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Motivation
This dissertation is a meta study that investigates how scientific knowledge was produced about the economic effects of immigration to the Netherlands during the period 1960-2005. The idea for this dissertation arose when I was gathering data for my MA thesis in Cultural Anthropology. This thesis dealt with the public debates on Dutch asylum policy and I wanted to write a chapter on the economic effects of immigration. However, I experienced great difficulty in finding data or sources on the subject. My first thoughts were that this had to do with the ‘political correctness’ regarding immigration that reigned over the Netherlands in the eighties and nineties.

That hunch was a good motivation to initiate my research, but brought two difficulties with it. Firstly, it implied the existence of a ‘hiatus’ in the production of knowledge about the economic effects of immigration into the Netherlands – knowledge that would have been produced with great likelihood in the absence of the aforementioned political correctness. Secondly, it brought the potential pitfall of teleological reasoning, in which the research is designed in such a way that in the end it is ‘found’ that indeed political correctness is to blame for the hiatus in knowledge production. In order to tackle both difficulties, I opted for an inductive and inclusive research design (Part I, Chapters 1-2).

Research design
Those deliberations led to the following research question:

(a) What was the qualitative and quantitative development of the production of scientific knowledge regarding the economic effects of immigration to the Netherlands during the period 1960-2005 and (b) which factors influenced this development in what way and to what degree?

To answer this question I use a method I call ‘qualitative variable analysis’. This is essentially a two-step process: firstly, the variation over time of one or more dependent and one or more independent variables is described qualitatively and secondly the variation in the dependent variable(s) is explained from the variation in the independent variable(s). This is done through an iterative process of ‘explanation building’, in which the explanation is improved in several successive steps until no further improvement is possible.

Qualitative variable analysis bears a strong analogy to regression analysis. However, this analogy should not be overstretched. For example, due to the richness of qualitative data, problems like endogeneity, multicollinearity and omitted variable bias are not as detrimental to the validity of the results as is the case with a quantitative research design.

The production of scientific knowledge regarding the economic effects of immigration to the Netherlands mentioned in part (a) of the research question is seen as the dependent variable, which is referred to as ‘knowledge production’. Furthermore, the factors that influence the development of the dependent variable ‘knowledge production’ as mentioned in part (b) of the research question, are seen as the independent variables.

The research period is divided into four subperiods – 1960-1980, 1980-1990, 1990-2000 and 2000-2005 – which roughly coincide with phases in Dutch migration policy. The research question is answered for those subperiods first, and then for the entire research period.

The independent variables (in italics) were derived from the existing metaliterature on knowledge production. They pertain to policy (economy & economic policy, immigra-
tion and migration policy), science (Dutch economics and minority research), the interface between both (science policy nexus) and inputs for knowledge production (data availability and international migration-economic literature). The independent variables were operationalised qualitatively in three 'context chapters' (Part II, Chapters 3-5) by describing them in narratives, based on many primary and secondary sources, including statistical and bibliometrical data, government reports and policy advices.

The dependent variable knowledge production was operationalised by a content analysis of fifteen Dutch migration-economic studies. Every subperiod was discussed in a separate chapter (Part III, Chapters 6-9). All selected studies focus on the effects of immigration on the Dutch economy. Whenever possible, the authors of those studies were interviewed. To minimise selection bias, the production of migration-economic knowledge in general was described for each subperiod separately. Furthermore, several economists that produced related studies were interviewed. Each chapter concludes with an explanation of the knowledge production during that period.

The next step was to integrate the explanations for each period into a paper which gives a preliminary answer to the research question. This paper was discussed in a workshop with five of the authors, an expert on the development of Dutch migration sociology, both my promoters and myself. With the outcomes of this workshop, the preliminary analysis was triangulated and improved. After that, final conclusions were reached (Part IV, Chapter 10).

Empirical findings: knowledge practices

An important concept in the analysis is knowledge practice. With a knowledge practice I mean the routine ways practitioners of a (sub)discipline, school of thought or field produce knowledge. I distinguish four ideal-typical knowledge practices which I will describe briefly.

