of applications, long history, and appealing simplicity, the gravity model’s shortcomings are numerous. For one, it overemphasizes macro trends. (Edwards 2009 pp 21) Simini et al. (2012) identify a number of further issues: i) the wide latitude available in determining the cost function $f(D_{i,j})$; ii) poor predictive performance in certain applications; iii) an over-reliance on population, and; iv) a number of free parameters. These points and others are addressed by an alternative which draws from another physics metaphor - radiation.²

The Radiation Model

In the radiation model proposed by Simini et al. (2012), an individual considers movement to all areas, including their current area of residence. The individual evaluates the relative attractiveness of all areas on the basis of some “offer”. The individual then chooses the closest offer which is at least some threshold higher than the most attractive offer in their current location. (Simini et al. 2012)

(2)

$$T_{ij} = T_i \frac{m_i n_j}{(m_i + s_{ij})(m_i + n_j + s_{ij})}$$

Where locations i and j have populations of size m and n . The distance between locations is represented by r_{ij} and s_{ij} is the total population in a circle with a radius r_{ij} . The centre of this circle is i , and the population s_{ij} excludes $m + n$. T_{ij} represents the total “flux” or commuting volume from location i to location j .

In analyses comparing the radiation and gravity models using city-level commuting data, the radiation and gravity models offer similar results, but the radiation model has the additional advantage of being simpler and does not have free parameters. (Masucci et al. 2013; Simini et al. 2012) As a new proposal, it remains an active area of migration modelling research.³

¹See Simini et al. (2012) for a concise description of both the gravity and radiation models.

²Other alternatives exist, such as the intervening opportunity or random utility models. (Simini et al. 2012)

³See, for example, the updated model in Simini, Maritan, and N  da (2013)

Persistent Rationality Assumption

Both gravity and radiation models are drawn from economic studies of commuting and more routine forms of migration. This leads them to rely on certain assumptions commonly found in rational choice models. (Edwards 2009 pp 20-22) These models assume an individual chooses to move from one location to another on the basis of some rational calculus - weighing the benefits and costs of staying or leaving. (Edwards 2009 pp 16)

The rationality assumption can be a useful approximation of human decision-making in many environments. Both the radiation and gravity model perform well despite this assumption. In forced migration studies, however, the objects of analysis are regularly coerced and operate in environments with poor information flow. As such, the rationality assumption may be a substantial theoretical weakness. (Ibid)

Robustness to Reality and Relaxing the Rationality Assumption

In search of greater robustness, some mixed models use elements of the above models with new approaches from areas such as network theory. In one informal variant, the attractiveness of a location is determined by its migrant population. Social ties between source and location are strengthened by successive migrant arrivals. (Lindstrom and Ramírez 2010; Garip and Asad 2016) More formal alternatives combine heuristics based on formal models with network or graph models. (Ahmed et al. 2016; Suleimenova, Bell, and Groen 2017) Edwards (2009) explores ways to account for a relaxed rationality assumption in detail, presenting an agent-based model on a generic lattice which combines elements of macro models (e.g., gravity) and observations from research at the micro level like the limitations of the rational choice assumption (e.g., informational asymmetry). Most recently, Suleimanova et al. (2017) preserve the rationality assumption but instead develop a network based on real locations and events with a set of rules similar to the gravity model (1).

Simulation in Forced Migration Studies

Simulation studies have potential for a number of interesting applications in forced migration studies. The principal benefits are fourfold: i) the ability to imitate experiments, which would be neither ethical nor practical (Hartmann 1996 pp 2-10; in Edwards 2009); ii) the ability to explore the internal dynamics of a phenomenon without comprehensive or highly reliable data (Ibid); iii) apart from time, little to no cost for the researcher, and; iv) no need for specialized knowledge beyond intermediate programming.

Simulation also implies certain drawbacks. Most germane to this discussion are those of generalizability and realism.⁴ Simulations are questionably generalizable, as they are only valid under the specific scenarios (i.e., combinations of parameters

⁴See Maldonado and Greenland (1997) pp 454-455 for a more extensive discussion.

and assumptions) used by the researchers. Furthermore, simulations are only approximations of reality, capturing but a fraction of the true complexity in social phenomena. In a purely theoretical study, this second objection is of less concern, but when a more applied orientation is adopted, this shortcoming raises substantial questions about the real-world implications of simulation studies. Maldonado and Greenland (1997) propose the results from simulations should be interpreted similar to clinical studies in medicine, with: i) great caution; ii) requirement for corroboration, and; iii) reference to real-world data.

