



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Migration research from the West: shortcomings and challenges

Penninx, R.

Publication date
2015

Published in
Critical reflections in migration research: views from the North and the South

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Penninx, R. (2015). Migration research from the West: shortcomings and challenges. In A. İçduygu, & A. B. Karaçay (Eds.), *Critical reflections in migration research: views from the North and the South* (pp. 19-33). Koç University Press.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

1

Migration Research from the West: Shortcomings and Challenges

RINUS PENNINX

Introduction

International Migration, Integration and Social Cohesion in Europe (IMISCOE) was established on April 1st, 2004, as a collaboration of then 19 research institutes in the field of migration and integration. It was funded for a five-year period by Directorate General (DG) Research, part of the European Commission (EC), through the 6th Framework Programme, as a “Network of Excellence.” The EC funding for five years should lead to a sustainable form of European cooperation between researchers within the EU. The funding was not meant for research itself, but for building a sustainable infrastructure expressing itself in research programming, the training of future researchers and practitioners, and the dissemination of the results of research to a wide audience.

The Network has worked successfully on these tasks: it has expanded its participation to 23 institutes and more than 500 researchers; it has generated a great number of publications based on systematic comparison and many proposals for new comparative and interdisciplinary research. It has built an infrastructure for the training of future researchers and has taken a great number of initiatives for dissemination of the knowledge that is brought together or generated within the Network.¹

1 Details to be found on www.imiscoe.org

The official period of EC funding ended on April 1, 2009.² However, in view of positive internal and external evaluations, the 23 institutes have decided to continue as an independent organization under the name IMISCOE Research Network. The core funding of this new Network is based on the fees of member institutes and individual members. A new Consortium Agreement, a Plan of Activities, and a Work Plan for the first year have been prepared and accepted. The IMISCOE Research Network has furthermore decided to expand its membership. It expects to have about 30 institutional members by the end of 2010.

This paper is not built upon a pre-supposed opposition of views from the West as against views from the South and East, but elaborates more on a critical observation of the state of research in the West—that is, in Europe.³ To this end, firstly, a brief outline that focuses on the changes in the European scene in the field of international migration and settlement of immigrants since the mid-1970s will be presented. It is followed by an elaboration of the relation between the themes of migration and development. Secondly, it indicates how European societies have reacted to these changes. Thirdly, the paper offers a sketch of how the research world has reacted to these changes, particularly asking what it has contributed to our understanding of the new dynamics and indicating where it has failed to do so. This leads, fourthly, to the question of what possible improvements we can make to our research efforts in the near future.

Changing Patterns of Immigration and Settlement in Europe

In the last five decades, there have been tremendous changes in migration movements in Europe. Not only has immigration in Europe increased immensely, but the origin of the immigrants has also changed completely:

-
- 2 The European Commission has allowed IMISCOE to use its under-spending during its five official years in its sixth year.
 - 3 Much of what is elaborated on in the following builds on the early state-of-the-art study that was produced within the IMISCOE context, see Penninx et al. 2006.

while migrants were predominantly from Europe and the circum-Mediterranean area until the 1960s,⁴ they have subsequently come from all over the world. All of the European countries have, to a certain extent, become immigration countries.

Another characteristic of the recent movements is that they have become more fluid than they were in the past: people come for shorter periods of time, go back and forth in cyclical processes, and have different destinations. There is much less on-and-off migration followed by permanent settlement. There are many more continuous multiple relations between origin and destination and new hybrid relations and communities that blur distinct borders of belonging and integration. This may lead to new practices of residence, integration, and community formation. Researchers are exploring these phenomena according to new notions such as transnationalism. Policymakers are asking the uneasy question of what such practices mean for integration.

Finally, when the migration scene of Europe in the 1960s is compared with the situation in later decades, another change is observed: migration movements changed from demand-driven worker migration to more supply-driven migration of refugees, asylum seekers, and dependents of earlier immigrants in the 1980s and 1990s. It is only during the last decade that demand-driven migration re-emerged for specific countries, sectors and levels of skills.

Reactions of European Societies: Changing Policies

An issue of concern is how European states and societies have reacted through changing policies of immigration, integration of immigrants, and policies of migration and development. Firstly, what has changed in the *regulation of international migration*? As a general trend, immigration policies have developed from rather liberal ones in the 1960s and early 1970s, facilitating demand-driven temporary immigration, to much more

4 Exceptions were the (ex-)colonial immigrants in the UK, the Netherlands, France, and Portugal.

restrictive policies after 1973 to keep out unsolicited immigrants. This took place at the national level, primarily in northwestern European states. Later, from the end of the 1990s on, this was also expressed in EU policies in which restrictions on third-country nationals have been the prime policy-driver. This is clearly expressed in the types of common aims and directives that have been developed in EU policies and in the *acquis* that is enforced on new EU members. The other side of the coin to these EU policies is that they have created free circulation of EU citizens and long-term third-country nationals within an enlarging EU area. This amounts to a paradoxical trend towards “free mobility” for those within and increasing closure for those outside the EU.

