

Artículo de revista:

Fortes de Lena, Fernanda (2022). Setting a research agenda on sexuality and migration in demographic studies: what emerges from the literature review. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos de População*, 39, 1–29. (980-5519) <https://doi.org/10.20947/S0102-3098a0222>



All the contents of this journal, except where otherwise noted, is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License

Setting a research agenda on sexuality and migration in demographic studies: what emerges from the literature review

Fernanda Fortes de Lena*

This article systematically reviews articles published from January 2000 to June 2021, that focus on internal migration and sexuality using quantitative methods and data related to demographic research. Therefore, this article aims to map what has been studied and learned so far in demographic research regarding internal migration of sexual minorities. A second objective is to use the development of studies on sexuality and migration in Brazil as a case study for migration and sexuality in the Global South; from this retrospection I intend to identify where these studies have become stifled in the last decades as well as the gaps to fill in order to establish a research agenda.

Keywords: Literature review. Global South. Internal migration. Sexuality. Demography.

* Universidade Estadual de Campinas (Unicamp), Campinas-SP, Brazil (ffortes@ced.uab.es; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6325-6685>).

Introduction

Until the late 1970's, sexuality remained absent from studies on mobility and internal migration, which assumed migrants to be heterosexual and mostly male (MANALANSAN IV, 2006). Bell and Valentine (1995) recall the first attempts from geographers to insert sexuality in the field of urban sociology that ultimately unfolded in studies of gay 'ghettos'. In the field of anthropology, it was Weston (1995) who first examined the rural-urban flows in the US during the late 1970's. Since then, rural-urban queer migration has been a recurring topic when analyzing migratory trajectories of sexual minorities seeking urban spaces (HUBBARD, 2012).

In the last two decades, the shift in the dynamics of internal migration to a predominately urban-urban flow has also changed the way scholars perceive sexuality in migration studies (SCHEITL; GUTHRIE, 2019). Before that, sexuality was limited to sexual and reproductive rights within the family realm. Additionally, beyond that, sexuality was constrained to gender roles, pathologies and deviance (MANALANSAN IV, 2006).

In demographic research, migration of sexual minorities has not advanced as much as studies of families of sexual minorities (RECZEK, 2020). Some studies have shown that sexual minorities have higher chances of migrating than heterosexual individuals (BAUMLE; COMPTON; POSTON JR., 2009), that they are over concentrated in highly urban cities (BLACK *et al.*, 2000; COOKE; RAPINO, 2007; WIMARK; ÖSTH, 2014), and that migration can also improve mental health of gays and lesbians (UENO; VAGHELA; RITTER, 2014; WIENKE; HILL, 2013). These studies reveal the need for more research on how internal migration affects sexuality and vice-versa. Therefore, a research agenda is necessary to show the dimensions of queer migration, which could benefit not only migration studies, but also all other subfields in demographic research that intersect with sexuality and migration. In this spirit, another *gap* to fill is migration studies of sexual minorities in the Global South that have emerged with a focus on international migration (ANDRADE, 2017; FRANÇA, 2017), but little has been done regarding internal migration in the past twenty years (FRANÇA, 2013; PARKER, 2002).

The primary aim of this article is to map studies appearing in academic journals between January 2000 and June 2021 in demographic research regarding internal migration of sexual minorities. A second objective is to use Brazil as a case study, by reviewing the development of demographic studies of sexuality and migration in a country from the Global South. From this retrospection, I intend to compare the progress in the Global North with that in a country from the Global South, to which extent these studies have become stifled, and to identify the *gaps* that need filling to establish a research agenda. This paper will not attempt to revise migration theories, but will allow space for discussions on how the inclusion of sexuality in migration studies might improve the understanding of population mobility.

Therefore, a literature review was conducted in different academic databases focusing on quantitative studies related to internal migration and sexuality. First, I give some general context on studying sexuality quantitatively, given that most demographic studies make use of quantitative data in their analysis. Then, I explain the method used to search and filter

the articles. I found 26 articles that fit the description of the search that were later classified into three categories (Internal migration, Spatial segregation, Spatial distribution) that were chosen based on the similarity of the topics in each article. Afterwards, I searched for Brazilian demographic articles within the scope of sexuality and migration. The review of these articles gave some clues to the reasons behind the lack of studies within this topic and the recent growth in studies of sexuality in demographic research. On the one hand, the studies show the potential of research in migration studies when considering sexuality in their analysis. On the other hand, this review identifies some *gaps* within migration studies that need to be addressed such as family issues, health and wellbeing and ethnicity when considering sexuality in population mobility and distribution.

Sexuality & migration

The study of sexuality within the field of demography is still in a process of establishment and has experienced a constant growth in the last couple of decades (BAUMLE; DREON, 2019). The absence of demographic research on this issue was pointed out when the term demography of sexuality was coined alongside demography of sexual orientation by Baumle, Compton and Poston Jr. (2009). Before that, Badgett and Williams (1992) established a research agenda in the field of economics that sparked a conversation about the lack of studies including sexual orientation. In this effort, a common critique amongst scholars was lack of good quality data to conduct research in a broader manner (BANENS, 2013; BLACK *et al.*, 2007; DEMAIO; BATES; O'CONNELL, 2013).

After the legalization of same-sex marriage in the early 2000's in European countries mostly, civil registry data became available, and after 2010, many population-based *surveys* also started to collect data on same-sex couples. At first, initial studies focused on measurement of data collection errors in where a significant number of miscoded different-sex couples were found in countries such as the US (O'CONNELL; FELIZ, 2011). In an attempt to make the data usable, Di Bennardo and Gates (2014) created a formula for researchers to adjust the US Census data on same-sex couples in future research. Another step would be to understand the best ways to obtain this kind of information in *surveys*, which few studies have done over the years (BANENS, 2014; CORTINA; FESTY, 2014; GATES; STEINBERGER, 2009).

In the last 20 years, a total of 29 countries have legalized same-sex marriage and have been able to obtain good quality *survey* data or/and registry data on same-sex unions. This gave way to groundbreaking research related to the demographics of same-sex couples and to new studies on partnership and family dynamics (ANDERSSON *et al.*, 2006; BAUMLE; COMPTON; POSTON JR., 2009; GOLDANI; ESTEVE; TURU, 2013). After that, over the course of the last ten to fifteen years some data have become available on sexual orientation, sexual behavior and sexual desire, which have led to the emergence of studies in the field

of demography that focus on family dynamics, labor market outcomes and health issues (BOERTIEN; VIGNOLI, 2019; CARPENTER, 2020; LAGOS; COMPTON, 2021; RECZEK, 2020).

In contrast, the studies of sexuality related to migration, spatial concentration and spatial segregation have many common aspects that limit their analysis in demographic research. The primary one is the lack of data that contain information on both migration and sexual orientation. The few *surveys* with this type of information are mostly focused on same-sex couples. Therefore, it is difficult for studies to advance and draw general conclusions about the mobility of sexual minorities since the information available is related to partnership and not sexual orientation. Thus, the analysis using this type of data lies on assuming that the category of same-sex couples is representative of the entire gay and lesbian community, which limits the power of inference in the results. Also, the category of internal migration has its own limitations with different definitions across studies, which can contribute to inconsistencies in the conclusions in comparative studies (GARCIA, 2015).

Review of the literature

Studies on sexuality in demography have increased over the last two decades, but studies that intersect sexuality and migration are still scarce in demographic research. By focusing on quantitative research, I aim to facilitate a dialogue between the fields of human geography, sociology and psychology found in the review through the greater affinity between quantitative studies and demographic research. Another reason to focus on quantitative studies is the lack of a literature review with this scope. The study by Manalansan IV (2006) focused on the development of gender and sexuality in international migration. Also, Donato *et al.* (2006) addressed the role of gender in qualitative research in casting a spotlight onto neighboring social science fields that are open to new methodologies bringing gender to the forefront of migration studies. Lastly, the systematic review done by Lee *et al.* (2018) focuses on quantitative studies showing how different geographical units of concentration of sexual minorities can impact health-related outcomes. These studies are important steppingstones to build knowledge regarding sexuality and migration, although their main scope are qualitative studies and international migration, and the quantitative review is focused on the field of geography. Thus, this review aims to add to these studies another layer related to internal migration and sexuality within demographic research.

With the aim to map these studies, I conducted systematic research on studies published from January 2000 to June 2021 in 10 of the top-ranked journals¹ in Demography according to SCImago in June of 2021. With the objective of obtaining more language diversity I chose from the 10 journals: 2 from Latin America, 3 from non-Anglophone countries in Europe, 3 from the U.K and the remaining 2 were from the US.

¹ *Revista Brasileira de Estudos de População, Papeles de Población, European Journal of Population, Journal of Population Economics, Population, Demographic Research, Population and Development Review, Population, Space and Place, International Migration Review, Demography.*

This initial search was done considering the scope of this revision that are studies of internal migration and sexuality related to demographic studies, which were filtered through title, keywords and abstract of the articles. Initially, I used the combination of the following keywords for the search: “same-sex”, “gay men”, “lesbian”, “homosexuality”, “sexuality”, “sexual minorities”, “sexual orientation” and “migration” and their translation to Spanish and Portuguese.

I retrieved a total of 63 articles from the search and classified them into six topics by reading their abstracts: Family and Household Dynamics (23), Labor Market (4), Measurement (11), Education (5), Health Issues (10), Tolerance (4) and Migration and Spatial Distribution (6). Given the small number of articles related to migration/sexuality (6) in the 10 journals, I chose to search Scopus and JSTOR databases using the same keywords to access studies of migration and sexuality in journals of other fields (sociology, human geography, psychology, economics and law) that are related to demographic research and population studies.