Researchers using simulation in forced migration studies account for these challenges by employing complex, multi-layered models (Edwards 2009), or basing their simulations on real parameters (e.g., locations and distances between those locations) of a specific instance of the phenomena of interest. (Suleimenova, Bell, and Groen 2017) The challenge of demonstrating real-world validity can also be addressed by structuring a simulation to produce predictions which can then be compared to real-world data.⁵

Reasonable approximations of displacement via simulation are achieved through a number of methods. While many methods exist, this review borrows from comparative politics and adopts the “most different” approach. First, it discusses the features of random walks, which relies the least on assumptions. Second, agent-based models, which require many assumptions.

Random Walks

The movement of displaced people can be thought of as a random walk, where displaced people move between points according to some set of probabilities defined by a specified function.⁶ This approach is used to model the movement of animal populations in biology and everyday human movement. (Codling, Plank, and Benhamou 2008; Bovet and Benhamou 1988; Gallotti et al. 2016) It may have some application in the study of forced migration - a random walk simulation from the International Organization for Migration reportedly predicts displacement trends with error rates less than 10%. (Migration 2017)⁷

For their apparent robustness, random walks have questionable theoretical value for research in forced migration. If a process of forced migration is in fact a random walk, how does one interpret the results of a given simulation? What do simulation results say about the experience of displaced people? To the author’s knowledge, there is no systematic way to interpret random walks to answer such questions. Nevertheless, random walks’ ability to “blindly” model real phenomena makes them useful as a benchmark against which to compare more sophisticated models - a “uniform probability plus” of sorts. If a random walk outperforms more theoretically-informed models, this should be interpreted as weakness in the sophisticated model, rather than support of any “chaos” theory of forced migration.

⁵One example of this strategy is found in Suleimenova, Bell, and Groen (2017).

⁶One well-known example is Lévy flight.

⁷This claim is yet to be tested in a peer-reviewed publication.

Agent-based Models

Agent-based simulations require the modeller to specify all rules by which individuals make decisions. This makes explicit the connection between results and theory. In a displacement simulation, agents (a household or individual) move across a virtual space and interact with elements of the simulation according to some set of rules.⁸ Beyond its proven ability to model a wide range of phenomena, this approach is intuitively understood by non-technical audiences and is relatively simple to implement.

Many of the critiques of simulation generally, such as those from Maldonado and Greenland (1997) apply to agent-based models in particular. The rules by which agents “live” may be unreasonable simplifications or require bold assumptions which, in the worst case, limit simulation results’ generalizability to just other simulations. This is notable given one of the reasons for choosing simulation methods is to manipulate virtual ecosystems that enhance understanding of reality.

Macro Models, Micro Requirements

Clearly formal models borrowed from economics (gravity, radiation), and simulation methods (random walks, agent-based models) have potential to produce valuable insights in forced migration studies. Yet there remain a number of gaps in this literature. Specifically, forced migration simulations mostly provide macro-level results with questionable generalizability or practical value. Moving forward, what characteristics should models have in order to be relevant in this way?

- i) *Focus on actionable insights:* A substantial amount of empirical work in this space focuses on causal drivers of displacement. Researchers investigate how significant events, regimes, or geographical scope and intensity of conflict effect long-term movement patterns. (Schon 2015; Melander and Öberg 2007; Iqbal 2007) These studies produce insightful results about broad displacement trends. However for practical purposes like humanitarian response, more granular results about volume and geographic distribution of displaced people in-country are valuable.
- ii) *Employ integrated models of displacement and return:* To the author’s knowledge, no empirical studies have examined displacement and return as integrated phenomena. Displacement is only part of the displaced individual’s experience, and displaced people can and do return to their communities of origin. Needs persist from displacement through to return and so the ability to model the lifecycle of a displacement event is valuable.

