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3. Local migrant policies - theoretical background

In this chapter I clarify what is meant by "local policies toward migrants" and discuss the existing literature in this area. Section 1 defines the parameters of this study: what is included and what is not under the heading 'local migrant policies'. Section 2 shows how existing national-level theories on immigration/immigrant policy are based at least in part on host-stranger relations, and critiques national-level explanations. Section 3 discusses and critiques the literature on migrant policies at the local level. Section 4 summarizes the problems with the existing literature on policies toward migrants and raises the need for an analytical framework at the local level, to be presented in Chapter Four.

1. Defining the study parameters

1.1 Defining 'local policies'

There are several definitions on what constitutes public policy. Broader definitions often include quasi- and non-governmental actors as part of the public policy process ('governance'), while narrower definitions confine public policy to workings of government agencies ('government') (cf. Keil 1998). For practical reasons, this study focuses on the narrow definition of 'policymaking' as limited to governmental agencies. Since the city serves as the unit of analysis in this study, the local 'governmental agency' will be the municipality, i.e. 'local policies' in this study equal municipal policies as a rule.\(^2\)

However, a municipality is not a monolithic body. Even in a relatively centralized municipality, attitudes and assumptions will differ between the political level (mayor and city councillors) and professional level (department directors to street-level bureaucrats), between different municipal departments, and between municipal councillors representing differing ideological views. Thus, a strong mayor, an influential alderman or an independent municipal bureaucracy may all determine local policies in different issue areas. But while these policies may be divergent and even contradictory, it is usually possible to identify prevailing local migrant policies in a given area at a given time.

In cases where the local authority has no discretion (or does not exercise it) in the implementation of a national policy, e.g. it simply channels government funding for local actions according to predetermined criteria, this will not be considered 'local policy'. What makes certain policies 'local' is the exercise by the local authority of its own discretion, e.g. in initiating a project, distributing funds according to municipal criteria, or affecting the implementation of a

\(^1\) Since this study is not limited to one policy domain but aspires to compare all local policies, from schools to policing, that substantially affect migrants, adopting the broader definition of policy as governance would make the work unfeasible.

\(^2\) When a lower tier of local government exists with its own policies toward migrants, e.g. city districts, both levels shall constitute 'local migrant policies'.
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national policy in some significant way. I can therefore adopt Robert Waste's definition of local policies as:

actions, commitments and decisions taken by persons in authority in local government, and involving the allocation of the symbolic and/or substantive resources of government. (Waste 1989: 10)

In the case of local policy responses to immigration, two additions must be made to Waste's definition. First, limiting the study to espoused policy (formal declarations and published documents) would mean missing much of the picture. Thus, ‘local policies’ in this study will include both espoused and enacted policies, the latter including informal but systematic practices by ‘street-level bureaucrats’ (Lipsky 1980), when these are relevant to our understanding of local policy as an expression of host-stranger relations. Second, understanding ‘non-policy’ is a crucial part of policy analysis especially in regard to immigrants (Hammar 1985: 277-278). My definition of local policies will therefore include also “non-actions/commitments/decisions of the local authority regarding migrants, where such non-policy is relevant”.

The above definition means that the actions and reactions of other players in the local migrant policy arena, such as national government, local NGOs and migrant associations, are regarded in this study as contextual variables affecting local policymaking, rather than as parts of the local policy process itself.

1.2 Defining ‘policies toward labour migrants’

At the national level, a basic distinction was made by Hammar (1985: 7-9) between immigration policy, which deals with the “regulation of flows of immigration and control of aliens” and immigrant policy, which “refers to the conditions provided to the resident immigrants”, e.g. work and housing conditions, welfare provisions, etc. Hammar emphasized the interrelation of immigration and immigrant policy, considering the latter to be a part of the former. At the local level, nearly all policies toward migrants can be classified as “immigrant policy” although there are some examples of what might be called ‘local immigration policy’, for example when the municipality plays a significant role in naturalisation or deportation procedures. To simplify matters, I shall include all local policies toward migrants in this study under the heading of ‘local migrant policies’. The prefix ‘im’ is deliberately dropped, as local policies do not normally concern the in-coming (and out-going) of immigrants. For the same reason, I shall use the term ‘migrant’ rather than ‘immigrant’ in most cases.