The search in Scopus and JSTOR, retrieved a total of 212 articles including the 6 articles on migration and spatial distribution from the previous search in the 10 journals. I filtered these results using the information in the title, keywords, abstracts, and selected only the articles related to migration and sexuality, which left me with 80 articles in total. These articles were classified into six categories: Sexual and Mental Health (40); Refugees and Asylum Seekers (3); International Migrants (11); Internal Migration (10); Spatial Distribution (8) and Spatial Segregation (8). Therefore, the literature review focuses on 26 articles classified into the following three categories: Internal Migration (10); Spatial Distribution (8) and Spatial Segregation (8). Although I found only 10 articles directly related to internal migration quantitatively, I chose to expand the analysis to include studies about spatial distribution and spatial segregation as they were instrumental to the analysis of internal migration.

The spatial aspect of studies related to sexual minorities have been the main subject of interest of scholars that saw the importance of knowing where sexual minorities live and if this spatial distribution was concentrated or dispersed given the stigma, discrimination and violence against sexual minorities. Another issue derived from spatial distribution is spatial segregation, which has its origins in analyzing unequal distribution of minorities spatially (BOLT; VAN KEMPEN; VAN HAM, 2008; BROWN; CHUNG, 2006; PEACH, 1996). Thus, it adds another layer to spatial distribution by qualifying and exploring the reasons behind the segregation of sexual minorities. An interesting topic that ties these together is internal migration, a key factor contributing to spatial distribution and segregation (CURRAN *et al.*, 2006; MASSEY; GROSS; SHIBUYA, 1994).

Most studies found were from the Global North, with a concentration of studies in European countries and the United States, as already shown by Lee *et al.* (2018). Baumle (2018) has described the hardship of navigating the intersection between sexuality studies and demographic research over the years. She shares her experience on how sexuality scholars are not very receptive to a limited categorization of sexual identity or the use of categories of sexual behavior and kinship as a *proxy* for sexual orientation. According to

Baumle (2018), an extra effort is needed to convey to reviewers the importance of findings and carefully explain the limitations and the reasons for using a determined category of sexuality and excluding another. In demography journals there is skepticism regarding the data being reliable to apply quantitative modeling. This could be the reason why studies found in the review are scattered over journals related to sexualities, demography, sociology, economics, and geography. Also, the interdisciplinary nature of migration and sexuality makes it hard to focus on a specific field.

Since the search retrieved no articles from the Global South that fit the scope of this study, I provide an extended review of research on sexuality and migration within demographic research in Brazil. I use Brazil as a case study to understand the dimensions of sexuality in a Global South context and aim to combine the insights from literature review of the quantitative research on the Global North to build a research agenda that showcases the *gaps* in research of migration and sexuality in demographic studies.

The exercise of revisiting this body of literature is relevant to the purpose of this study and will ground the analysis and delineate the state of the art of this growing field of knowledge. I argue that establishing a research agenda can help move forward studies on migration of sexual minorities since it is an important life event and therefore, an important piece to be included with other life events such as family formation, parenthood, schooling, entering labor market and childbearing.

Spatial distribution

It was only in the early 2000s that demographic studies recognized the potential of using population-based *surveys* to analyze the spatial distribution of gay men and lesbians. In the literature review there were nine articles of research conducted using quantitative population-based *surveys* to map the spatial distribution of sexual minorities. Initially, Black *et al.* (2000) used the geographical distribution of same-sex couples in the US as a means to identify possible measurement errors in data collection. The results of geographic concentration of same-sex couples in major cities in the US compared to the population in general validated the data and pointed to a tendency already observed in qualitative studies (BELL; VALENTINE, 1995; WESTON, 1995).

Afterwards, Black *et al.* (2002) investigated the spatial distribution of male couples in the US and tested if these couples chose cities with high amenities to live in. They found that gay men concentrated in cities with high housing value and coastal climate compared to lesbians and heterosexuals. In addition, Gates and Ost (2004) showed that same-sex couples had a diverse distribution geographically in the 2000 US. Census, when taking ethnicity into account it became evident that African-Americans and Latinos in same-sex couples had different spatial distribution than the rest of the couples. Baumle (2010) also brought attention to the concentration of same-sex unmarried couples in the US-Mexico

border. The results built on the necessity to incorporate ethnicity as well as the intersection with sexual orientation in determining residential choices.

The understanding of residential preferences of sexual minorities and their spatial distribution has led to the identification of neighborhood characteristics related to a higher concentration of same-sex couples. Since geographers had already pointed out the importance of space for sexual minorities in previous case studies, the pursuit of this type of research seemed a natural fit in the field (KNOPP, 1995; SIBALIS, 2004; VALENTINE, 1996).

Anacker and Morrow-Jones (2005) have shown in their national level study that same-sex households cluster in neighborhoods that have lower cost of living and at the same time a higher number of job openings. Also, these couples concentrate more in neighborhoods with low levels of crime and high levels of cultural, health and recreational activities. These findings suggest social and spatial characteristics influence where same-sex couples chose to live. The authors concluded that quality of life is one of the motivators behind the spatial concentration of same-sex couples in certain parts of the US.

Brown and Knopp (2006) questioned how the information available in the 2000 US. Census about gay men and lesbians can lead to closeting individuals that became invisible according to a specific geographical level of analysis. To this end, the authors use the work by Gates and Ost (2004) as an example of how different decisions can bring upon conclusions that exclude certain gay and lesbian individuals from spaces.

Baumle, Compton and Poston Jr. (2009) studied which spatial aspects could explain the concentration of same-sex couples in metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas in the US. The results found that climate, poverty rate, population size, the heterosexual cohabitation rate and the percentage of voting Republicans were associated with where these couples were residing. Walther, Poston Jr. and Gu (2011) used the 2000 US. census to understand the concentration of same-sex couples in metropolitan areas of the country, but added heterosexual couples to the comparatives. The results are quite similar to those found by Baumle, Compton and Poston Jr. (2009) with the addition that heterosexual couples show different results, which according to the study are related to the role of migration of these couples. The correlations between the percentage of migrants and the prevalence indexes of male and female couples are much higher than for heterosexual couples, which led the authors to attribute part of the differences in prevalence to migration decisions to relocate to warmer locations (WALTHER; POSTON JR.; GU, 2011).

Another important aspect of the spatial distribution of population is the civil *status* of individuals. Since most studies rely on data on same-sex couples, Wimark and Östh (2014) undertook the challenge of comparing spatial concentration of single gay men and lesbians to coupled gay men and lesbians in Sweden. The results suggest that single gay men concentrate more in urban cities as opposed to couples. Therefore, the authors conclude the difference between single and coupled gay men and lesbians might have a life course factor that needs to be addressed further such as couples' preference for less or more urban space to raise children.

A systematic review conducted by Lee *et al.* (2018) assessed how the measure of area unit characteristics can affect what is known about sexual minority concentration and their surroundings. At a regional level, sexual minorities concentrate in regions that are high in resources and at neighborhood level they are concentrated in places with fewer resources. Thus, the authors showed the lack of studies in the field and how variation in the geographical levels of analysis can influence studies leading to opposing conclusions about where sexual minorities reside in the same country.

Another recent study using same-sex couple data from the Spanish census showed a concentration of 40.7% of same-sex couples in the cities of Barcelona and Madrid (LAMA; NIETO CALAMAESTRA, 2018). The gender differences in geographical concentration of same-sex couples were also found in Spain, which calls attention to the need for a gender based perspective when analyzing this type of data since male partners are concentrated in fewer cities than female partners. Moreover, the concentration in more urban and touristic places adds to the findings in other countries of the Global North (BLACK *et al.*, 2002; WIMARK; ÖSTH, 2014).

Identifying the spatial distribution of sexual minorities is only the first step in creating a bigger picture regarding where these individuals live and what their surroundings look like. Another study worth mentioning by Everett (2014) has linked the relationship between neighborhood characteristics to mental health of sexual minorities, in which fewer urban spaces with high percentages of Republican voters are associated to higher risk of depression.

Wimark and Fortes de Lena (2022) are interested in understanding the spatial concentration of gay men and lesbians in Sweden. Findings show that the preference of residence in each group is different with a concentration of same-sex partners in more urban areas, with the exception of male same-sex partners that also concentrate in bordered deprived areas. Another interesting finding is that when controlling for children results do not differ from those found using the dissimilarity index, which differ from previous studies using family structure to justify differences in spatial distribution between male same-sex partners and female same-sex partners (BLACK *et al.*, 2002; WIMARK; ÖSTH, 2014). These results show the importance of future studies that may explain the differences in residential mobility that differ from the established knowledge mainly based in US studies.

The studies mentioned above have shown that sexual minorities tend to concentrate in more urban cities with warm weather and with large population size and that lesbians are more spatially dispersed than gay men. At the neighborhood level these groups tend to surround themselves with more tolerant, ethnically diverse people and sites high in natural amenities. These initial findings open a discussion on spatial segregation discussed below.

Spatial segregation

The studies that have focused on segregation of sexual minorities were an initial attempt to understand the “gayborhood” phenomenon (GHAZIANI, 2014). Early scholars denominated these enclaves as “ghettos” and tried to establish connections between gentrification and spatial concentration of sexual minorities as consequence of social marginalization. Some studies were able to establish connection between areas considered deprived with the presence of gay men and lesbians (KNOPP, 1990; LAURIA; KNOPP, 1985). The systematic research found eight studies related to segregation using quantitative data. Most studies are focused on the US with the exception of two: one in Australia (GOLDIE, 2018) and another in France (GIRAUD, 2006).

One of the first researchers on residential segregation of gay and lesbians couples by Baumle, Compton and Poston Jr. (2009) uses an exposure index to quantify the segregation between same-sex couples and different-sex couples in 40 large cities of the US. The findings show that gay male partners are less exposed to heterosexuals than lesbians. Afterwards, they consider what variables might be related to their segregation and find that population size, number of gay men and lesbians are important predictors of segregation between homosexuals and heterosexuals in the US in 2000.

