

**Master on Immigration Management
Course 2015-2016**

**Comparative Migration Policies
Second term**

Lecturer

Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas

blanca.garces@upf.edu

http://www.upf.edu/gritim/Membres/GRITIM-UPF_Researchers/bg.html

*“To think about migration is always to think about the state,
and more precisely, it is to think about the state
that thinks about migration”
(Sayad 1994: 164)*

DESCRIPTION

Immigration studies have been highly comparative. Comparisons (mostly cross-national) have sought to go beyond local conditions to develop more comprehensive explanations. The basic assumption is that only by comparing is it possible to formulate questions that otherwise would have never been considered and, by so doing, trace relationships and deconstruct categories that are too often taken for granted in particular historical and national contexts.

The objective of this course is to provide students with an overview of the dominant debates on policies regulating migration (Part I) and immigrants' incorporation (Part II) from a comparative perspective. We will discuss questions such as: are liberal democracies constrained by rights when regulating immigration? To what extent the more repressive states are, the more efficient they can be in deporting unwanted immigrants? Does citizenship's function as instrument of social closure work when looking at irregular migration from a global comparative perspective? To what extent does a different understanding of nationhood determine different naturalisation and integration policies? How are public manifestations of Islam, like mosque building or Islamic religious education in schools, regulated in different European countries? How can we explain that the educational attainment of second generation immigrants is much higher in Sweden and France than in Germany and Austria? What does explain convergence and divergence of integration policies at the local level?

Through deepening in these “classic” debates from a comparative perspective, this course will contribute to the understanding of the major challenges surrounding immigration in today’s increasingly globalised world. All sessions will consist of a first theoretical part based on the discussion of the readings (1 hour), a lecture on particular cases to illustrate and deepen into the theoretical discussion (1 hour) and a third part (1 hour) with interactive discussions on concrete issues concerning the theoretical articles to be developed by students.

PREREQUISITES

- Capacity to understand and utilize theoretical concepts
- Openness to critical feedback
- Ability to draw connections between theory and practice
- Ability to generate critical and creative arguments
- Capacity to understand major policy issues and trends related to immigration and its social implications

OBJECTIVES

- Ability to recognize social and political discourses related to immigration in Europe and other Western contexts
- Capacity to identify major trends in international social and political debates surrounding immigration
- Ability to critically analyze theories pertaining to the political management of immigration
- Understanding of economic, social, and legal aspects of international migration

THEORETICAL ARTICLE

The course is practice intensive and operates under the philosophy ‘learning by doing’. With this in mind, students will be required to produce a theoretical article on a particular topic from a comparative perspective.

The article should include a review of the existing literature as well as the main shortcomings and questions to be further developed. A key question will be to justify why a comparison is needed and what and how should be compared with regard to the key question considered in the paper.

The article should be no longer than 3,500 words. It should include the following sections: 1) introduction; 2) state of the art, including shortcomings to be covered; 3) why a comparison; 4) what to compare; and 5) how to compare.

The making of the article will be discussed in class (in the third hour). On the 1st of February a first outline – including research question and first overview of the relevant literature – will have to be handed in. In the last two sessions of the course the articles will be defended (but not presented) in the context of an academic seminar.

READING MATERIALS

Articles and book chapters will be posted in the Aula Global at least a week prior to each seminar meeting.

EVALUATION

- 10% attendance and participation in class.
- 30% readings presentation and essay (1 reading presentation + 1 essay; or 3 essays for those who do not present).
- 20% defence of the theoretical article.
- 40% theoretical article. The grade of this part should be above 5 in order to complete successfully the course.

CONTENT SESSIONS

Session 1. Introduction to the course

Description

After introducing the main purposes and duties of the course, we will begin with a brief history of comparative studies on immigration and integration policies. The second part of the session will be devoted to explain the when, why, what and how of any comparative research on migration policies.

Additional readings:

Martiniello, M. (2013), "Comparisons in Migration Studies", *Comparative Migration Studies* 1 (1): 7-22.

Brettell, C.B. & J. Hollifield (2007), *Migration Theory: Talking across Disciplines*. New York: Routledge.