Most European cities with an immigration history contain several ‘types’ of migrant and ethnic minority populations, including ‘labour migrants’ or ‘guest workers’ (and their families) who originated from poor countries, economic migrants from wealthy countries, post-colonial migrants and political migrants (asylum seekers and refugees). Official categorisation of migrants and ethnic minorities is a notoriously fluid business which depends as much on the labeller as on the labelled. Migrant categories may be based on supra-nationally defined status (refugee, asylum seeker, EU-national or Third Country national, etc.) and/or nationally-defined civic status (’foreign worker’, repatriate, etc.). Government policy can change a migrant’s status almost
overnight, from national (citizen/subject) to non-national, from legal to illegal, or vice versa. Indeed, migrant categories can be seen as a dependent rather than independent variable, since governments change them as a policy instrument to control migration (Lahav 1998, Money 1999: 25). Finally, at some point the label of 'migrant' may be replaced by 'ethnic minority'.

Migrant categories are therefore social and legal constructs determined by the host society, varying from place to place as well as over time, depending on administrative and legal changes as well as social perceptions. Researchers have tried to use more 'objective' criteria (Van Amersfoort 1998), classifying migrants for example according to the historical context of the migration, thus: post-colonial migrants, guestworkers, and the post-1989 "new migration" (below). However, most authors regard the state-determined civic status as being predominant, and accept its categories. Adrian Favell (1999: i) criticised this adaptation (conscious or unconscious) of nationally defined categories:

Nearly all current thinking on integration...in Europe is bound up within a reproduction of nation-state and nation-society centred reasoning, which may increasingly fail to represent the evolving relationship between new migrants or ethnic minorities and their host 'societies.'

I agree with Favell's point: while legal (state-determined) categories remain crucial, locally determined categories are becoming increasingly relevant to our understanding of this issue. In this study, then, I adopt migrant categories as defined at the local rather than the national level. This is further justified by the research subject, which focuses on the local host reaction rather than on the migrants themselves.

The type of migrant that this study focuses on is what I will henceforth call 'labour migrants'. This is due to several traits of this migrant category that make it fitting for a comparison of local policies as an expression of host-stranger relations. This refers primarily to 'guestworkers' or 'foreign workers' who arrived in northwestern European cities in the 1960s-1970s mostly from southern Europe, the Maghreb and Turkey, often following recruitment by the host country, but also immigrants who arrived on their own, sometimes illegally ('undocumented' or 'irregular' labour migrants). As they were later joined by family dependents, they too are included in the 'labour migrant' category as well as their children born in the new country (hereafter: 'second-generation').

---

3 Koser (1998: 186) notes that migrants may be legalised through regularisation legislation or illegalized due to changes in government policy (e.g. requiring migrants to give up dual nationality), and the same applies to changes in national or non-national status. The latter occurs when a government redefines the dimensions of the nation-state, e.g. when the Kingdom of the Netherlands or France redefined themselves to exclude, respectively, Surinamese and Algerian migrants from the category of nationals.

4 Host society attitudes and policies toward another type of Newcomer-Stranger are clearly relevant as well. Asylum seekers and refugees often arrived concurrently with the foreign workers, but their weight has usually been much smaller. Over the past two decades and especially since the 'asylum crises' of the 1990s, the perceived problem of asylum seekers and refugees has increased in the eyes of European host societies, although they represent a minute proportion of all foreigners in most countries. This affects attitudes and policies toward other types of Newcomers, including labour migrants and their offspring (even as governments try to distinguish between policies toward different migrant categories - cf. Robinson et al. 2003). In Chapter 4, I explain the focus in this book on attitudes and policies toward 'labour migrants' and elaborate on the definition of this category of Strangers.
For southern European cities, 'labour migrant' refers primarily to immigrants arriving in the 1980s-90s. This "new migration" has been identified (Koser and Lutz 1998) as a distinct category arising from the end of the Cold War and the Yugoslav wars. The "new migration" is characterised by an increasingly wide and polarised range of types of migrants, from long-term to short-term (both pendular and transit) migration, legal and illegal (from skilled workers to clandestine 'boat people' and sex workers), as well as asylum seekers. Countries of origin are also more varied, including ex-Soviet and ex-Yugoslav states, Africa, Iraq, Iran and China.