A study by Giraud (2006) uses the number of subscribers of a gay magazine in 2007 and the French census of 1999 to calculate a gay coefficient in each Parisian neighborhood. The author controls the distribution of gay men by occupation and age group, which show that occupation is a good *proxy* for economic *status* given that senior executives live in more central neighborhood and blue-collar workers live in less appealing neighborhoods. Another interesting finding is that the age group 30-39 concentrates in the central highly desirable neighborhoods and adults over 50 years old are living in the outskirts of Paris. The study has data limitations, but shows in a simple manner how sexuality intersected with life stages can influence where they live.

Hayslett and Kane (2011) focused their study in Columbus, Ohio and found mixed results in which co-location of gay and lesbian couples was an important explanatory variable for high concentration of same-sex couples. However, other variables like diversity, openness and diversity were also significant in the regression models. The findings evidence that gay men are more concentrated in neighborhoods with less family households and more rented houses and lesbians are concentrated in neighborhoods with more family households and foreign-born residents. The results show that different barriers constrain these two groups into different areas. The authors can only hypothesize about these constraints and have suggested qualitative studies as an alternative to understand and identify these barriers more clearly.

A study centered in the San Francisco Bay Area conducted by Compton and Baumle (2012) uses mixed methods that show evidence of the larger concentration of gay men in San Francisco County and of lesbians in Sonoma County. Other findings include differences in racial and ethnic composition and average age, in which Alameda County had a more diverse racial/ethnic population of lesbians with a younger age average as opposed to the San Francisco County

that was predominately white and Sonoma County that had the highest age averages. However, the counties were different regarding demographic characteristics, as the qualitative interviews found that the residential choices in all counties were motivated by the presence of a gay/lesbian community and a liberal political climate. Therefore, the creation of gay/lesbian enclaves in the San Francisco Bay Area might have similar motivations, but different demographic profiles may also have different preferences and constraints in check when choosing where to live.

Spring (2013) with a study using US census from 2000 and 2010 tried to fill the *gap* regarding segregation of same-sex partners from different-sex partners at city level. The findings show a decline in segregation of same-sex couples from different-sex couples from 2000 to 2010. This was in tune with the studies questioning whether social acceptance or tolerance were driving the decline of segregation, which could mean the end of the “gayborhood”. In addition, the study sheds light on the segregation of same-sex partners and its similarity to segregation of ethnic minorities, which shows that sexual orientation should be taken into account in segregation studies that usually only considered race and economics as main factors of segregation (SPRING, 2013).

A study by Madden and Ruther (2015) also uses two points in time (2000-2010) to follow how the presence of gay men and lesbians influences population growth and income in US census tracts. The evidence points to lesbians and gay men being less segregated than African Americans and found that lesbians are less spatially concentrated than gay men. Additionally, census tracts that had more gay men in 2000 finished the decade with more population growth and income. The same cannot be said for lesbian concentration in census tract regarding these two variables. A downside of this article is not accounting for how much of the population growth in the census tract is due to migration, which could help explain if gay men are indeed attracted to high amenity places and are the protagonists of that growth.

The most recent study of residential segregation in US uses the American Community Survey from 2008 to 2012 to calculate dissimilarity indexes and test whether gay and lesbian partners are segregated from heterosexual partners (POSTON JR. *et al.*, 2017). The hypotheses are based on previous evidence (BAUMLE; COMPTON; POSTON JR., 2009; SPRING, 2013) and initially analyse the dissimilarity indexes between male same-sex partners, female same-sex partners, male-female married partners and male-female cohabitating partners. The authors conclude that gay men are more segregated than lesbians, which reaffirms the evidence of previous studies in the field. The results suggest the prevalence of gay men contributes to a higher segregation. In addition, conservatism and population size influence segregation between male same-sex partners and male-female married or cohabitating partners. Poston Jr. *et al.* (2017) reinforces the findings in previous studies and does not advance the discussion that connects individual and neighborhood characteristics.

Goldie (2018) traces the levels of aggregation and segregation between gay men and lesbians in Australia in an attempt to understand if there are differences in the relationship of these groups to urban spaces and to each other spatially. The results show that gay men and lesbians have high levels of clustering in Sydney and less in Melbourne, with lesbian

couples being less clustered than gay couples in both cities. Another finding is that gay couples are segregated from lesbian couples, despite being in close proximity to each other. Goldie (2018) shows that ethnic diversity, which was an important variable in other studies of spatial distribution in the US, is not significant in the Australian context.

The studies on segregation reviewed here mainly focused on the US, which evidences the need to expand the studies of residential and spatial segregation of sexual minorities to other countries. The narrow scope of studies in other countries has shown that the process of segregation that occurred in those places has parallels, but at the same time differences with the US context. On one hand, the findings stir a conversation about the importance of considering the surroundings of sexual minorities when looking at where they live or choose to live. On the other hand, these studies miss the opportunity of combining individual and neighborhood sociodemographic characteristics to help understand the profile of the groups that live in a certain part of a city or country. Therefore, the relationship between internal migration and spatial segregation has yet to be explored in future studies.

Internal migration

It was in the field of anthropology that a first step was taken towards creating a narrative that focused on gay and lesbian individuals and internal migration with the classic *Get Thee to a Big City* by Weston (1995). The collective imagination of the small-town queer individual that fled to the large city in an effort to experience their true selves has been the benchmark for queer migration studies for decades. Still in the 90's, geographers were drawn to this subject with the works of Bell and Binnie (1999), which explored the relationship between space, sexual orientation and gender identity. The studies of where gay men lived were ample since academia is not exempt of gender bias, which meant that there were more men interested in studying other men. Feminist scholars pushed for a more inclusive perspective and lesbians started to get more visibility in geography of sexualities in the early 2000s.

In the systematic research, 10 articles on internal migration were found, some of which were related to subjects such as wellbeing, labor market, marriage laws and sexual behavior. Only four of the articles deal specifically with internal migration as a phenomenon, the others used migration *status* as a control variable in regression models or as a variable in descriptive analysis. When analyzing the information about sexuality used in these articles: four on same-sex couples, three use data on men who have sex with men, three on LGB individuals, three on lesbians and gay men and one uses sexual attraction and sexual identity.

A first attempt to use the 1990 US census data with migration *status* was made by Cooke (2005) who tested if same-sex couples are affected in the labor market when moving to a new city. The hypothesis is that because heterosexual married women suffer employment issues when moving to a new city, a same-sex couple would not have that problem given that there isn't a gender role difference between the couples. The results indicate that employment and working hours are not affected by the move made by same-sex couples, which for the author is

indirect evidence that heterosexual women that migrate with families are affected in the labor market because of their gender role. While the study has interesting findings, an addition to the analysis would be inserting the family structure of the couples, which seems odd since the author mentions the importance of family migration for heterosexual married women.

Rosenfeld and Kim (2005) were interested in the relationship between independence from community of origin and unions that are nontraditional in US society. To that end, the authors focused on interracial, same-sex unions, married and cohabitating unions. They used geographical mobility as a *proxy* for independence from place of origin and found that nontraditional unions are more likely to move from the place of origin than heterosexual, same-race, married unions. In that spectrum, the most mobile group is the same-sex, interracial and cohabitating couples. Rosenfeld and Kim (2005) found that the independence life stage is declining over time, which could be an indication of more acceptance and tolerance towards nontraditional unions in the communities of origin. However, the findings of Rosenfeld and Kim (2005) are enlightening regarding the likelihood of internal migration in the US, there is little indication of distance from the community of origin and no differentiation between male same-sex and female same-sex couples, which previous studies have shown to be important in the migration and spatial distribution of gay men and lesbians in the US (BLACK *et al.*, 2000; COOKE, 2005).

A topic that gained traction in demographic and epidemiological studies is that of migration and HIV/AIDS. Most of these studies are focused on men that have sex with men (MSM) and want to understand the migration patterns and risk behavior of these migrants. On that note, Catania *et al.* (2006) uses migration *status*, *closetedness* and family structure to create a profile on urban men that have sex with men in the US. The authors hypothesize that minority ethnic groups and lower socioeconomic groups will disclose their sexuality less than other groups. On the other hand, they use migration *status* to test if it affects the disclosure of sexuality when controlled also by age, ethnicity and social class. The findings evidence that most of the sample of MSM is of in-migrants (82%) and that they are more likely to be white highly educated men. Age and social class were not variables that differentiate MSM from non-migrants MSM in large urban areas. Overall, the results suggest that sub-representation of ethnic minority groups in MSM *surveys* might be due to non-disclosure of sexuality by these minority groups that, when in-migrants, lower the chances of disclosing their sexuality.

Cooke and Rapino (2007) uses census data on interregional migration to show the migration patterns of gay men and lesbians in the US. The findings showed that migration flows of gay men were mostly to moderate-sized urban regions with an abundance of natural amenities and that lesbians migrated to less populated regions with a significant pre-existing lesbian community. An interesting result is that population density is not significant to lesbian migration and is important for gay migration, which could be gender related, either showing that women do not have preference for large and dense cities or that they do not take those variables into account when choosing where to migrate. Unfortunately,

there was not a regression with heterosexual couples and therefore conclusions regarding the comparisons between these groups cannot be drawn from the study.

Rault (2016) was able to add knowledge about distance from the family of origin in his study regarding the geographical mobility of gay men and lesbians in France. These results suggest that sexual minorities are more prone to move further away from their family of origin, especially gay men when compared to lesbians. Another finding is that compared to heterosexual couples, same-sex couples invest more in education and upward social mobility. Gay men are also more likely to move to larger cities than their heterosexual counterparts. Some of the latter findings are in line with other studies in the US that focus on spatial concentration of gay men in large cities (BLACK *et al.*, 2002; COMPTON; BAUMLE, 2012). At the same time, this study shows the importance of considering distance from family as an important indicator of migration decision making among sexual minorities.