Until the late seventies, the knowledge practice of policy economics dominated Dutch economics. Policy economics was pragmatic and policy-oriented. For many Dutch economists, participating in the institutions of the consensus-oriented Dutch social market economy counted as more prestigious than publishing internationally. The most important of those institutions are the Socio-Economic Council (SER, a corporatist body in which employers, employees and the government are represented) and the government-related Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis (CPB). There was a strong preference for macro-economic modelling. The generally accepted view on the science-policy nexus was that there should be a division of labour in which economists provided the empirical data and policymakers made the normative decisions. Despite this view, there was strong co-production on topics like wage moderation.

From the late sixties onward, growing discontent among a group of students about the lack of critical (Marxist) views in Dutch academic economics led to the genesis of the knowledge practice of (Marxist) political economy. In this practice an activist approach to economics prevailed, which implied that there should be no division of labour coinciding with the fact-value dichotomy.

In the late seventies, yet another group of young economists started to criticise Dutch mainstream economics because of its focus on national policy and its limited orientation on international academic economics. This led to a restructuring of Dutch economics during the eighties. Through a process of internationalisation and Americanisation, a new practice arose which I coined the knowledge practice of academic economics. In this practice, publishing in high ranking journals is paramount. Other features are mathemati-
sation and a preference to work with existing statistical data (rather than producing data).

From the nineties onwards, the orientation of policy economics (e.g. as practiced in the CPB) on the international literature grew, and in that sense this practice converged somewhat to the practice of academic economics. Another recent development is a growing inclination in academic economics to produce statistical data.

Finally, I briefly discuss the knowledge practice of (Dutch) minority research. In the Netherlands, ‘minority research’ (minderhedenonderzoek) is a widely used name for social-scientific research on immigrants and ethnic minorities. During the fifties and sixties, minority research was scarce and fragmented. This changed in the seventies, when government interest boosted research and the government started to dominate funding.

The installation of the Advice Committee on Migration Research (ACOM) in 1978 also brought research programming under direct influence of the government. In the ACOM social scientists, especially anthropologists, were influential. This led to a preference for the method of ethnographic fieldwork, and induced a research ethos in which identification with the ethnic minorities was seen as a moral obligation by many practitioners. The ACOM programming caused the dominance of the so-called minorities paradigm in which ethnicity is seen as the central explanatory variable. Economic research was lacking altogether.

During the eighties, both policymakers and minority researchers held a technocratic view on the science-policy nexus, believing that policy problems could be solved with scientific means. This gave minority researchers a lot of influence on migration policy and caused strong co-production with policy-makers. The technocratic approach was also inspired by the wish to prevent extreme right parties from gaining power.

This co-production diminished in the early nineties, when faith in a technocratic approach faded. The ACOM was dissolved in 1992 and minority research went through a process of internationalisation in terms of funding and a growing focus on international academic research.

Empirical findings: perspectives

I will now recapitulate the empirical findings of my research. This is done in five subperiods, which differ from the a priori chosen four subperiods. In the analysis the concept perspective plays a central role. With a perspective I mean the problem definition – and its underlying empirical assumptions and normative preferences – used by policy makers and experts when they think about a policy problem.

1960-1972. For this period, I distinguish three perspectives. Until 1972 the wage-moderation perspective dominated. This perspective related to the so-called Recruitment Policy, which aimed at recruiting low-skilled guest workers in the Mediterranean. This perspective was advocated by the (responsible) Ministry of Social Affairs, the Dutch government and the employer organizations. All those actors deemed wage-moderation a key element in Dutch economic policy, because it increased international competitiveness and boosted industrial exports which was seen as the motor for (future) economic growth. However, wage-moderation meant an incentive for labour-intensive production. As a side-effect severe shortages of low-skilled labour arose in the late fifties. This caused an upward pressure on wages in the sixties. The government considered ample supply of cheap (low-skilled) labour essential to Dutch industry and developed the Recruitment Policy, which can be seen as wage-moderation by other means.