Castles, S., H. de Haas & M.J. Miller (2013), *The Age of Migration. International Population Movements in the Modern World*. The Guilford Press.

Martiniello, M. & J. Rath (2012) *An Introduction to International Migration Studies. A European Perspective*. Amsterdam: IMISCOE/Amsterdam University Press.

PART I: Policies regulating migration

Session 2. Rights constraints in liberal democracies?

Description

Discussion on the limits of migration control in liberal democracies has been central in most political analyses on migration policies. In the first part of this session we will examine the main approaches to the so-called "liberal state thesis", that is, whether and how human rights constrain state sovereignty and particularly its right to decide who enters and who does not, or who is an insider and who is not. In the second part the so-called "liberal state thesis" will be re-discussed by looking at both liberal and non-liberal states. By comparing what some would call "the incomparable", the key question is: are liberal states as fundamentally different as assumed by the academic literature?

Compulsory reading:

Freeman, G.P. (1995), 'Modes of immigration politics in liberal democratic states', *International Migration Review* 29 (4): 881-902.

Ruhs, M. & P. Martin (2006) 'Numbers vs rights: Trade-offs and guest worker programmes', Working paper no. 40. University of Oxford.

Additional readings:

Arango, J. (2003), 'Dificultades y dilemas de las políticas de inmigración', *Circunstancia. Revista de Ciencias Sociales del IUIOG* 1 (2): 3-7.

- Guiraudon, V. (1998), 'Citizenship rights for non-citizens: France, Germany and the Netherlands', in M. Bommes & A. Geddes (eds.) *Immigration and welfare: Challenging the borders of the welfare state*. London: Routledge.
- Hollifield, J. (1992), *Immigrants, markets and states: The political economy of postwar Europe*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hollifield, J. (2000), 'The politics of international migration: How can we bring the state back in?', in C.B Brettell & J.F. Hollifield (eds.), *Migration theory: Talking across disciplines*, 132-160. New York: Routledge.
- Ruhs, M. (2013), *The Price of Rights: Regulating International Labor Migration*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Soysal, Y. (1994), *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Session 3. Do immigration policies fail? A discussion of the policy gap theory

Description

Theories of migration policies have paid particular attention to the question why migration policies fail. Some scholars have identified a gap between policy goals and outputs while others have observed a gap between public and policymakers at the decision-making stage. In this session we will first get familiar with the so-called policy gap theory. Second this theory will be discussed with regard to regularisation policies in different European countries. The persistent mismatch in *all* cases between policy rhetoric and policy outcomes will lead us to the question to what extent a policy gap should not rather be understood as a policy in itself.

Compulsory readings:

- Castles, S. (2004) "Why migration policies fail", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27 (2): 205-27.
- Cornelius, W.A. & T. Tsuda (2004) "Controlling immigration: The limits of government intervention." In *Controlling immigration: A global perspective*, edited by W.A. Cornelius, P. Martin and J. Hollifield. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Additional readings:

- Cornelius, W.A. (2005) "Controlling 'Unwanted' Immigration: Lessons from the United States, 1993-2004", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31 (4): 775-794.
- Duvell, F. (2011) "Paths into Irregularity: the Legal and Political Construction of Irregular Migration", *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 13 (3): 275-95.
- Boswell, Ch. (2007), "Theorizing migration policy: Is there a third way?" *International Migration Review* 41 (1): 75-100.

Session 4. Citizenship and irregular migration

Description

While the literature on citizenship and immigration points at citizenship's function as “instrument” and as “object” of social closure and as a means to protect “prosperous states from the migrant poor”, a close look at the situation of irregular immigrants shows that the common assumptions that citizenship is based on a sharp opposition between foreigners and citizens and that civic, political and social rights (using Marshall's distinction) are gradually allocated to prospective citizens cannot be sustained anymore. By looking at the recent literature on irregular migration in Western countries, we will see how irregular immigrants are excluded while at the same time economically, socially and even legally incorporated in the host society. By shifting the attention to other countries in Asia and the Middle East, we will also understand how illegality can represent at the same time a way to escape state control.