An innovative study by Hughes, Chen and Scheer (2017) created a modeling method to estimate the migration patterns of men that have sex with men using race and HIV serostatus. With the use of data from the National HIV Behavioral Surveillance project, the authors estimated in-migration, out-migration and net migration from 2006 to 2013 of MSM in San Francisco. The results show that HIV-positive out-migration is higher than HIV-positive MSM in-migration and when analyzed by race the values are even higher compared to white MSM. In regard to HIV prevalence in the population, the results show a decrease in HIV-positive in the population over time for all races/ethnicities. The importance of having a model that relates migration with HIV serostatus is a critical step to establish a benchmark that can be beneficial for future studies seeking to understand how migration can impact HIV transmission (HUGHES; CHEN; SCHEER, 2017).

The wellbeing of sexual minorities has been a subfield of interest that relates minority stress, stigma and discrimination with mental health of queer individuals. Wienke and Hill (2013) expanded on this topic and were interested in investigating how the place of residence could influence wellbeing for gay men and lesbians. Controlling for individual characteristics, they found the wellbeing of gay men and lesbians to be lower in large cities than in rural areas. In more specific terms, using migration status results suggest that non-migrant lesbians from large cities were less happy than migrant lesbians to large cities and from rural areas. Also, migrants to rural areas reported more satisfaction with their work than migrants and non-migrants of large cities. These results are contrary to what some studies have suggested over the years that rural settings are detrimental to the wellbeing of sexual minorities. Therefore, determinist theory can explain to some extent that urban life is not without costs, including noise, pollution, traffic, crime and ethnic conflicts all of which negatively affect wellbeing (WIENKE; HILL, 2013).

Wienke and Hill (2013) started the conversation surrounding mental health, place of residence and migration status, another study by Ueno; Vaghela and Ritter (2014) tried to fill the gaps left by previous studies regarding internal migration, sexual orientation and mental health. Using Add Health data from the US, the authors found that sexual minorities

have a higher migration rate than heterosexuals and have better mental health when they migrate to counties more urban than the places they left. These findings add to the importance of migration for sexual minorities that use this strategy to escape stigma and discrimination, thus improving their mental health. Having data that enabled the study to be delineated around transition to adulthood is innovative and necessary since migration is in many cases closely related to that process, which makes the results even more robust.

A more recent study by Scheitle and Guthrie (2019) acknowledges that few studies have tackled internal migration systematically and using data that allows for measures of childhood and current residency. In this context, their article utilizes the General Social Survey from 2008 until 2016 to calculate in the residential context where gay men, lesbians, bisexual and heterosexual people lived when they were 16 years of age and where they currently live. The authors conclude there is no clear sexuality effect in moving towards more urban areas, mainly because most sexual minorities are already from an urban context. They also found that ethnic minority individuals were more likely to have moved to more urban areas since the age of 16. The article has its limitations, insofar as they capture only one stage of movement for these individuals. Nevertheless, their study shows the importance of residential context in the childhood of sexual minorities when analyzing migration patterns.

A lot of studies on migration use data on same-sex partners but none had used it with a purpose of establishing a relationship between marriage and migration. It was Marcén and Morales (2022) who connected the dots and analyzed the impact of same-sex marriage legalization on migration patterns in the US. With the use of data from the America Community Survey there is evidence that the legalization of same-sex marriage does have a positive effect on the migration flows of homosexual individuals to the states where it became legal. The novelty of the study is using an external factor that can impact and shift the spatial distribution of sexual minorities in the country. This line of research deserves more attention where the study of marriage migration takes on a mean of its own regarding same-sex marriage.

The literature review shows that there are still many mixed results and at the same time many possibilities of dialogue within migration studies and with other fields related to sexuality. The fact that space and mobility are two important factors for demographic research makes it an ideal environment to develop research about the relationships between sexuality and migration. Therefore, an important articulation is paramount to solidify the subfield of demography of sexualities, which has scholars spread across many different fields and in need of a network to push this agenda forward.

The next step is to use Brazil as a case study in which migration is intertwined with sexuality studies. The aim is to give the reader a historic context that will help understand what is known about the relationship between sexuality and spatial mobility in Brazil and the challenges faced to advance these understandings.

Sexuality & migration: demographic research in Brazil

The literature review has shown that there are many isolated studies from different parts of the world with a large concentration of studies in the United States that investigate the relationship between sexuality and migration. There were also no quantitative studies found on migration and sexuality using Brazilian data. Therefore, I bring an overview of the context in which sexuality and migration co-exist in Brazil and try to create a research agenda that may contribute to this subfield of knowledge in the country more recently.

It was only a decade ago that the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) started collecting data on same-sex couples through the 2010 Census. At the time same-sex marriage was not yet legal and would only become a reality in the country in 2013. The availability of quantitative data on same-sex couples such as the 2010 Census, later on the civil registry, and most recently the National Health Survey of 2019 could be the missing link necessary for Brazilian demographers to research and produce knowledge on the subject.

Despite the fact that studies about sexual minorities using quantitative data are scarce, qualitative studies brought the topic to light in the 1980s, as Maria Andrea Loyola recalls in her paper *Anthropology of Sexuality in Brazil* (2000), in which she describes the first seminars of the Sexuality and Reproduction Work Group of the Brazilian Association of Population Studies (1983), where she found “a real desert of studies regarding the subject”.² In 1984, at the IV Brazilian Association of Population Studies Meeting, Loyola alongside Peter Fry coordinated a seminar on a wide range of subjects related to sexuality such as equality, hierarchy, liberty, dependency among others. While Loyola’s (2000) intention with her paper was to describe the trajectory of studies of sexuality in the country, it also revealed that research on sexuality in population studies had encountered conceptual disagreements that were put to the test given the interdisciplinary nature of the subject. This seemed to have made scholars at the time gravitate towards their core fields of sociology, anthropology, psychology and history and not the other way around. Of all the scholars that participated in the 1983 seminar, only two remained conducting research in population studies: Elza Berquó and Elisabete Dória Bilac.

Elza Berquó, a reference in demographic research in Brazil, would continue her studies on family planning and postponement of motherhood related to sexuality and reproduction (BERQUÓ, 1987, 1990; BERQUÓ; LOYOLA, 1984). She also investigated sexual behavior and risk behavior specially related to HIV/AIDS (BARBOSA *et al.*, 2008; FERREIRA *et al.*, 2008). Elisabete Bilac would go on to become a reference in family demography in the country shedding light on the discussion of gender, labor and family (BILAC, 1995, 2014). The other participants in the seminar would become references in their own fields regarding sexuality, such as Peter Fry and Edward MacRae (1991); Maria Luiza Heilborn (2004); Nestor Perlongher (1987) and Carmen Dora Guimarães (2004) who paved the way for many anthropologists and sociologists interested

² Loyola (2000, p. 146) freely translated.

in researching sexuality and identity. The difference between these paths is that the latter did their work on sexuality related to sexual orientation and not sexuality, related to reproductive rights, therefore the methodological and conceptual discussion that Loyola points out at the end of her paper did not advance:

Considering the field of sexual-affective relations in its totality, with tensions and internal contradictions among different organizational and categorical systems, we can think and visualize the logical and political function that implement a more ample reproduction of a social system that it constitutes and is constituted by it. (LOYOLA, 2000, p. 160-161)

Tracing back to the first studies about sexuality in Brazil most of them were focused on individuality, power dynamics and romantic relationships. A step further was to find the first studies that related mobility and migration to sexual minorities, which were found to be concentrated in the field of Urban Anthropology.

The first works to allude to migration of gay men and lesbians in Brazil started in the 70's with Guimarães (2004) that studied homosexual middle class men in Rio de Janeiro who happened to be migrants. Unfortunately, this line of queries regarding migration was not the focus of her work, but came up in the interviews where "freedom and anonymity" were the main motivators of the migration of those individuals. It was only in the 80's and 90's that Richard Parker (2002) dedicated a chapter of his book to identifying internal migration in three major cities in the country. The conclusions after several interviews with gay men was that most of the migration occurred in two stages, in which migrants left small rural towns towards regional capitals and then eventually went to São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro as a final destination. In some cases, the final destination was another country, but to get there all of them had gone to São Paulo and Rio before. Also, in the 80's Perlongher (1987) who focused his work on male prostitution in São Paulo acknowledged the importance of migration to that city, which led to the structuring of a network that revolved around the male prostitution market. Other scholars such as the historian Green (2000) pointed to the rural-urban migration in the 70's as an important mobility by gay men at the time, fundamental for creating networks for homosexual individuals move and settle in these large cities. Some scholars have even argued that this migration help build and fortify the homosexual civil rights movement that emerged in the 1970's in the cities of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro (SIMÕES; FACCHINI, 2009).

The rural-urban migration trajectories of sexual minorities described by qualitative research were inserted into a national dynamic of internal migration flows that were occurring at the time in a country spiked by the economic growth and job availability centered in the Southeast region, mostly São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro (BRAGA, 2006). The industrial development of the country between 1970 and 1980 was responsible for the redistribution of population in Brazil and for making internal migration part of Brazilian culture (DURHAM, 1984; FARIA, 1991; PATARRA; PACHECO, 1997). Despite being part of a larger dynamic of internal migration the reasons behind this type of migration had more than just economic motivators as depicted by Parker (2002).

In 1994, the International Conference of Population and Development established the control of the HIV/AIDS epidemic as one of the most important actions regarding population. This opened a field of studies of sexual behavior especially in epidemiology in sync with demographic research at the time (PARKER; BARBOSA, 1996; KNAUTH *et al.*, 2002). The funding of these studies in the 1990's, which focused on HIV/AIDS made an impact that still reverberates in the field of sexuality and sexual behavior (FERREIRA *et al.*, 2008; PAIVA *et al.*, 2015). Although there are international studies that relate to migration and HIV/AIDS (CATANIA *et al.*, 2006; HUGHES; CHEN; SCHEER, 2017), in Brazil this topic is yet to be explored.