Around 1970, two other perspectives gained influence. In the Marxist perspective the Recruitment Policy was seen as a strategy to create a reserve army of low-skilled (for-
eign) workers in order to maintain a downward pressure on wages – actually a Marxist rephrased version of the main objective of the Recruitment Policy. The Marxist perspective criticized this policy for its focus on Dutch national interest and its aim to maintain the privileged position of The Netherlands in the international socio-economic stratification.

In the restructuring perspective, on the other hand, Recruitment Policy was criticized because it harmed Dutch (and international) economic interest in the long run. The central argument was that keeping down wages and supplying cheap (foreign) labour hindered a necessary and beneficial restructuring of the Dutch economy from a labour-intensive mode of production towards a more knowledge and capital intensive one.

In the period 1960-1972 the policy coalition around the Recruitment Policy dominated knowledge production – mostly economic assessments of the Recruitment Policy. Employers organizations and especially the Ministry of Social Affairs played an important role in funding and initiating research (and in several occasions the authors were employees). Many of those studies – including an important report of the CPB (1972) – were the result of co-production, written from the wage-moderation perspective. Surprisingly, elements of the restructuring perspective were often present – even in policy documents – but those elements were neutralised by giving more weight to the assumptions of the wage-moderation perspective. However, the Ministry of Social Affairs did not systematically steer knowledge production, which can be told from the fact that it funded two dissertations, which unequivocally fit in the Marxist and the restructuring perspective, respectively.

1973-1977. The year 1973 was a breaking point. Firstly, slacking economic activity (oil crisis) decreased the need for guest workers, and made clear that the postponed restructuring of the economy was speeding up. Secondly, after a long period of rather conservative, pro-employer cabinets, the leftist Den Uyl administration (1973-1977) gained power. One of the main goals was a quite radical ‘redistribution of power, knowledge and income’, both nationally and internationally. A side effect was the so-called ‘polarization’ between employers and employees.

This power shift influenced knowledge production. A report of the SER (1974) stated that recruitment may be beneficial to employers and costly for the national economy, which can be seen as a reflection of the ‘polarization’. This report also supported the restructuring perspective, naming innovation and capital-intensive production as alternatives for recruitment.

Furthermore, much work within the restructuring perspective was done by the economist Hans Heijke. Heijke participated in the science-policy nexus; he contributed to an important government report on population matters and became member of ACOM. Heijke also pointed at a hiatus in the 1972 CPB-report which ignored essential issues like technical innovation and differences in skill levels and labour-intensity of industries – elements that would have been included in an approach from the restructuring perspective.

Additionally, Jan Pronk, an economist who had published on the Recruitment Policy from the Marxist perspective became Minister of Development Cooperation in the Den Uyl administration, and initiated the so-called REMPLOD research program to investigate the possibilities to combine remigration of guest workers with development in the source countries. This boosted the practice of Marxist political economy.

1978-1986. The year 1978 was another turning point. The Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Work (CRM) took the initiative and founded the ACOM. The Marxist approach on (re)migration and development aid disappeared together with the Den Uyl
administration, though there was some continuity, because several minority researchers had been involved in REMPLOD as well. Societal unrest about migration created a sense of urgency within CRM and the community of minority researchers. This eventually led to the development of the so-called Minorities Policy in the early eighties, which aimed at socio-cultural emancipation and socio-economic upheaval of minority groups.

The actors within the policy subsystem around the Minorities Policy shared what I coined the *minorities perspective*. This stated that the immigration that led to the existence of ethnic minorities in The Netherlands was historically unique, that future immigration could be avoided and the task at hand was integrating those minorities in a multicultural society. Immigration lacked in the *minorities perspective* and it’s telling that the ethnically Dutch ‘trailer dwellers’ (*woonwagenbewoners*) were included as a target group.

Due to a severe economic crisis, immigration was indeed low in the early eighties. This crisis also accelerated the long postponed process of economic restructuring, and reduced the need for low-skilled labour. The socio-economic position of immigrants deteriorated rapidly.