Compulsory readings:

Chauvin, S. & B. Garcés-Mascreñas (2012), “Beyond Informal Citizenship: the New Moral Economy of Migrant Illegality.” *International Political Sociology* 6 (3), 2012, 241-259.

Sadiq, K. (2005), ‘When States Prefer Non-Citizens Over Citizens: Conflict Over Illegal Immigration into Malaysia’, *International Studies Quarterly* 49: 101-122.

Additional readings:

De Genova, N. (2002), Migrant illegality and deportability in everyday life. *Annual review of anthropology* 31: 419-447.

Varsanyi, M. (2006), “Interrogating ‘Urban Citizenship’ vis-à-vis Undocumented Migration.” *Citizenship Studies* 10(2): 229–249.

Coutin, S. (2005), “Contesting Criminality: Illegal Immigration and the Spatialization of Illegality.” *Theoretical Criminology* 1 (9): 5–33.

Leerkes, A., M. Varsanyi & G. Engbersen (2012), “Local Limits to Migration Control Practices of Selective Migration Policing in a Restrictive National Policy Context.” *Police Quarterly* 15(4): 446-475.

Nicholls, W. (2013), *The Dreamers: How the Undocumented Youth Movement Transformed the Immigrant Rights Debate*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

PART II: Policies regulating immigrants' incorporation**Session 5. National models of integration?****Description**

There have been many attempts to identify the main abstract types of immigration regimes. Scholars have distinguished, for instance, between traditional countries of immigration and new countries of immigration; between countries with exclusionist, assimilationist and pluralist policies; countries with a territorial understanding of citizenship and those that put the emphasis on blood descent. Over the last decade, however, this so-called “regime paradigm” has received important criticisms. Can we

really refer to fixed national models? How to explain differences between and within countries? These questions will be discussed first with regard to the existing literature on national models and then focusing on the particular case of civic integration policies.

Compulsory readings:

Castles, S. (1995) "How nation-states respond to immigration and ethnic diversity", *New Community* 21 (3): 293-308.

Joppke, J. (1997) "Beyond national models: civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe", *West European Politics* 30 (1): 1-22.

Additional readings:

Brubaker, R. (1992) *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bousetta, H. (1997) "Citizenship and political participation in France and the Netherlands: reflections on two local cases", *New Community* 23 (2): 215-231.

Mollenkopf, J. (2000) "Assimilating Immigrants in Amsterdam: A Perspective from New York", *Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences* 36: 15-34.

Favell, A. (2003) "Integration Nations: The Nation-State and Research on Immigrants in Western Europe", *Comparative Social Research* 22: 13-42.

Session 6. Comparing policies in the religious domain

Description

Comparative studies on integration policies have often focused on particular policy domains. This session will be devoted to policies regulating religious institutions. In the first part we will discuss to what extent the institutionalisation of Islam in Europe has varied significantly in timing, content and direction. Are Muslims being given the opportunity to set up their institutions according to their own agenda? How are public manifestations of Islam, like mosque building or Islamic religious education in schools, regulated? In the second part we will discuss the validity of national models when looking at the incorporation of religious diversity.

Compulsory reading:

Rath, J., R. Penninx, K. Groenendijk & A. Meyer (2001) 'Western Europe and its Islam' and 'Conclusions', in *Western Europe and its Islam*. Leiden: Brill.

Additional readings:

Sunier, T. & E. Sengers (eds) (2010) *Religious newcomers and the nation state. Political culture and organized religion in France and the Netherlands*. Delft: Eburon.

Maussen, M. (2006) *The Governance of Islam in Western Europe: A state of the art report*. Amsterdam: IMES.

Bowen, J.R. (2011) *Can Islam be French?: pluralism and pragmatism in a secularist state*. Princeton University Press.

- DeHanas, D.N. & Z.P. Pieri. "Olympic proportions: the expanding scalar politics of the London 'Olympics mega-mosque' controversy" *Sociology* 45.5 (2011): 798-814.
- Astor, A. (2012) "Memory, community, and opposition to mosques: the case of Badalona" *Theory and society* 41 (4): 325-349.
- Lettinga, D. N. (2011) "Framing the hijab: The governance of intersecting religious, ethnic and gender differences in France, the Netherlands and Germany".