In the last ten years, some qualitative studies have emerged and discussions surrounding the specificities of migration of sexual minorities in Brazil started to gain traction. França (2013) examined the migration of gay men from São Paulo to Recife and found that social practices common to these men in both cities is what bonded them despite their different *backgrounds*. Later, Teixeira (2015) discusses homosexual migration in the context of urban spaces while using the concept of *metronormativity* (HALBERSTAM, 2005), where the urban space is supposed to be the equivalent of freedom and sexual satisfaction, to discuss how much of the migration process plays a part on the narratives of the lives of homosexuals. In his final remarks, the author concludes that the mobility of homosexual individuals to different cities and even to other countries is almost an imposition of how their subjectivity is built and therefore: "the homosexual would be an innate migrant" (TEIXEIRA, 2015, p. 36). Unfortunately, there is no quantitative data available that can support his conclusions, which are therefore open for discussion.

Passamani (2016) focused his study on the city of Corumbá near the Bolivian border and found contradicting most studies that the participants were non-migrants who made their lives in this small city by negotiating the private and public spaces where their sexuality could be communicated. Campos and Moretti-Pires (2018) focused their study on homeless gay men and lesbians in Florianópolis, in the South region of Brazil, and found that most of the individuals interviewed were migrants who had been kicked out by their family because of violence triggered by homophobia and that their socioeconomic *background* was determinant as to why they ended up in homelessness. More recently, research on international LGBTIQ+ migrants showed that internal migration has occurred in the trajectories of sexual minorities once established in Brazil. Hadriel and Cogo (2020) show how internal migration by international migrants and their partners occurs in three stages: first leaving a small-town heading to the state capital and afterwards going to São Paulo, a similar path noted by Parker (2002) in the late 1990s.

It was only in 2015 that studies in demographic research in Brazil focused on sexual minorities using data on same-sex couples from the 2010 Census comparing assortative mating of these couple to different-sex couples (DE LENA; OLIVEIRA, 2015). A subsequent study by De Lena (2016) explored conjugality and parenthood of same-sex couples in the descriptive statistics of same-sex couples and showed that 12% of gay men and 8% of lesbians in same-sex

relationships had both migrated between 2005 and 2010. Unfortunately, there was no further analysis to identify if these couples had migrated together between those years.

Recently, a qualitative study by Souza (2020) that investigates the childbearing and parenthood intentions of same-sex couples in Brasília, capital of Brazil, found differences in parental intentions of lesbians when compared to gay men. The reproduction of heteronormative roles regarding family formation were found among the couples, which made female care a more common approach to parenting. Lastly, a study by Silva (2021) draws on a mixed-method approach to understand the relationship between mental health and identity building of sexual minorities in Minas Gerais in the Southeast region of Brazil. The author finds that lesbians and bisexual women in more advanced ages were mostly migrants and fared better in regard to mental health when compared to younger lesbians and bisexual women. In the qualitative part of the study, there were indications that lesbians and bisexual women migrated at an earlier stage of their life course than gay men. These results suggest that migration might be a strategy for lesbians and bisexual women which may affect their future mental health.

Most of the studies showcased here stem from the social sciences, but in the field of geography, which was marked in the country by the work of Silva (2008), publications have emerged related to sexual minorities, territoriality and space (SOUZA; ORNAT, 2020; ORNAT, 2008; SILVA; ORNAT, 2015). In their review of articles published on sexuality in the field of geography in Brazil, Silva and Vieira (2014) set the scenery of literature published between 1995 and 2012 and the problems faced by Brazilian scholars in a field dominated by Anglophone literature. Initially, the authors thought that the existence of established international journals of geography of sexualities would facilitate the insertion of their discussions in the field. They draw attention to the requirements imposed by top-ranked journals that make the possibility of a wider dissemination of knowledge produced by geographers of sexualities about Brazil very limited. In addition, the little regard Anglophone reviewers have for concepts and methodologies not based on native Anglophone scholars creates a specific way of producing knowledge in the field, which excludes productions from the Global South (SILVA; VIEIRA, 2014).

The difficulties to publish in international journals encountered by Silva and Vieira (2014) could help explain the absence of articles in the systematic review from the Global South using quantitative data on migration and sexuality. Another reason might be related to the lack of articulation between scholars of the subfields of sexualities and migration in the country. Silva and Vieira (2014) point to the importance of the launch of the *Revista Latino-Americana de Geografia e Gênero* in 2009 thus creating a space where articles of geography of sexualities from the Global South could circulate.

So far, studies conducted in Brazil that research migration and sexuality have used qualitative methods, which limits the power of generalization of the results in terms of the Brazilian population. A recent study by Fortes de Lena (2022) has made use of census data and found that migration of gay men and lesbians is concentrated on medium sized cities, which is similar to the migration of heterosexuals. Beyond that, when analyzing large cities, gay men do migrate more to megacities such as São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro than lesbians and heterosexual

men and women. Nevertheless, these studies indicate that migration of sexual minorities is an important event in the life course and needs to be addressed quantitatively to gain better understanding of this phenomenon in a more general perspective.

Setting a research agenda

After reviewing the studies from the systematic review, it is clear that the questions of where sexual minorities live, and where they move to are both important aspects of the lives of sexual minorities, which are a part of social and economic processes related to availability of capital, warm weather, tolerance and urbanity to name a few (BLACK *et al.*, 2002; COMPTON; BAUMLE, 2012). The profile of sexual minorities remains unclear, as well as whether their individual characteristics make a difference in where they choose to live. The studies reviewed here point to some topics that stand out and have the potential to be explored and incorporated into migration studies. Three main topics thread the needle into discussions about internal migration of sexual minorities: Migration and Health Issues, Migration and Family, Migration and Ethnicity,

Migration and health issues

A field of studies that can benefit from a deeper knowledge on internal migration is epidemiology and health related studies, which have data on sexual orientation and gender identity that fuels the production of knowledge around issues such as HIV/AIDS, minority stress, mental health and access to healthcare. The legalization of marriage has generated studies interested in wellbeing of same-sex couples after marriage equality. Studies have shown how equal rights increase the wellbeing of these couples and social acceptance of sexual minorities in places like the U.K. and the Netherlands (BOERTIEN; VIGNOLI, 2019; CHEN; OURS, 2018).

In addition, health disparities among the LGB population have been shown to increase over birth cohorts, which shows the importance of identifying the causes of these disparities for public policies (LIU; RECZEK, 2021). The study by Liu and Reczek (2021) shows that LGB people fare worse regarding mental and physical health controlling for sociodemographic and geographical factors, but they did not use information on migration *status*, which could be a factor since migration has been shown to improve mental health of sexual minorities in the US (UENO; VAGHELA; RITTER, 2014; WIENKE; HILL, 2013).

Two of the studies reviewed in this paper have showed the importance of wellbeing of gay men and lesbians and migration, and have come to different conclusions regarding migration and mental health. Wienke and Hill (2013) found that gay men and lesbians that live in urban areas have a higher wellbeing than those in rural areas. On the other hand, Ueno, Vaghela and Ritter (2014) showed that in the context of transition to adulthood migration to urban cities improves the mental health of sexual minorities. In the Brazilian context, future studies focusing on internal migration of sexual minorities in the country related to mental health might be able to explore the relationship initially found by Silva (2021).

Migration and family

Family demography has been the entry point for studies of sexuality in demographic research that take into account the sexual orientation of the population. The field of family formation and family dynamics of sexual minorities has been studied at large in demographic research, especially with regard to marriage equality laws and differences between same-sex and different sex couples regarding marital choices and union stability. In the 1990's many of the family studies had not successfully incorporated family diversity into their analysis mostly due to lack of data (ALLEN; DEMO, 1995).

More recently, Reczek (2020) reviewed studies on sexual – and gender-minority families (SGM) and found that a lot has changed in the last decade. The author draws attention to the multiplicity of research related to sexual – and gender-minority families focusing on adolescence, young adulthood, family formation, household dynamics, parenthood, relationship dissolution, health and wellbeing. On the other hand, Reczek shows that there are still limitations to studies on these families such as the underrepresentation of groups such as bisexual, transgender and asexual individuals and polyamorous families. Another important point is the lack of racial-ethnic representation and the necessity to incorporate studies with a life course perspective (RECZEK, 2020). Another issue that had no mentions in the study conducted by Reczek was migration related gender- and sexual minority families, which suggests an oversight in this field.

Wimark (2016) has shown that family ties are an important factor in the analysis of migratory trajectories of sexual minorities in Turkey. As family ties influence migration by constraints and supportiveness (WIMARK, 2016), migration can also be the factor influencing family formation and family dissolution of sexual minorities. In the systematic review there were some studies that signaled the incorporation of family structure by insertion of having children in the household.

In addition, the size of marital markets is important in union formation (VERBAKEL; KALMIJN, 2014) and has not been correlated with the knowledge that migration of sexual minorities partly occurs not only as a pursuit of sexual freedom but also a pursuit of sexual and marital markets. Marcén and Morales (2022) showed that legalization of same-sex marriage had an impact on the spatial distribution of same-sex couples. Another question would be if the decision of where to migrate to for gay men and lesbians is correlated to the size of the marriage markets. Wimark and Östh (2014) found that single gay men and lesbians concentrate more in larger cities. Therefore, a follow up question would be: is the urban space the only environment for family formation of sexual minorities? There is evidence to support the large concentration of sexual minorities in large cities, but most of these studies rely on individuals who are already in romantic relationships. Therefore, the importance of urban spaces for family formation of sexual minorities is a subject to be addressed by scholars as well as how that may also explain the appeal of large cities for migrants in search of partners.