However, the social construct of 'labour migrant' in a given city does not always correspond to the above categories, just as it may not correspond to the migrant's nationally-defined official status. In some cities, migrants in this social category (often referred to as 'foreign workers' or 'guestworkers' or simply 'immigrants'/'foreigners') may include migrants of post-colonial and/or refugee-origin including second-generation, while excluding economic migrants from wealthy countries (other Europeans, Americans, Japanese). Since the typology proposed here relates to municipal policies toward labour migrants, *the criteria for defining 'labour migrant' will be the distinctions made by the local authority*. Usually, and here, the relevant parameters for this definition are the foreign origin of these newcomers (specifically from less developed countries) and the temporary nature of this migration (as assumed by the local authority).

With these criteria I avoid classifying migrants automatically by their civic status, using instead the attitude of the local authority as a measure. What is important here is their *a priori* status in the eyes of the local authority, as 'labour migrants' or as another type of Stranger. Thus, post-colonial migrants are excluded as an object of 'local migrant policies' in this study, *if local authority attitudes and policies effectively treat them as a different category of Strangers* -- although this population may not differ significantly from labour migrants in its demographic characteristics, migration trajectory, economic status, etc. Indeed, they may serve as contextual variables to explain policies toward labour migrants. If another city's policies do not make such a distinction (e.g. in determining eligibility or access to services), then the 'local migrant policies' of that city shall encompass the other categories as well. In the latter case I may refer to 'ethnic minority policies', e.g. for Amsterdam from the 1980s. For the same reason, the inclusion or exclusion of illegal migrants within 'local migrant policies' will depend on the distinction made by the local authority.

1.3. Defining the policy issue areas

This study includes general as well as specific policies under the heading of 'local migrant policies', encompassing whatever policy areas may be relevant toward labour migrants in each city. General (or indirect) policy refers to measures for the general public which also affect immigrants substantially. Specific (or direct) policy "targets specific groups or categories of

---

5 For example, Dutch policies toward migrants from Indonesia in the 1950s-60s, or French policies toward Algerians.

6 Aristide Zolberg notes that "categoric distinctions between [...] guest workers and undocumented aliens, reflect administrative practices rather than economic and sociological realities" (in Money 1999: 25).
people" using ethnic-based or civic status eligibility criteria (Vermeulen 1997:9; cf. Hammar 1985). I include general (indirect) policies in cases where they reveal something about local authority attitudes toward migrants. Thus, transport policies are not covered, but urban renovation policies may be, if they significantly affect labour migrants.

To obtain the most complete picture of what constitutes 'local migrant policies', I did not decide on specific policy areas a priori but followed 'what is out there' in the existing literature. The literature survey made it clear that some policy areas are more important than others in their effect on labour migrants: housing, education, health and welfare services, the labour market, religion and culture, and migrant mobilisation/representation all appear regularly in writings and research on policies and migrants.

To simplify matters, the various policy areas were grouped into four 'policy domains'. Thus policies regarding migrant representation and mobilization are grouped in the Juridical-political domain. The Socio-economic domain groups newcomer/reception services, labour market policies, education and welfare policies, etc. The Cultural-religious domain includes policies relating to minority religious and cultural practices as well as policies aimed at changing attitudes toward ethnic/cultural diversity in the host society. Housing, urban renovation and other policies with a strong spatial dimension are grouped in the Spatial domain. This is elaborated in Chapter Four.

1.4 Summary: 'local migrant policies' in this study

In sum, this study includes under the heading of 'local migrant policies' (or 'local policies toward migrants') all policies determined exclusively or to a significant degree by the local authority, which are aimed explicitly or implicitly at labour migrants (specific/targeted policies), or in the case of general policies, which significantly affect them. Inaction (non-policy) may also be a variant of local migrant policy. The criteria for who is included in the 'labour migrant' population which is the subject of these policies, is the de jure or de facto distinction made by the local authority at the time.

2. National-level theories of migrant policy

2.1 National-level models

National-level theories are important for understanding local migrant policies for two reasons. First, local migrant policies are strongly embedded in national immigration regimes. Immigration regimes encompass both immigration control7 and citizenship policies (Hammar 1985), thus most of the national-level literature relating to immigration policy subsumes within it immigrant (citizenship and integration) policy. Theories on local-level migrant policies should therefore take into account explanations of immigration/immigrant policy at the national level. Second, much of the national-level theorising invokes the theme of host-stranger relations, although the terms are

---

7 For a summary of the literature that focuses on immigration control, see Brochmann and Hammar 1999, Cornelius et al. 1994.
not often used in the realm of political science in which national migrant policy analysis usually takes place. This subsection looks at those national-level explanations in order to highlight the similarities and differences between them and the local-level model proposed in the following chapter.