Session 7. Comparing policies in the domain of education

Description

This session will be devoted to policies regulating education. Instead of identifying the main factors that account for particular institutional and policy arrangements, this time the comparison will seek to evaluate the different effects of policies on educational attainment. For instance, how can we explain that the educational attainment of the second generation Turks is much higher in Sweden and France than in Germany and Austria? And why are attainments different when it comes to access to and integration into the labour market? While the first part of the session will focus on cross-national differences within Europe and North America, the second part will shift the attention to the role of education in immigrants' integration from a historical perspective.

Compulsory reading:

Maurice Crul, Philipp Schnell, Barbara Herzog-Punzenberger, Maren Wilmes, Marieke Sloopman & Rosa Aparicio Gómez (2010) "School careers of second-generation youth in Europe. Which education systems provide the best chances for success?" in *The European Second Generation Compared. Does the Integration Context Matter?*, IMISCOE: Amsterdam University Press.

Alba, Richard, Jennifer Sloan, and Jessica Sperling. "The integration imperative: the children of low-status immigrants in the schools of wealthy societies." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37 (2011): 395-415.

Additional readings:

Heath, A.F., C. Rothson & E Kilpi (2008) "The Second Generation in Western Europe: Education, Unemployment, and Occupational Attainment", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34: 211-235.

Lucassen, L. (2005) *The immigrant threat: The integration of old and new migrants in Western Europe since 1850*. University of Illinois Press.

Foner, N. (2000) *From Ellis Island to JFK: New York's two great waves of immigration*. Yale University Press.

Session 8. Towards a local turn?

Description

Often in contrast to highly symbolic debates at the national level, local policies have been characterised by a rather “bottom-up place sensitive approach” and a “pragmatic logic of problem-solving”. Whereas this may lead to inclusion in some instances and exclusion in others, several scholars argue that local policies are more likely to provide immigrants with equitable opportunities, accommodate ethnic diversity and work with immigrant organisations, which in turn would facilitate a greater degree of immigrant political participation. But to what extent is this true? Comparative research has shown that local contexts may trigger very different policy responses depending on specific political and policy developments and local circumstances and events. By taking different European and North American cities, we will discuss the main determinants to explain convergence and divergence of integration policies at the local level.

Compulsory reading:

Alexander, Michael (2003) "Local policies toward migrants as an expression of Host-Stranger relations: a proposed typology." *Journal of ethnic and migration studies* 29 (3): 411-430.

Schmidtke, O. (2014) “Beyond National Models? Governing migration and integration at the regional and local levels in Canada and Germany”, *CMS*, 2 (1): 77-99.

Additional readings:

Penninx, R. (2009) “Decentralising Integration Policies – Managing Migration in Cities, Regions and Localities”, *Policy Network Papers*, November: Policy Network: London;

Caponio, T. & M. Borkert (eds.) (2010) *The Local Dimension of Migration Policymaking*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Mahnig, H. (2004) “The politics of minority-majority relations: How immigrant policies developed in Paris, Berlin and Zurich” in R. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.), *Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies*, 17-37. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Back Jorgensen, M. (2012) “The Diverging Logics of Integration Policy Making at National and City Level”, *IMR* 46 (1): 244-278.

Bousetta, H. (2001) *Immigration, Post-Immigration Politics and the Political Mobilisation of Ethnic Minorities. A comparative Case-Study of Moroccans in Four European Cities*. PhD Thesis: Katholieke Universiteit Brussels.

Schmidtke, O. (2014) “Beyond National Models? Governing migration and integration at the regional and local levels in Canada and Germany”, *CMS*, 2 (1): 77-99.

Poppelaars, C. & P. Scholten (2008) “Two Worlds Apart: The Divergence of National and Local Immigrant Integration Policies in the Netherlands”, *Administration and Society* 4: 335-357.

PART III: Seminar

Session 9. Seminar: Discussion of the theoretical articles

Description

This session will be dedicated to discuss students' theoretical articles.

Session 10. Seminar: Discussion of the theoretical articles**Description**

This session will be dedicated to discuss students' theoretical articles.