Research which can address one or both of these points will fill important extant gaps in the literature on forced migration simulation. Moreover, it will

⁸See Edwards (2009) for an accessible explanation of agent-based models.

address an important ethical imperative - research which focuses on negative human experiences must in some way contribute to alleviating or preventing that experience.⁹

⁹This point was first made to the author in 2013 by James Milner during an undergraduate seminar at Carleton University.

References

- Ahmed, Mohammed N, Gianni Barlacchi, Stefano Braghin, Francesco Calabrese, Michele Ferretti, Vincent Lonij, Rahul Nair, Rana Novack, Jurij Paraszczak, and Andeep S Toor. 2016. “A Multi-Scale Approach to Data-Driven Mass Migration Analysis.” In *SoGood@ Ecml-Pkdd*.
- Bovet, Pierre, and Simon Benhamou. 1988. “Spatial Analysis of Animals’ Movements Using a Correlated Random Walk Model.” *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 131 (4). Elsevier:419–33.
- Codling, Edward A, Michael J Plank, and Simon Benhamou. 2008. “Random Walk Models in Biology.” *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* 5 (25). The Royal Society:813–34. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2008.0014>.
- Edwards, Scott. 2009. *The Chaos of Forced Migration: A Means of Modeling Complexity for Humanitarian Ends*.
- Gallotti, Riccardo, Armando Bazzani, Sandro Rambaldi, and Marc Barthelemy. 2016. “A Stochastic Model of Randomly Accelerated Walkers for Human Mobility.” *Nature Communications* 7. Nature Publishing Group:12600.
- Garip, Filiz, and Asad L. Asad. 2016. “Network Effects in Mexico–U.s. Migration: Disentangling the Underlying Social Mechanisms.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 60 (10):1168–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764216643131>.
- Hartmann, Stephan. 1996. “The World as a Process.” In *Modelling and Simulation in the Social Sciences from the Philosophy of Science Point of View*, 77–100. Springer.
- Iqbal, Zaryab. 2007. “The Geo-Politics of Forced Migration in Africa, 1992–2001.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 24 (2). Taylor & Francis:105–19.
- Lindstrom, David P., and Adriana López Ramírez. 2010. “Pioneers and Followers: Migrant Selectivity and the Development of U.s. Migration Streams in Latin America.” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 630 (1):53–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716210368103>.
- Maldonado, George, and Sander Greenland. 1997. “The Importance of Critically Interpreting Simulation Studies.” *Epidemiology* 8 (4). Lippincott Williams & Wilkins:453–56. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3702591>.
- Masucci, A. Paolo, Joan Serras, Anders Johansson, and Michael Batty. 2013. “Gravity Versus Radiation Models: On the Importance of Scale and Heterogeneity in Commuting Flows.” *Phys. Rev. E* 88 (2). American Physical Society:022812. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.88.022812>.
- Melander, Erik, and Magnus Öberg. 2007. “The Threat of Violence and Forced Migration: Geographical Scope Trumps Intensity of Fighting.” *Civil Wars* 9 (2). Routledge:156–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698240701207310>.

Migration, International Organization for. 2017. “Prepositioning relief: Using a random walk model to predict the distribution of IDPs in Nigeria.” <https://displacement.iom.int/content/prepositioning-relief-using-random-walk-model-predict-distribution-idps-nigeria>.

Ravenstein, E. G. 1885. “The Laws of Migration.” *Journal of the Statistical Society of London* 48 (2). [Royal Statistical Society, Wiley]:167–235. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2979181>.

Schon, Justin. 2015. “Focus on the Forest, Not the Trees: A Changepoint Model of Forced Displacement.” *Journal of Refugee Studies* 28 (April).

Simini, Filippo, Marta C González, Amos Maritan, and Albert-László Barabási. 2012. “A Universal Model for Mobility and Migration Patterns.” *Nature* 484 (7392). Nature Publishing Group:96.

Simini, Filippo, Amos Maritan, and Zoltán Néda. 2013. “Human Mobility in a Continuum Approach.” *PLOS ONE* 8 (3). Public Library of Science:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0060069>.

Suleimenova, Diana, David Bell, and Derek Groen. 2017. “A Generalized Simulation Development Approach for Predicting Refugee Destinations.” *Scientific Reports* 7 (1). Nature Publishing Group:13377.