Different explanations have been offered in the literature focusing on various national and supra-national factors in the determination of immigration and immigrant policy. Jeanette Money (1999: 26) distinguishes between theories emphasising cultural traits and national identity, and those that emphasise the interplay of economic and political interests. The latter include typologies linking national welfare regimes to immigration/immigrant policies (Baldwin-Edwards 1991, Faist 1996, Domburg de Rooij and Musterd 2002). Faist (1996:228), for example, argues that "there is a fundamental symmetry between welfare state regimes, on the one hand, and immigration and integration regimes on the other." Indeed, he defines immigration regimes as "the institutional arrangements of national welfare states to regulate admission and integration of newcomers." This clearly connects to host-stranger relations:

What the national welfare state offers to its members is not only a bundle of rights. The national welfare state also offers a sense of belonging [...] at the level of the national state (ibid.: 243).

Different welfare regimes offer different definitions of membership and membership rights, creating different degrees of 'us and them' (in Faist's terms: citizenship, denizenship and alienship). The recent shift toward more restrictive welfare regimes, often explained in terms of globalisation and increased competition, can also be seen as a response of the host society to increased immigration, an "ethnicization of welfare state politics" (ibid. 246). Koser and Lutz (1998: 8) note

[the] current process of European self-definition through defending its prosperity and the institutions of the welfare state against greedy, indigent 'outsiders'.

Redefining the welfare state is linked, therefore, "with notions of defending home, space and territory against 'the other'" (ibid.).

However, it is the national-level theories "emphasizing the primacy of cultural values" (Money 1999: 27) that most clearly link national immigration policies with host-stranger relations as defined here. This literature (e.g. Brubaker 1992 on Germany, Weil 1991 and Hollifield 1994 on France) "builds upon sociological and psychological theories and concepts such as national identity, nation building, prejudice, alienation and social closure" (Meyers 2000: 1251). For example, Leitner (1995, cited in Money 1999: 27) proposes that "dominant racial and national ideologies, defining who belongs and who does not belong to a national community, also influence who is admitted". Money notes (ibid., citing Stalker) that "perhaps the most fundamental factor in defining the level of tolerance for foreigners 'is how the country regards itself -- its own national mythology'". Similarly, Schnapper (1992: 17) proposes that immigration policies be seen as "one dimension of nation-building".
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The national identity approach has been applied comparatively, resulting in a number of typologies of immigration regimes. The most well-known is Stephen Castles' (1995) 'citizenship regimes' theory, which is based on what he defines as national historical-cultural traits. Castles' models are based on three archetypes of how nation-states have defined membership (ethnically-based; based on political and cultural community; or immigration-based pluralism) -- in other words, how the host society defines who is a Stranger and who is 'one of us' (Box 3.1).

Many other comparative analyses of migration regimes follow a similar reasoning and present the same countries as examples, with some variations. These national-level categorizations follow three basic (and sometimes overlapping) distinctions (Money 1999: 27-29): between homogenous and heterogenous countries; between 'settler societies' which are more open to immigration and ethnic-based states which are more restrictive; and between states which determine citizenship based on ethnicity *ius sanguinis* and those based on place of birth *ius soli*. These distinctions all relate to different types of host-stranger relations deriving from the characteristics of the host society, recalling Wood's (1934) analysis of local host societies in their contact with newcomers.

---

*Brubaker's (1992) citizenship model is based on the historical development of particular nation-states , contrasting between republican and ethnic-based concepts of nationhood and their terms of membership. Heckmann (1994) describes three ideal types of state organization: ethnic-based nationalism (e.g. Germany), demotic-unitarian political nationalism (e.g. France), and ethnically-plural political nationalism (e.g. Switzerland). For each type he characterizes its attitude toward ethnic heterogeneity and subsequent policies toward migrants/ethnic minorities (in Vermeulen 1997: 133). Entzinger identifies a Guestworker model in Germany, Austria and Switzerland, an Assimilationist model in France, and a Pluralist ethnic minority model in the U.K., the Netherlands and Scandinavian countries (in Cesari 1993: 139). Freeman (1995) contrasts between Anglo-Saxon settler societies and continental European states that underwent mass immigration only after World War Two (in Meyers 2000: 1254).*
Stephen Castles’ typology of citizenship regimes remains the dominant model of immigration policy based on national identity. Castles (1995: 303-305) identifies three models of “national responses to immigration”.