As said, it was a period of strong co-production and a technocratic view on the science-policy nexus. This gave minority researchers a lot of influence on the development, implementation and monitoring of the Minorities Policy. It is telling that the Minorities Policy was by and large based on texts produced by Rinus Penninx, a former REMPLOD-researcher who was by that time a member of ACOM and a civil servant in the Ministry of CRM, and who later became the director of IMES, a leading institute in social-scientific migration research.

The technocratic approach was also inspired by the wish to prevent extreme right parties from gaining power, most notably the CD (*Centrum Democraten*, Centre Democrats) from Hans Janmaat. The other political parties, with help of the media and public opinion, depoliticised the issue of immigration and left it to experts, i.e. minority researchers. The *minorities perspective* developed in opposition to the *extreme right perspective* of which Janmaat was the exponent *par excellence* in the eighties. Janmaat saw immigrants foremost as an economic threat (later a cultural and religious dimension was added). Immigrants competed with (low-skilled) indigenous workers for the same jobs and social services, and their abuse of social security formed a burden to the indigenous taxpayer.

Depolitisation led to specific taboos in science and politics, most notably a taboo on *blaming the victim* and a taboo to *play into the hands of the extreme right*. It also caused a strong tendency towards *moral reading*, which is a practice of assessing data and knowledge on their potential social and political implications, rather than on their truth or validity. Moral objections were often found in WWII and the Holocaust. Knowledge on certain topics – like abuse of social security and ‘ethnic crime’ – were seen as dangerous knowledge by many. Gathering statistical data on immigrants and minority groups was touchy and became very difficult, causing a general lack of data.

All those factors contributed to a low production of knowledge during the eighties. Unlike the perspectives of the sixties and seventies, the *minorities perspective* lacked an economic dimension. This, together with the fact that it was not at all geared towards future immigration, made that prospective migration-economic research was not very relevant from this perspective. Indeed, until 1987, there was no demand for such knowledge from policy-makers.

Several factors explain the limited interest from the side of (academic) economists. Firstly, the fact that the *extreme right perspective* had a economic dimension, combined
with the very bad socio-economic position of many non-western immigrants made economists vulnerable for moral reading, in particular for accusations of blaming the victim and playing in the hands of the extreme right. Secondly, immigration was low and bibliometrical analysis shows a quite strong correlation between immigration and knowledge production, both in the US and in the Netherlands. Thirdly, there was a lack of data, and economists did not have the habit to produce data themselves. Fourthly, there was a kind of ‘interdisciplinary incommensurability’ between economics and the other social sciences. For instance, Heijke proved unable to broaden the programming of ACOM with an economic dimension, and his suggestions were discarded by other members of ACOM on moral and methodological grounds.

In this period a hiatus in knowledge production existed, in the sense that knowledge could have been produced that would either have been relevant to policymakers or a contribution to the international migration-economic literature. One subject is the effect of welfare state provisions on (re)migration patterns and the unforeseen permanent settlement of Mediterranean guest workers. Another subject would be the economic effects of the ‘colonial immigration’ of Surinamese into the Netherlands in comparison to other migrations – like the Mariel boatlift – that are not directly related to labour market conditions.

1987-1999. By the late eighties there was growing discontent among policymakers about the results of the Minorities Policy. Among non-western immigrants, unemployment and the consumption of social security were high and labour participation and educational attainment were low. Furthermore, immigration began to rise sharply and controlling it within the framework of (inter)national laws and treaties proved to be rather difficult. Finally, there was great concern about the deactivating effects of the extensive Dutch welfare state in general. The high costs of the system destabilised the government budget and from 1987 onward many attempts were made to reform the welfare state.