Migration and ethnicity

In the systematic review, some studies showed the similarities between the spatial segregation of sexual minorities and ethnic minorities (SPRING, 2013). Other studies showed how ethnicity might influence where some sexual minorities choose to live (BAUMLE, 2010). Another finding related to the migration of MSM, showed different patterns when analyzing by race/ethnicity (HUGHES; CHEN; SCHEER, 2017). All of these studies contributed in showing the importance of ethnicity in migration studies of sexual minorities. Nevertheless, these studies are based on the US, which have historic differences to the Brazilian context of how race/ethnicity are engendered into these societies. Studies on spatial segregation and race in the Brazilian context have shown that internal migrants according to race are spatially segregated to peripheral regions (FACCHINI; FRANÇA, 2020). Therefore, adding to these findings would be the incorporation of sexual minorities by race and their migration patterns which remain unknown so far and how they might contribute to the spatial segregation found in previous studies.

Final remarks

Demographic research is an interdisciplinary field at its core and therefore, the perfect setting for studies of sexuality and migration that are complex and require quantitative and qualitative research to produce knowledge. In reviewing the body of work produced so far regarding migration and sexuality within demographic research, I have identified some hypotheses that could explain some reasons for the small number of publications regarding this subject in demographic studies and, more specifically, in the Global South. The review also gave some indication of themes that should be explored in future research creating a research agenda that can encourage research on migration and sexuality in demographic research.

However, there are still few quantitative studies with information on both sexuality and migratory *status*, which stifles progress in the understanding of how sexuality operates in the spatial distribution and mobility of populations. Moreover, most studies are concentrated in the Global North, where social acceptance of sexual minorities is much higher than in countries in the Global South. The comparison of the inner workings of sexuality in the Global North and Global South is a theme that has yet to be explored in demographic research. This review has shown that the knowledge on sexual minorities quantitatively is focused in the Global North. However, this review has also shown there is a growing number of studies given the recent availability of *surveys*, census and registry data that enable the analysis of sexual minorities in the Global South. How sexuality operates in these locations regarding migration and how it differs from studies in the Global North will contribute not only to migration studies, but also to gender and sexuality studies, since openness, stigma and discrimination have been shown to drive migration for sexual minorities.

As a case study, the production of sexuality studies in Brazil has created a narrative of urban migration studies interested in sexuality and the city. The advance in geography of sexualities

in the country has shown how the relationship between sexuality, gender, urban spaces and territory is a source of interesting findings even with some resistance from scholars (SILVA; ORNAT, 2019). However, studies focusing on internal migration and sexuality quantitatively in demographic research and geography of sexualities in Brazil remain scarce. The lack of progress in the field of demographic research is combined with unfamiliarity of migration scholars with sexuality studies and vice-versa. In this sense, it is important for future scholars to articulate cooperation among these academics to investigate how sexuality affects the spatial distribution of sexual minorities in the country through internal migration.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Thomas Wimark, Glaucia Marcondes dos Santos, Diederik Boertien and the reviewers for the generous comments that helped improve the final version. This article was funded by Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior, Grant/Award Number: 88882.329802/2018/01 and the European Research Council, Grant/Award Number: ERC-2020- 948557-MINEQ.

References

- ALLEN, K. R.; DEMO, D. H. The families of lesbians and gay men: new frontier in family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, v. 57, n. 1, p. 111-127, 1995.
- ANACKER, K. B.; MORROW-JONES, H. A. Neighborhood factors associated with same-sex households in US cities. *Urban Geography*, v. 26, n. 5, p. 385-409, 2005.
- ANDERSSON, G. *et al.* The demographics of same-sex marriages in Norway and Sweden. *Demography*, New York, v. 43, n. 1, p. 9-98, 2006.
- ANDRADE, V. L. *Imigração e sexualidade: solicitantes de refúgio, refugiados e refugiadas por motivos de orientação sexual na cidade de São Paulo*. 2017. 238f. Dissertação (Mestrado) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Antropologia Social, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, SC, 2017.
- AZEVEDO, D. C. P. *Na capital: trajetórias migratórias e homossexuais em Goiânia*. (Monografia) – Universidade Federal de Goiás, Goiânia, GO, 2014.
- BADGETT, M. V. L.; WILLIAMS, R. M. The economics of sexual orientation: establishing a research agenda. *Feminist Studies*, v. 18, n. 3, p. 649-657, 1992.
- BANENS, M. Sex miscoding and same-sex couple estimates evidence from the French 2011 Census and family survey. *In: IUSSP INTERNATIONAL POPULATION CONFERENCE. Proceedings [...]*. South Korea, 2013.
- BANENS, M. Same-sex unions in Europe: some observations on European diversity. *Reviews & Critical Commentary*, 2014.
- BARBOSA, R. M. *et al.* Sexual behavior and practices among men and women, Brazil 1998 and 2005. *Revista de Saúde Pública*, São Paulo, v. 42, Supl. 1, p. 21-33, 2008. doi.org/10.1590/s0034-89102008000800005.

BAUMLE, A. K.; DREON, B. The demography of sexuality. *In*: POSTON JR., D. L. (ed.). **Handbook of population**. 2. ed. Berlin: Springer, 2019. p. 290-299.

BAUMLE, A. K. The demography of sexuality: queering demographic methods. *In*: COMPTON, D'L. R.; MEADOW, T.; SCHILT, K. (ed.). **Other, please specify**. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2018.

BAUMLE, A. K. Border identities: intersection of ethnicity and sexual orientation in the US: Mexico borderland. **Social Science Research**, v. 39, n. 2, p. 231-245, 2010.

BAUMLE, A. K.; COMPTON, D'L.; POSTON JR., D. L. **Same-sex partners: the social demography of sexual orientation**. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2009.

BELL, D.; BINNIE, J. Authenticating queer space: citizenship, urbanism and governance. **Urban Studies**, v. 41, n. 9, p. 1807-1820, 2004.

BERQUÓ, E. A new attempt to infringe on reproductive rights. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos de População**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 7, n. 1, p. 87-94, 1990.

BERQUÓ, E. On family planning policy in Brazil. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos de População**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 4, n. 1, p. 95-103, 1987.

BERQUÓ, E.; LOYOLA, M. A. Conjugal unions and reproductive strategies in Brazil. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos de População**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 1, n. 1-2, p. 35-98, 1984.

BILAC, E. D. Trabalho e família: articulações possíveis. **Tempo Social**, São Paulo, v. 26, n. 1, p. 129-145, 2014.

BILAC, E. D. Família: algumas inquietações. *In*: CARVALHO, M. C. B. **A família contemporânea em debate**. São Paulo, SP: Cortez, v. 3, 1995. p. 29-38.

BLACK, D. *et al.* **The measurement of same-sex unmarried partner couples in the 2000 US census**. Los Angeles: California Center for Population Research, 2007.

BLACK, D. *et al.* Why do gay men live in San Francisco? **Journal of Urban Economics**, New York, v. 51, n. 1, p. 54-76, 2002. doi.org/10.1006/JUEC.2001.2237.

BLACK, D. *et al.* Demographics of the gay and lesbian population in the United States: evidence from available systematic data sources. **Demography**, New York, v. 37, n. 2, p. 139-154, 2000. doi.org/10.2307/2648117.

BOERTIEN, D.; VIGNOLI, D. Legalizing same-sex marriage matters for the subjective well-being of individuals in same-sex unions. **Demography**, New York, v. 56, n. 6, p. 2109-2121, 2019. doi.org/10.1007/s13524-019-00822-1.

BOLT, G.; VAN KEMPEN, R.; VAN HAM, M. Minority ethnic groups in the Dutch housing market: spatial segregation, relocation dynamics and housing policy. **Urban Studies**, v. 45, n. 7, p. 1359-1384, 2008.

BRAGA, F. Migração interna e urbanização no Brasil contemporâneo: um estudo da rede de localidades centrais do Brasil (1980/2000). *In*: ENCONTRO NACIONAL DE ESTUDOS POPULACIONAIS, 15., 2006, Caxambu, MG. **Anais [...]**. Belo Horizonte, MG: Abep, 2006.

BROWN, L. A.; CHUNG, S.-Y. Spatial segregation, segregation indices and the geographical perspective. **Population, Space and Place**, v. 12, n. 2, p. 125-143, 2006.

BROWN, M.; KNOPP, L. Places or polygons? Governmentality, scale, and the census in the gay and lesbian atlas. **Population, Space and Place**, v. 12, n. 4, p. 223-242, 2006. https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.410.

CAMPOS, D. A.; MORETTI-PIRES, R. O. Trajetórias sociais de gays e lésbicas moradores de rua de Florianópolis (SC), 2016. **Estudos Feministas**, Florianópolis, v. 26, n. 2, e45995, 2018.

CARPENTER, C. S. The direct effects of legal same-sex marriage in the United States: evidence from Massachusetts. **Demography**, New York, v. 57, n. 5, p. 1787-1808, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-020-00908-1>.

CATANIA, J. *et al.* Understanding the demographics of urban men who have sex with men. **Journal of Homosexuality**, New York, v. 51, n. 3, p. 33-53, 2006. doi.org/10.1300/J082v51n03_03.

CHEN, S.; OURS, J. C. van. Subjective well-being and partnership dynamics: are same-sex relationships different? **Demography**, New York, v. 55, n. 6, p. 2299-2320, 2018.

COMPTON, D'L. R.; BAUMLE, A. K. Beyond the Castro: the role of demographics in the selection of gay and lesbian enclaves. **Journal of Homosexuality**, New York, v. 59, n. 10, p. 1327-1355, 2012. doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2012.724633.