The **differential exclusion** model is tied to “nation-states based on ethnic belonging”. National identity is based on *ius sanguinis* from which follows a policy proclaiming ‘we are not an immigration country’, with the important exception of ‘repatriation’ for immigrants defined a priori as ethnically belonging to the host ‘nation’. Other immigrants are viewed as a temporary necessity (e.g. guestworkers) and excluded from most aspects of national life (labour market integration is the exception), through legal mechanisms and informal means. Germany is given as the closest case of differential exclusion.

A **total exclusion** model is also hypothesised, but Castles notes that no country has succeeded in pursuing total exclusion of immigrants since World War Two, although Japan is cited as an example of a country trying to do so. This results in a formal lack of immigration policy coupled with toleration or even encouragement of illegal labour immigration.

The **assimilationist/republican** model is tied to “nation-states based on political and cultural community”. National identity stems from a republican ideology in which membership is based on *ius soli*. Immigration is tolerated or even encouraged, but integration is seen as a one-sided process in which the migrant adapts to the host culture. However, formal inclusion is accompanied by informal exclusion through socio-economic marginalisation and racism. Castles distinguishes between a statist version (e.g. France) and a laissez-faire version (e.g. U.K.) of the assimilationist model.

The **pluralist/multicultural** model is tied to immigration-based settler states (USA, Canada, Australia), but Sweden presents an example of a homogenous society that made a policy decision to accept the multicultural ideology. This is based on a vision of the nation-state made up of various ethnic communities that maintain their cultural differences while conforming to common political values. Immigrants are accepted as a part of this mosaic. Castles notes a laissez-faire approach of pluralism (e.g. USA) and a statist variant (e.g. Sweden) in which government is actively involved in the maintenance of ethnic diversity through multicultural policies.

**Sources**: Castles and Miller 1993, Castles 1995.

Some theories that emphasise the importance of supra-national variables (Soysal 1994, Sassen 1998) in determining migrant policy also link their explanation to host-stranger relations. For example, Yasemin Soysal argues (1994: 3) that a postnational model of membership based on global human rights discourses (“postnational citizenship”) is penetrating the national frameworks of citizenship and immigration policies that derive from them. Her analysis of
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9 Proponents of supra-national explanations argue that economic globalisation, the transfer of functions to transnational non-governmental and quasi-governmental institutions (EU, WTO) and the evolution of an international human rights regime increasingly limit the degree to which states can assert their own immigration and immigrant policies.
migrant policies focuses on conflicting (supranational versus national) definitions of membership vis-à-vis some host polity.

Soysal proposes a typology of four 'membership models' or 'incorporation regimes' that is partly based on different types of host-stranger relations.\(^{10}\)

Differences in incorporation regimes reflect the different collective modes of understanding and organizing membership in host polities. (p. 35, italics added)

By focusing on the effects that global discourses of citizenship and universal human rights have on national immigration policies, Soysal shifts attention from the national to the supranational level of migrant policymaking. However, her 'incorporation regimes' typology, although differing in some aspects from the models above, remains firmly rooted in the national-identity paradigm, and open to some of the same criticisms regarding national-level explanations. These are summarised below.

2.2 Critiques of national-level explanations

Critics have exposed several weaknesses in the national-level analyses of immigration/immigrant policies, especially those based on citizenship models such as Castles' theory (Vermeulen 1997, Favell 2001, Money 1999, Meyers 2000). The main objection is that the proposed models are based more on *a priori* explanations of 'national objectives' rather than actual policy differences. Instead of positing historically-determined 'national traits' that are supposedly expressed in nationality laws and immigrant policies (e.g. Brubaker, Castles), different immigration regimes may be interpreted as phases in the historical development of a country (e.g. 'assimilationist' policies occur during the state development stage). Thus, previously assimilationist countries like the US and Sweden today have 'multicultural' policies (Vermeulen 1997).