This gave rise to the so-called integration perspective which is formulated most clearly in a report of the influential state-related think tank Scientific Council on Government Policy (WRR). In this report (1989) the WRR stated that immigration was a lasting phenomenon. The Minorities Policy had turned many immigrants into passive recipients of the welfare state. Continuing this policy would strain the welfare state to a breaking point and make the absorption of future immigration very costly for The Netherlands. Hence, the government had to acknowledge that immigrants represent ‘human resources’ and had to invest in them accordingly through obligatory, sanctioned ‘integration courses’. At the same time, immigrants should be made responsible for their own wellbeing. Finally, in order to monitor the progress of the new policy it was necessary to remove moral and legal obstructions for the production of statistical data on immigrants.

The integration perspective clearly contained an economic dimension; it linked immigration and integration to Dutch economic interests and the viability of the welfare state. This – combined with the fact that it touched on many vested interests – caused a lot of resistance within the policy subsystem around the Minorities Policy, including the ACOM and the minority research community. Nevertheless, during the nineties, a so-called Integration Policy took shape. Also, legal and moral obstructions to the collection of statistical data on immigration were gradually removed, and with a time lag, the availability of data improved somewhat during the late nineties.

Those developments are reflected in the knowledge production, which aimed at answering two, interrelated questions. The first question is: how can the Dutch welfare state be made more ‘immigration proof’? An answer to this question – temporary exclusion of
immigrants from welfare state provisions – was given in a policy advise, but so far, such policy was never adopted for moral and legal reasons.

The second question is: what are the (fiscal) costs and benefits of immigration? Often implicit or explicit reference is made to the sustainability of the welfare state. This question is taken up by half a dozen studies, of which some initiated by the government, which are non-academic but policy-oriented in character. All authors discuss how touchy the subject is, either in (the preface to) the study and/or in (contemporary) interviews – often with reference to the (generally) expected negative outcome. Some explicitly state they want to shed a positive light on immigration to counterweight all negative attention in public debates, and reach a positive result or just calculate the benefits. Others refrain from a cost-benefit analysis altogether, pointing at the lack of data and/or the potential moral implications (like blaming the victim and playing into the hands of the extreme right).

Partly, this cautious approach can be traced back (via contracting, consulting and steering committees) to the policy subsystem and research community around the Minorities Policy. This cautiousness certainly had to do with the subject, because it is lacking in some academic studies into subjects like brain gain and discrimination that were published in the same period.

Despite the fact that the matter was partly addressed, there is a hiatus in knowledge production in the sense that research (by academics and knowledge institutes like CPB) into subjects like the interaction between welfare state provisions and patterns of (re)migration and integration would have been highly relevant from both a policy and academic perspective.

2000-2005. The turn of the century is a breaking point in several ways. Firstly, a booming economy and labour shortages give rise to the so-called profitability perspective. In this perspective, labour migration is seen as a means of economic policy, to ease the financial burden of aging and create a ‘knowledge economy’. Furthermore, immigration and especially the number of asylum seekers is reduced drastically by a new ‘Aliens Act’ (2000). At the same time, the share of labour migrants and foreign students rises. The admission policy seemingly becomes slightly more selective on human capital and more emphasis is put on the socio-economic aspects on immigration.

Simultaneously, there also is a development in the opposite direction. Due to 9/11 and the rise and murder of the politician Pim Fortuyn, the political climate towards immigration changes drastically. Also, depolitisation of immigration in the media came to an end. The cultural and religious identity of immigrants was more and more seen as problematic. Many politicians deemed it an electoral necessity to take firm or even harsh positions on immigration and integration.

Furthermore, due to the internet and the fact that the lifting of moral and legal restrictions on collecting data on immigration came to a full effect, the availability and accessibility of data improved a lot. In addition, economists started to produce statistical data themselves.

All those developments are reflected in the knowledge production, which rose due to better data availability and the fact that with the profitability perspective an economic dimension was added to public debates on immigration. Some authors explicitly refer to the change in political climate as a factor in their decision whether or not to produce certain migration-economic knowledge, for example research on the (external) costs of immigration that result from an increase in population size and density.