COOKE, T. J.; RAPINO, M. The migration of partnered gays and lesbians between 1995 and 2000. **Professional Geographer**, Washington, v. 59, n. 3, p. 285-297, 2007. doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9272.2007.00613.x.

COOKE, T. J. Migration of same-sex couples. **Population, Space and Place**, v. 11, n. 5, p. 401-409, 2005. doi.org/10.1002/psp.383.

CORTINA, C.; FESTY, P. Identification of same-sex couples and families in censuses, registers and surveys. **Families and Societies**, v. 8, 2014.

CURRAN, S. R. *et al.* Mapping gender and migration in sociological scholarship: is it segregation or integration? **International Migration Review**, New York, v. 40, n. 1, p. 199-223, 2006.

DE LENA, F. F. “**Só se for a dois**”: conjugalidade e homoparentalidade no censo brasileiro de 2010. 2016. Dissertação (Mestrado) – Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2016. doi.org/10.47749/T/UNICAMP.2016.972619.

DE LENA, F. F.; OLIVEIRA, A. M. H. C. Assortative mating patterns of homosexual and heterosexual couples in Brazil. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos de População**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 32, n. 1, p. 121-137, 2015. doi.org/10.1590/S0102-30982015000000007.

DEMAIO, T. J.; BATES, N.; O'CONNELL, M. Exploring measurement error issues in reporting of same-sex couples. **Public Opinion Quarterly**, Chicago, v. 77, n. especial, p. 145-158, 2013. doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfs066.

DIBENNARDO, R.; GATES, G. J. Research note: US Census same-sex couple data: adjustments to reduce measurement error and empirical implications. **Population Research and Policy Review**, Amsterdam, v. 33, n. 4, p. 603-614, 2014.

DONATO, K. M. *et al.* A glass half full? Gender in migration studies. **International Migration Review**, v. 40, n. 1, p. 3-26, Mar. 2006.

DURHAM, E. **A caminho da cidade**. São Paulo, SP: Perspectiva, 1984.

EVERETT, B. Changes in neighborhood characteristics and depression among sexual minority young adults. **Journal of the American Psychiatric Nurses Association**, v. 20, n. 1, p. 42-52, 2014.

FACCHINI, R.; FRANÇA, I. L. (ed.). **Diretos em disputa: LGBTI+, poder e diferença no Brasil contemporâneo**. Campinas, SP: Editora da Unicamp, 2020.

FARIA, V. Cinquenta anos de urbanização no Brasil: tendências e perspectivas. **Novos Estudos**, São Paulo, n. 29, p. 98-119, 1991.

FERREIRA, M. P. *et al.* Knowledge and risk perception on HIV/AIDS by Brazilian population, 1998 and 2005. **Revista de Saúde Pública**, São Paulo, v. 42, Supl. 1, p. 65-71, 2008. doi.org/10.1590/s0034-89102008000800009.

FRANÇA, I. L. “Refugiados LGBTI”: direitos e narrativas entrecruzando gênero, sexualidade e violência. **Cadernos Pagu**, Campinas, n. 50, 2017. doi.org/10.1590/18094449201700500006.

FRANÇA, I. L. Frango com frango é coisa de paulista. **Sexualidad, Salud y Sociedad – Revista Latinoamericana**, Rio de Janeiro, n. 14, p. 13-39, 2013.

FRY, P.; MACRAE, E. **O que é homossexualidade**. 3. ed. São Paulo, SP: Brasiliense, 1991.

GARCIA, R. A. A mensuração da migração de data-fixa no Brasil com base nos censos demográficos: dificuldades e inconsistências. **Cadernos do Leste**, v. 15, n. 15, 2015.

GATES, G. J.; OST, J. **The gay and lesbian atlas**. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press, 2004.

GATES, G.; STEINBERGER, M. D. Same-sex unmarried partner couples in the American community survey: the role of misreporting, miscoding, and misallocation. *In*: ANNUAL MEETINGS OF THE POPULATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA. **Proceedings** [...]. Detroit, 2009.

GHAZIANI, A. **There goes the gayborhood?** New Jersey, NY: Princeton University Press, 2014.

GIRAUD, C. Residential spaces: looking at where homosexual men in Paris choose to live. **Sociétés Contemporaines**, Paris, v. 81, n. 1, p. 151-176, 2006.

GOLDANI, A. M.; ESTEVE, A.; TURU, A. Coming out in the 2010 Census: same-sex couples in Brazil and Uruguay. *In*: IUSSP INTERNATIONAL POPULATION CONFERENCE, 27., 2013, Busan, Korea. **Proceedings** [...]. França: IUSSP, 2013.

GOLDIE, X. Together, but separate: neighborhood-scale patterns and correlates of spatial segregation between male and female same-sex couples in Melbourne and Sydney. **Urban Geography**, v. 39, n. 9, p. 1391-1417, 2018. doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2018.1456030.

GREEN, J. N. **Além do carnaval: a homossexualidade masculina no Brasil do século XX**. São Paulo, SP: Editora da Unesp, 2000.

GUIMARÃES, C. D. **O homossexual visto por entendidos**. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Garamond, 2004.

HADRIEL, T.; COGO, D. (In)visibilidades sociocomunicacionais na diáspora queer. **Palabra Clave**, La Plata, v. 23, n. 3, e23332, 2020. doi.org/10.5294/pacla.2020.23.3.2.

HALBERSTAM, J. **In a queer time and place: transgender bodies, subcultural lives**. New York, NY: University Press, 2005.

HAYSLETT, K. L.; KANE, M. D. “Out” in Columbus: a geospatial analysis of the neighborhood-level distribution of gay and lesbian households. **City and Community**, v. 10, n. 2, p. 131-156, 2011. doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6040.2010.01353.x.

HEILBORN, M. L. **Dois é par: gênero e identidade sexual em contextos igualitários**. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Garamond, 2004.

HUBBARD, P. **Cities and sexualities**. New York, NY: Routledge, 2012.

HUGHES, A. J.; CHEN, Y.-H.; SCHEER, S. A novel modelling approach for estimating patterns of migration into and out of San Francisco by HIV status and race among men who have sex with men. **Journal of Urban Health**, New York, v. 94, n. 3, p. 350-363, 2017.

KNAUTH, D. R. *et al.* Medical culture and reproductive decisions among women infected with AIDS. **Interface-Comunicação, Saúde, Educação**, Botucatu, v. 6, n. 11, p. 39-54, 2002.

KNOPP, L. Sexuality and the spatial dynamics of capitalism. **Environment and Planning D: Society and Space**, London, v. 10, n. 6, p. 651-669, 1992.

KNOPP, L. Some theoretical implications of gay involvement in an urban land market. **Political Geography Quarterly**, v. 9, n. 4, p. 337-352, 1990. doi.org/10.1016/0260-9827(90)90033-7.

LAGOS, D.; COMPTON, D'L. Evaluating the use of two-step gender identity measure in the 2018 general social survey. **Demography**, New York, v. 58, n. 2, p. 763-772, 2021.

LAMA, A. C.; NIETO CALAMAESTRA, J. A. Geographical analysis of same-sex marriage in Spain: evolution, distribution and profiles after a decade of legality. **Boletín de La Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles**, Barcelona, v. 77, p. 368-397, 2018. doi.org/10.21138/bage.2545.

LAURIA, M.; KNOPP, L. Toward an analysis of the role of gay communities in the urban renaissance. **Urban Geography**, v. 6, n. 2, p. 152-169, 1985. doi.org/10.2747/0272-3638.6.2.152.

LEE, J. G. L. *et al.* Health-related regional and neighborhood correlates of sexual minority concentration: a systematic review. **PLoS ONE**, v. 13, n. 6, p. 1-17, 2018. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0198751.

LIU, H.; RECZEK, R. Birth cohort trends in health disparities by sexual orientation. **Demography**, New York, v. 58, n. 4, p. 1445-1472, 2021.

LOYOLA, M. A. A antropologia da sexualidade no Brasil. **Physis: Revista de Saúde Coletiva**, Rio de Janeiro, v.10, n. 1, p. 143-167, 2000. doi.org/10.1590/s0103-73312000000100007.

LUIBHEID, E. Queer/migration: an unruly body of scholarship. **GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies**, Baltimore, v. 14, n. 2-3, p. 169-190, 2008. doi.org/10.1215/10642684-2007-029.

MADDEN, J. F.; RUTHER, M. Gayborhoods: economic development and the concentration of same-sex couples and neighborhoods within large American cities. *In*: NIJKAMP, P.; ROSE, A.; KOURTI, K. **Regional science matters**. Berlin: Springer, 2015. p. 399-420.

MANALANSAN IV, M. F. Queer intersections: sexuality and gender in migration studies. **International Migration Review**, New York, v. 40, n. 1, p. 224-249, 2006. doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2006.00009.x.

MARCÉN, M.; MORALES, M. The effect of same-sex marriage legalization on interstate migration in the USA. **Journal of Population Economics**, Berlin, v. 35, p. 441-469, 2022. doi.org/10.1007/s00148-021-00842-5.

MASSEY, D. S.; GROSS, A. B.; SHIBUYA, K. Migration, segregation, and the geographic concentration of poverty. **American Sociological Review**, v. 59, n. 3, p. 425-445, 1994.

O'CONNELL, M.; FELIZ, S. **Same-sex couple household statistics from the 2010 Census**. [S. l.: n. s.], 2011.

ORNAT, M. J. **Território da prostituição e instituição do ser travesti em Ponta Grossa-Paraná**. 2008. 161f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Gestão do Território: sociedade e natureza) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Geografia, Universidade Estadual de Ponta Grossa, Ponta Grossa, PR, 2008.

ÖSTH, J.; MALMBERG, B.; ANDERSSON, E. K. Analysing segregation with individualized neighbourhood defined by population size. *In*: LLOYD, C. D.; SHUTTLEWORTH, G.; WONG, D. W. (ed.). **Social-spatial segregation concepts: processes and outcomes**. Briston: Policy Press, 2014. p. 135-162.