Vermeulen has also questioned the assumption of cohesion in immigration policy, especially when immigrant policies are taken into account. Based on a comparative analysis of integration, language and religion policies toward migrants in five western European countries, he shows that no country can be classified according to one model across all these policy areas. Thus, the UK is "assimilationist" in its language and religion policies but "multicultural" in its integration policies. The assumption of cohesion across policy areas results in the same countries being classified differently by different authors, depending on which policy areas they focused on in their analysis.\(^{11}\)

Finally, national-level explanations ignore local-level policy variations. Regarding places of worship for migrants, for example, Vermeulen notes (1997: 151) that policy variations between

\(^{10}\) Soysal's (1994) typology is based on the state's "organizational configuration" (centralized or decentralized) and the "locus of action and authority" (society or state), resulting in four models. In the corporatist model, incorporation occurs through a pillarised system (e.g. Sweden, Netherlands); in the liberal model the individual is incorporated through the market (e.g. U.K., Switzerland); in the statist model the individual is incorporated through state policy (e.g. France; Germany is presented as a mixed case of the corporate and statist models). In the fragmented model there is only partial incorporation due to weakness of the state.

\(^{11}\) Castles himself notes some of these points later (1995).
cities in each country are "considerable" as a result of decentralisation, while "variation between countries seems smaller". Other researchers of migrant policy have observed this as well, even as they continue to carry out their analyses at the national level (e.g. Money 1999).

Patrick Ireland (1994), one of the pioneers in research of migrant policies at the local level, summarises the weakness of national-level theories:

As elegant and convincing as these arguments are...they remain far too theoretical and abstract. Their proponents have marshaled surprisingly little evidence to support their conclusions. (p. 9)

Money (1999) tested the validity of several national-level theories by comparing immigration policies and levels of immigration in different countries over time. Her conclusion:

Certainly the logic underlying the various hypotheses is plausible...Nonetheless, the systematic examination of some of the most straightforward distinctions employed in the literature, such as the settler-ethnic state duality, reveals that they do not shed much light on the varying levels of openness to immigration. (p. 42-43)

Her explanation is that "the use of national-level indicators overlooks one central feature of the immigration process: immigrants are geographically concentrated in the host country" (ibid, italics in the original). Money postulates that this geographical concentration creates an uneven distribution of the costs and benefits of immigration, resulting in "the organization of political pressures for and against immigration" (ibid: 206). The interplay between these localised pressures and national-level politics can better explain change as well as continuity in national immigration policies in different countries.

Despite these criticisms, and the recognized importance of the local level in understanding migrant policymaking (noted in Chapter 1), there is very little theorising on migrant policies at the sub-national level. The following section summarises this literature. As we see below, local-level analyses avoid many of the problems associated with overly deductive explanations. At the same time, however, they shift the focus away from host-stranger relations as the explanatory variable, to more political-institutional explanations.

3. Local-level research on migrant policy

Local-level analyses of migrant policy can be grouped into several types. The first comprises descriptions or case-studies of local migrant policies in individual cities, usually focusing on one policy area (e.g. Grillo 1985 on Lyon; Vertovec 1996 on Berlin; Friedman and Lehrer 1997 on Frankfurt; Jacobs 2000 on Brussels). A significant number of city studies have been carried out within the framework of multi-city research projects such as the MPMC project (Box 3.2). However, most single-city studies do not generalize beyond the case in question.

The multi-city research projects vary in the degree of generalisation they attempt. Most of them focus on particular issue areas (e.g. advisory councils) and most involve relatively little

---

theorising, considering the amount of comparative data that is produced.\textsuperscript{13} Many of these multi-city European research projects (e.g. LIA, ELAINE) were developed and funded with the aim of providing policy recommendations, and consequently limit their analysis to a ‘best practices’ approach. More academically-oriented studies (e.g. Musterd et al. 1998) contain some comparative generalisations (e.g. linking between welfare regimes and segregation patterns), but these are not translated into more universally applicable models or theories regarding migrant policies.

\textsuperscript{13} An exception is the DIECCEC (1996) final report, which proposes a model on intercultural education based on the project findings.
**Box 3.2 Multi-city research networks/projects covering local migrant policies**


**METROPOLIS** (1993 - ongoing). An international forum for research and policy on migration and cities. Metropolis conferences combine theoretical and 'best practices' approaches, bringing together academics, local authority officials and representatives of civic organisations. Sponsored by the Canadian government.


**URBEX:** Spatial Dimensions of Urban Social Exclusion and Integration (1999–2001). A comparative research project on the urban dimensions of social exclusion and integration in 11 cities (Amsterdam, Antwerp, Berlin, Birmingham, Brussels, Hamburg, London, Milan, Naples, Paris, Rotterdam). While not confined to migrants/minorities, this project also compared local migrant policies in housing and welfare. Sponsored by the EU's TSER programme, coordinated by the Amsterdam study centre for the Metropolitan Environment (AME), University of Amsterdam.