More importantly, the WRR issued a report on immigration that, unlike earlier re-
ports, contained a chapter on the economic aspects of (labour)migration and the effects of immigration on the sustainability of the Dutch welfare state. However, the WRR did not allow the author of the chapter, Harry van Dalen, to add recommendations to make the welfare state more ‘immigration proof’, with the argument that immigrants would be blamed for the restructuring of the welfare state. Discontent with the functioning of the council, Van Dalen left the WRR and published an article with much the same content, but which contained the recommendation to temporarily exclude immigrants from the welfare state and create financial incentives that link immigration to integration.

Furthermore, in 2003 the CPB published a report on the effects of immigration on the Dutch economy – for the first time since 1972. The idea for the report was born when a journalist in 1995 asked CPB-researcher Hans Roodenburg: What are the costs and benefits of immigration according to the CPB? – a question Roodenburg couldn’t answer properly. In 2000, Roodenburg published an exploratory literature study on the economic effects of immigration, within the framework of a more general report to the government on demography. Around that time, he proposed to the board of the CPB to initiate a large study on the subject. Initially, they deemed it a very touchy subject and hesitated, but with reference to the profitability perspective and the international migration-economic literature, Roodenburg convinced them that the subject was policy-relevant. Despite the fact that the report drew some tough conclusions, the reception was surprisingly mild, which relates to the 180° turn in public debates on immigration that had taken place by the time it was published.

Finally, even after the turn of the century, moral reading played an inhibitive role, for example with regard to research on the (external) costs and benefits of immigration in relation to population density. This was related to the fact that the rightwing CD of Hans Janmaat used the slogan vol=vol (full=full) in the 1994 elections, thereby morally mortgaging any debate on the (physical) absorption capacity of The Netherlands.

**Conclusions**

The quality and quantity of knowledge production can be explained by the independent variables (in *italics*) as follows.

1. Policy has a distinctive influence: knowledge production is relatively high when economic policy and migration policy coincide and when migration policy has a explicitly formulated economic dimension. That is the case around 1970 when the Recruitment Policy becomes politicised, and again around 2000 when policymakers consider a renewed labour migration policy. The other way round, during the eighties, knowledge production is low because migration policy lacks an ‘immigration perspective’ and an economic dimension.

2. The influence of policy on science and vice versa is modulated by the science-policy nexus. Co-production (around the wage moderation perspective) between policymakers and the knowledge practice of policy economics predominantly influenced the character of the knowledge produced. Co-production between policymakers and the knowledge practices of political economy and minorities research predominantly influenced the amount of knowledge produced.

3. During the eighties, in the co-production around the Minorities Policy, moral reading with regard to ‘ethnic data’ and migration-economic knowledge, together with specific taboos like blaming the victim and playing into the hands of the extreme right played a inhibitive role in knowledge production. This situation continued beyond the turn of the century.
4. **Data availability** is a prerequisite for migration-economic research. Lack of data frustrated knowledge production with a *time lag*: normative inhibitions that proved inhibitive for the production of ‘ethnic data’ during the eighties, discouraged research well into the nineties. There exists an ‘epiphenomenological relationship’ between lack of data and the *moral reading* mentioned in point 3: both can be traced back to the trauma of the Second World War and the Holocaust.

5. Co-production between policy and the knowledge practice of policy economics decreased as a result of the internationalisation and academisation of Dutch economics. This process decreased the influence of national, policy-related ‘second order’ considerations (for example regarding wage moderation) on knowledge production and increased the influence of international, discipline-related ‘second order’ considerations (for example regarding ‘publishability’). As a result, the *international migration-economic literature* gained influence as source and goal. For the knowledge practice of academic economics, this development incidentally proved to be a hindrance, but for the knowledge practice of policy economics the international literature had a legitimising and neutralizing influence *vis-à-vis* nationally-bound normative inhibitions. In that sense, the variable Dutch economics has a modulating effect on the variable *international migration-economic literature*.