PAIVA, V. *et al.* The current state of play of research on the social, political and legal dimensions of HIV. **Cadernos de Saúde Pública**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 31, n. 3, p. 477-486, 2015. doi.org/10.1590/0102-311X00172514.

PARKER, R. G. **Abaixo do Equador: culturas do desejo, homossexualidade e comunidade gay no Brasil**. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Record, 2002.

PARKER, R. G.; BARBOSA, R. M. (org.). **Sexualidades brasileiras**. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Relume Dumará, 1996.

PATARRA, N.; PACHECO, C. A. Movimentos migratórios anos 80: novos padrões? *In*: PATARRA, N. *et al.* (org.). **Migrações, condições de vida e dinâmica urbana**. Campinas, SP: Editora da Unicamp, 1997. p. 25-52.

PEACH, C. Good segregation, bad segregation. **Planning Perspectives**, London, v. 11, n. 4, p. 379-398, 1996.

PERLONGHER, N. O. **O negócio do michê: a prostituição viril**. São Paulo, SP: Brasiliense, 1987.

POSTON JR., D. L. *et al.* The residential segregation of same-sex households from different-sex households in metropolitan USA, Circa-2010. **Population Review**, Baltimore, v. 56, n. 2, p. 1-29, 2017. doi.org/10.1353/prv.2017.0005.

RAULT, W. Les mobilités sociales et géographiques des gays et des lesbiennes. **Sociologie**, v. 7, n. 4, p. 337-360, 2016.

RECZEK, C. Sexual- and gender-minority families: a 2010 to 2020 decade in Review. **Journal of Marriage and Family**, v. 82, n. 1, p. 300-325, 2020. doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12607.

ROSENFELD, M.; KIM, B. S. The interdependence of young adults and the rise of interracial and same-sex unions. **Journal of Homosexuality**, New York, 70, n. 4, 541-562, 2005.

SCHEITL, C. P.; GUTHRIE, S. K. Urban migration of sexual minorities in the United States: myth or reality? **Sexuality and Culture**, Berlin, v. 23, n. 1, p. 96-111, 2019. doi.org/10.1007/s12119-018-9544-0.

SIBALIS, M. Urban space and homosexuality: the example of the Marais, Paris' "gay ghetto." **Urban Studies**, v. 41, n. 9, p. 1739-1758, 2004. doi.org/10.1080/0042098042000243138.

SILVA, J. M.; ORNAT, M. J. Feminist geographies: fight and achievement of a place in the Brazilian scientific production. **Gender, Place and Culture**, v. 26, n. 7-9, p. 956-963, 2019. doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2018.1553868.

SILVA, J. M.; ORNAT, M. J. Intersectionality and transnational mobility between Brazil and Spain in travesti prostitution networks. **Gender, Place and Culture**, v. 22, n. 8, p. 1073-1088, 2015. doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2014.939148.

SILVA, J. M.; VIEIRA, P. J. Geographies of sexualities in Brazil: between national invisibility and subordinate inclusion in postcolonial networks of knowledge production. **Geography Compass**, v. 8, n. 10, p. 767-777, 2014. doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12165.

SILVA, J. M. A cidade dos corpos transgressores da heteronormatividade. **GeoUERJ**, Rio de Janeiro, Ano 10, n. 18, p. 1-17, 2008.

SILVA, S. A. G. **"Nós que mudamos, eles não": a importância do suporte familiar, da idade e do gênero na análise do desenvolvimento da identidade sexual e da saúde mental de lésbicas, gays e bissexuais em Minas Gerais**. 2021. 286f. Tese (Doutorado) – Faculdade de Ciências Econômicas, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG, 2021.

SIMÕES, J. A.; FACCHINI, R. **Na trilha do arco-íris: do movimento homossexual ao LGBT**. São Paulo, SP: Editora da Fundação Perseu Abramo, 2009.

SOUZA, L. C. G. **Parenting intentions of same-sex couples: a case study in Brasília, Brazil**. 2020. 140f. Tese (Doutorado) – Centro de Desenvolvimento e Planejamento Regional, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG, 2020.

SOUZA, M. B.; ORNAT, M. J. The micro scales of regional development: reflections on the right to the city of LGBTQI+ people⁴. **International Journal of Professional Business Review**, São Paulo, v. 5, n. 2, p. 141-152, 2020. doi.org/10.26668/businessreview/2020.v5i1.166.

SPRING, A. L. Declining segregation of same-sex partners: evidence from Census 2000 and 2010. **Population Research and Policy Review**, Amsterdam, v. 32, n. 5, p. 1-7, 2013. doi.org/10.1038/jid.2014.371.

TEIXEIRA, M. D. A. A. “Metronormatividades” nativas: migrações homossexuais e espaços urbanos no Brasil. **Áskesis – Revista dos Discentes do Programa de Pós Graduação em Sociologia da UFSCar**, São Carlos, v. 4, n. 1, p. 23-38, 2015.

UENO, K.; VAGHELA, P.; RITTER, L. J. Sexual orientation, internal migration, and mental health during the transition to adulthood. **Journal of Health and Social Behavior**, Albany, v. 55, n. 4, p. 461-481, 2014.

VALENTINE, G. (Re)Negotiating the “heterosexual street”: lesbian productions of space. In: DUNCAN, N. (ed.). **Bodyspace: destabilizing geographies of gender and sexuality**. New York, NY: Routledge, 1996. p. 146-155.

VERBAKEL, E.; KALMIJN, M. Assortative mating among Dutch married and cohabiting same-sex and different-sex couples. **Journal of Marriage and Family**, v. 76, n. 1, p. 1-12, 2014. doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12084.

WALTHER, C. S.; POSTON JR., D. L.; GU, Y. Ecological analyses of gay male and lesbians partnering in the metropolitan United States in 2000. **Population Research and Policy Review**, Amsterdam, v. 30, n. 3, p. 419-448, 2011.

WESTON, K. Get thee to a big city: sexual imaginary and the great gay migration. **Gay and Lesbian Quarterly**, v. 2, p. 253-277, 1995. doi.org/10.1215/10642684-2-3-253.

WIENKE, C.; HILL, G. J. Does place of residence matter? Rural-urban differences and the wellbeing of gay men and lesbians. **Journal of Homosexuality**, New York, v. 60, n. 9, p. 1256-1279, 2013. doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2013.806166.

WIMARK, T.; DE LENA, F. F. Same-sex marriage and neighborhood landscape overlap: a revised understanding of the spatial distribution of gay men and lesbians. **Population, Space and Place**, v. 28, n. 2, 2022. doi.org/10.1002/psp.2507.

WIMARK, T. The impact of family ties on the mobility decisions of gay men and lesbians. **Gender, Place & Culture**, v. 23, n. 5, p. 659-676, 2016. doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2015.1034246.

WIMARK, T.; ÖSTH, J. The city as a single gay male magnet? Gay and lesbian geographical concentration in Sweden: the city as a single gay male magnet. **Population, Space and Place**, v. 20, n. 8, p. 739-752, 2014. doi.org/10.1002/psp.

About the author

Fernanda Fortes de Lena is a post-doctoral researcher at the Centre for Demographic Studies of Barcelona (CED) with a PhD and MSc in Demography by the University of Campinas (Unicamp). She was a visiting researcher at the Stockholm University during her doctorate at the Human Geography Department and graduated in Economics by the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG).

Contact address

Centre d'Estudis Demogràfics, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
Carrer de Ca n'Altayó, Edifici E2, Bellaterra
08193 – Barcelona, Espanha

Resumo

Estabelecendo uma agenda de pesquisa em sexualidade e migração nos estudos demográficos: o que emerge da revisão de literatura

Esse artigo faz uma revisão sistemática de textos publicados no período de janeiro de 2000 a junho de 2021, com enfoque em migração interna e sexualidade, utilizando métodos quantitativos e dados relacionados a estudos demográficos. Portanto, esse trabalho tem por objetivo mapear o que se sabe até o momento em estudos demográficos associados à migração interna de minorias sexuais, bem como utilizar o desenvolvimento dos estudos de migração e sexualidade no Brasil como um estudo de caso em migração e sexualidade no Sul Global. A partir dessa retrospectiva são identificados os empecilhos encontrados nas últimas décadas e as lacunas que precisam ser preenchidas. Com isso, se estabelece uma agenda de pesquisa para estudos de migração interna de minorias sexuais em estudos demográficos com ênfase no Brasil, que englobam temas relacionados à saúde, família e raça/etnia.

Palavras-chave: Revisão sistemática. Sul Global. Migração interna. Sexualidade. Demografia

Resumen

Estableciendo una agenda de investigación sobre sexualidad y migración en los estudios demográficos: lo que emerge de la revisión de la literatura

Este artículo presenta una revisión sistemática de textos publicados desde enero de 2000 hasta junio de 2021, centrados en la migración interna y la sexualidad utilizando métodos cuantitativos y datos relacionados con estudios demográficos. Por tanto, tiene como objetivo mapear lo conocido hasta el momento en los estudios demográficos vinculados a la migración interna de minorías sexuales. Un segundo objetivo es usar el desarrollo de estudios sobre migración y sexualidad en el Sur Global, perspectiva a partir de la cual se identifican los obstáculos encontrados en las últimas décadas y qué vacíos es necesario llenar. Con esto, se establece una agenda de investigación para estudios de migración interna de minorías sexuales en estudios demográficos con énfasis en Brasil que abarcan temas relacionados con la salud, la familia y la raza-etnia.

Palabras clave: Revisión sistemática. Sur Global. Migración interna. Sexualidad. Demografía.

Received for publication in 05/10/2021
Approved for publication in 10/08/2022