**Sources:** DIECEC 1996, ELAINE 1997a, LIA 2000, Musterd et al. 1998, Rogers and Tillie 2001, [www.international.metropolis.net](http://www.international.metropolis.net); [www.unesco.org/most/p97htm](http://www.unesco.org/most/p97htm); [www.frw.uva.nl/ame/urbex](http://www.frw.uva.nl/ame/urbex).
Finally, there are a handful of multiple case studies, comparing local migrant policies in a small number of cities with varying levels of in-depth analysis. Patrick Ireland's (1994)\textsuperscript{14} comparison of four small and medium-sized towns in France and Switzerland was one of the first comprehensive attempts to analyse the political interaction between migrants and the host polity at the local level. An institutional-political channelling approach (until then used at the national level) explains the differences and similarities in migrant political participation in each city. While this study was groundbreaking in its analysis of local-level variations in the political opportunity structure facing migrants, it does not provide a systematic or comprehensive comparison of local migrant policies in the four towns. Instead, selected examples of migrant policies in the Juridical-political domain are used to illustrate how they affected migrant politics in each town.

Hassan Bousetta (2000, 2001)\textsuperscript{15} also adopts the political-institutional channelling approach, comparing the policies of Antwerp, Liege, Lille and Utrecht as part of his study on Moroccan mobilization patterns in European cities. Fenemma and Tillie's ongoing comparison\textsuperscript{16} between Amsterdam and Berlin adopts the same approach, describing migrant policies as part of the political opportunity structure that determines migrant mobilization. These studies are limited to the Juridical-political domain of local migrant policies and analyse them as a contextual variable affecting migrant mobilization, i.e. the focus remains on the migrant side of the host-stranger equation.

Romain Garbaye's (2000)\textsuperscript{17} comparison of local migrant policies in Birmingham and Lille also adopts the institutional channelling approach, but focuses on the local authority more than the migrants. Garbaye identifies three elements that make up the context of local migrant policymaking (city-state relations, the party system and the organization of local government) and describes how these can explain the different migrant policies adopted by the two cities.\textsuperscript{18} Garbaye's analysis, too, is limited to local policies in the Juridical-political domain, primarily consultative structures and policies toward migrant organisations.

\textsuperscript{14} Ireland (1994) *The Policy Challenge of Diversity: immigrant politics in France and Switzerland.*


\textsuperscript{17} Garbaye (2000) “Ethnic minorities, cities and institutions: a comparison of the modes of management of ethnic diversity of a French and a British city”.

\textsuperscript{18} In Birmingham, these elements combined to make ethnic minority mobilization and penetration of the local political system relatively easy, requiring the Labour-led city council to adopt a long-term strategic alliance with ethnic-based organizations. The result was group-targeted policies backed by multicultural and anti-discrimination rhetoric. In Lille, the interpenetration of national and local politics meant that the local Socialist party was eager to avoid politicization (and specifically, Le Penisation) of migrant/ethnic minority issues. The centralized, mayoral style of local government made it possible for the city to exclude newcomers from the policy process, neutralise ethnic-based mobilization and ignore ethnic discrimination (Garbaye 2000).
Other local-level studies follow a similar focus. For example, Rex and Samad's (1996)\textsuperscript{19} comparison of Birmingham and Bradford focuses on migrant policies in the political domain, with little or no mention of policies (or lack of policies) in other areas. Their description and analysis of “the institutional response of local authorities to the presence and mobilization of ethnic minorities” is limited to consultative structures and policies toward migrant organizations, multicultural rhetoric, attempts at ethnic monitoring and a brief mention of school policies in the two cities (pp. 24-36). A similar comparison was carried out by Blommaert and Martiniello (1996) on local migrant policies in Antwerp and Liege. It too focuses on the Juridical-political domain and is “mainly exploratory and descriptive” (p. 17).