6. Quantitative bibliometrical research shows that the ‘size’ of both knowledge production and immigration are quite strongly correlated. Because of interdependency between immigration and migration policy (multicollinearity) causality is investigated by looking at three periods that form an exception to this relation: (a) During the sixties economists take little interest in the then rapidly increasing influx of guest workers. Knowledge production only increases when (around 1970) the Recruitment Policy becomes politicised, its economic problem definition becomes explicit and politicians start to demand expert knowledge. (b) Around 1980 economist react more on the then rapidly decreasing labour migration than on high non-economic immigration. (c) Around the turn of the century, economist react on proposed labour migration policy, while at the same time immigration is rapidly decreasing, but also becomes more selective with regard to human capital.

In general, we can conclude that the production of policy-relevant knowledge is a complex and multi-factorial process. Knowledge is produced within *knowledge practices* which change due to internal dynamics and mutual interaction, and the influence of two external factors: (1) (predominantly international) developments within the scientific discipline(s) each knowledge practice relates to and, (2) (predominantly national) developments in relevant policy fields. The influence of policy on a specific knowledge practice, and vice versa, is modulated by the science-policy nexus, which is dynamic itself. Besides that, there might be co-production within policy subsystems that form around specific perspectives on the policy problem the produced knowledge pertains to. Furthermore, there might be interaction between the relevant policy fields and one or more policy-relevant variables, which also might have a direct influence on the knowledge production itself (like immigration in this study). Likewise, one or more existing knowledge stock may provide input for the process of knowledge production. Here, there might be an intricate interplay with other variables as well. In this study, the influence of the international migration-economic literature was conditional on the degree of internationalisation of Dutch economics. To add to this complexity, there might be feedback mechanisms and time lag. In general, new knowledge products are added to the existing knowledge stock and may with some time lag also influence relevant policy fields.

More in general, those findings suggest that when studying the production of policy-
relevant knowledge, it is a fruitful strategy to include the following elements in the research design: (i) an analysis of the dynamics of all relevant policy fields, including the policy subsystems that arise around the different perspectives, (ii) an analysis of the dynamics of all knowledge practices involved, including the existing knowledge stocks that provided input for those practices, and (iii) an analysis of the dynamics of the science-policy nexuses that connect those knowledge practices and policy fields. In the initial phase, the approach should be inductive and inclusive, largely qualitative in nature, and allowing for feedback, time lag and bi-directional causality. Such a dynamic approach leads to complex outcomes, but this research shows that allowing for less complexity increases the risk that the research design somehow lays a template over reality.

This study also has implications for existing theories on the interplay between science and policy. For example, in the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) it is assumed that causality points from science to policy – a logical consequence of the objective of ACF to understand the influence from science on politics (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith 1999; Sabatier & Weible 2007). Furthermore, the ACF also takes the policy subsystem as unit of analysis and hence assumes it to be static. This study shows that neither assumption holds: politics influences science as much as vice versa and policy subsystems can be very dynamic. Hence, those findings imply that the ACF needs revision on those points.

**Recommendations**

This study reveals some shortcomings of Dutch policy research. In particular, it is remarkable that knowledge institutes like the WRR en the CPB did not study the economic effects of immigration into The Netherlands for such a long time. Among the main causes are co-production, practices of moral reading with regard to ‘ethnic data’ and migration-economic knowledge and the development of Dutch economics. Therefore, I would like to recommend in this respect: (1) The WRR should make more substantial and systematic efforts in order to fulfil its duty (Act of Establishment) to reduce shortcomings and hiatuses in long-term policy-relevant research in the Netherlands; (2) The establishment of a meta-scientific commission or institute that monitors and optimises the functioning of the science-policy nexus with help of insights from Science & Technology Studies and related fields; (3) The establishment of a permanent ‘commission on self-reflection’ within knowledge institutes like the CPB which systematically monitors practices of moral reading and co-production within the knowledge institute; (4) The introduction within knowledge institutes of a ‘diversification policy’ aimed at maximising value-neutrality of the institute and value-diversity within the institute (with regard to scientific disciplines, knowledge practices and the political colour of staff); (5) The creation of a knowledge infrastructure (comprising the CPB) that combines academic standards and academic career perspectives with policy-relevant economic research.