A few local-level comparisons of migrant policies explore other areas beyond the Juridical-political domain. Damian Moore (2001)\textsuperscript{20} compares the ‘management of ethnicity’ in France and Great Britain by looking at urban development policies in Marseille and Manchester. Moore focuses on urban policies whose ideological framework is national, but whose implementation is localized. While demonstrating the complexity of the policy process at all its levels, from national to neighbourhood, the study is not meant to provide a comprehensive comparison of local migrant policies in other domains (e.g. policies toward mosques, ethnic diversity in schools, etc.).\textsuperscript{21} Other examples of local-level comparative studies that focus on one policy domain include Rath et al. 2001 and Body-Gendrot 2000.\textsuperscript{22}

4. Summary: the gap between national-level theorising and local-level research

This brief overview of the literature on immigration/migrant policies suggests several observations. Among national-level theories, many of the explanations based on national identity refer to the theme of host-stranger relations. The dominant typology remains Castles’ ‘citizenship regimes’ model which defines, in effect, three types of host-stranger relations at the national level to explain national immigration policies. Variants on this model by others are also based on the host society’s definition of itself and its attitudes regarding membership (i.e. criteria for incorporating newcomers). Alternative theories that focus on economic variables (e.g. Faist 1996) are also based in part on different definitions of membership (included or excluded from the host country’s welfare regime). Other explanations (e.g. Soysal 1994) focus on conflicting (supranational versus national) definitions of membership vis-a-vis some host polity. In sum, the existing literature demonstrates that the concept of host-stranger relations can be plausibly linked to national policies toward migrants.

\textsuperscript{19} Rex and Samad (1996) "Multiculturalism and political integration in Birmingham and Bradford".
\textsuperscript{21} Moore’s in-depth analysis reveals how ideological differences at the national level, between the French Politique de la Ville and the British Inner Cities Policy, are translated into comparable practices at the local (neighbourhood) level. Specifically, he observes the use of ethnic-origin ‘mediators’ who serve as official links between the public authorities and ethnic minority residents, in the daily implementation of development programmes and projects. In Manchester the ethnic origin is explicit, in Marseille it is implicit, in both cities it is clearly a policy of ‘ethnic diversity management’.
However, national-level theorising suffers from several defects, including a tendency to deductive explanations with insufficient evidence to back them up. National-level models tend to ignore variations across policy areas, and variations between local policies within states. This is possible since most national-level explanations rely more on their internal logic than on a systematic comparison of actual policies. This logic overemphasises the nation-state as a variable, as noted by Adrian Favell and others. In his overview of the immigration policy literature, Favell concludes (1999: 30) that the nation-state centred paradigm of the research has become repetitive and often “reproduces” state-centred views of immigration and policy:

Too many studies in the past have compared immigration politics or policies of immigration using the general ‘institutional’ features of national political systems. Although initially productive, this is now leading to repetitive and moribund research. It is also often normatively biased in favour of state-centered policy approaches.

What is needed, says Favell, is more research that reduces the nation-state to “one among several potential structuring variables” of migrant policy (ibid: i). This critique of national-level theorising is echoed by Soysal (1994: 6):

By omitting the global element and focusing on the nation-state as the unit of analysis, much of political sociology axiomatically privileges the nationally bounded model of citizenship and bypasses the reconfiguration of contemporary membership.

Like Soysal, I also "redress this overemphasis of the national unit" (ibid), but from below rather than above the nation-state. Further, I contend that the local level is better suited to comparative analysis, as it makes possible a more inductive approach that is based on the observation of actual policies. This was also proposed by Favell (1999: 30), who suggested that the city is[a] far better unit of comparison...which enables both contextual specificity and structural comparisons that allow for the fact that immigrant integration might be influenced simultaneously by local, national and transnational factors.

However, local-level comparisons of migrant policy have been relatively rare until recently. Research on local migrant policies has ranged from single case studies, to comparative case studies in a small number of cities, to multi-city research projects. Most of these were limited to the study of local migrant policies in one policy domain, e.g. the Juridical-political domain, focusing on policies affecting migrant representation and mobilisation. Those comparative case studies which offer the most in-depth analyses usually regard local policies as political opportunity structures for migrant mobilization, in other words they focus on the stranger rather than the host side of the equation. Most importantly, none of the local-level studies have attempted a systematic, multi-policy area comparison or developed their findings into a general explanation or model of local migrant policies, i.e. an analytical framework that could be applied to other cities. In short, they have not reached the level of theorising that characterises the literature at the national level.

In the next chapter I attempt to bridge this gap by proposing a framework which makes it possible to use the findings of case-study research in different cities as a basis for theoretical generalisation on local policymaking toward migrants. The typology I propose builds on
distinctions made in the national-level literature (especially Castles' models of exclusionary, assimilationist and pluralist policies), while attempting to overcome some of the problems noted in the national-level literature.