This general tendency towards restrictiveness has had a rather special internal dynamic. At the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, the inadequacy of policies for regulating migration led to a kind of trauma of failure of migration management in northwestern European countries. Particularly, the failure to manage unsolicited migration has led, in a spiral movement, to ever more restrictive policies, which have, in turn, created more illegality and, consequently, necessitated the creation of more instruments to combat such illegality. One might even say that this trauma of failed migration management has led to reluctance to cooperate on the new demand-driven or desired migration that emerged during the last decade.

A focus in the last few decades on the development of *integration policies* in European countries makes it clear that these policies were non-existent in the beginning. There has been a strong tendency within European countries to call themselves non-immigration countries and declare the actual immigrants they received or attracted to be “temporary” migrants, thereby creating a logic according to which there was no necessity to have integration policies. Terms like “guest workers” indicated the (assumed) temporary character of the phenomenon. There have been a few early exceptions to this rule: in Sweden, for example, integration policies had already started in the late 1970s and in the Netherlands in the early 1980s. However, most of the western European countries only started to think about integration policies in the 1990s, and soon thereafter it became a central political theme in Europe.

Northwestern European countries have moved in recent years from a conception of integration policies that focused on the position of newcomers in society to one that primarily focuses on the cohesion of societies as a whole and on commonalities that are supposed to be crucial for such social cohesion. This has led to much more fundamental questions and discussions on the identity of immigration societies: “Who are we?” The outcomes of such discussions have consequences for newcomers and for what their integration should mean in the eyes of the society of destination. Some observers have called the recent policies in countries like Denmark and the Netherlands as “neo-assimilationist.”⁵ Within such a frame of policy thinking, the trauma of the failure of integration of earlier migrants nowadays backfires against the present migrants: they are now confronted with heavy requirements to integrate. The first steps of such a process sometimes have to be taken even before migration and as a precondition for admission into the country, as in the Dutch case. Migration and integration have clearly become connected, but in a very specific way.

A third domain of study and policy-making—that is *development and migration*—needs to be elaborated on as well. This topic was researched and policy options were explored in the 1960s and 1970s in a few countries, particularly in Sweden, the Netherlands,⁶ Canada, and the UK. At that time, this was done from a more or less morally based development policy. However, the topic and the approach did not gain a substantial place in the agenda of later development policy. It simply seems to have disappeared from the radar of researchers and policymakers in the West in the 1980s and 1990s.

Recently, the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM, 2005) has brought the topic of migration and development back on the

5 See for the Dutch case: Penninx, 2006.

6 In the case of Turkey, the **REMPLOD** project (1974-1978) is an example. **REMPLOD** stands for Reintegration of Emigrant Manpower and Promotion of Local Opportunities for Development. See: Abadan-Unat et al., 1976, and Penninx and Van Renselaar, 1978.

policy agenda, not in the least, because the GCIM has been able to bring countries of origin and destination to the table for discussion on migration policies. That has made for a much stronger articulation of the possible contribution that migration could or should make to the countries of origin. Two basic questions shoulder this new approach: the first is what remittances can mean to these countries of origin in terms of economic, social and cultural development. The second is how the circulation of people and the circulation of brains can be brought to bear on development in the countries of origin of migrants. However, as soon as one thinks about how such conceptions of development in the countries of origin relate to the actual practice of both migration and integration policies in the countries of destination, it is possible to immediately observe many contradictions. How do the heavy requirements for the integration of immigrants in their countries of destination relate to the proposed promotion of circular migration that could possibly have advantages for the countries of origin in the long run? What should one think of the fact that present discussions between sending and receiving countries are dominated by questions such as the taking back of irregular migrants - a preoccupation of the immigration policies of destination countries?

The new dynamics of migration and integration have thus led to policy changes in each of the formerly separate policy domains of migration, integration, and migration and development. However, one of the most significant new trends is that these policy domains have become more and more intertwined, in very specific and often contradictory ways. They give rise to new topics of study, involving different perspectives for researchers. Furthermore, they accentuate the need for new comprehensive thinking.

Research on Migration, Settlement and Social Cohesion

In the wake of the developments outlined above, research in Europe has developed and expanded in the course of time and followed roughly the timing of the migration phenomenon itself. Initially, in the 1960s and 1970s, individual researchers engaged in such research, often focusing on one particular flow of migrants or immigrant group. The 1980s witnessed

the first research institutes with more comprehensive programmes: in Sweden (Centre for Research in International Migration and Ethnic Relations, **CEIFO**), in the United Kingdom (Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, **CRER**), in France (Migrations Internationales, Espaces et Sociétés, **MIGRINTER**) and in the Netherlands (Centre for Race and Ethnic Studies, **CRES**; European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations, **ERCOMER**; Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies, **IMES**). This pattern expanded to other western European countries and to the southern countries in the late 1990s.

Traditionally, migration and integration research was strongly embedded in national contexts, both in terms of the framing of its questions and its funding. As a consequence, it strongly reflected national concerns and perspectives. Topics and priorities accordingly were related primarily to destination countries. Most of that research was, moreover, mono-disciplinary.⁷

It was the **IMISCOE** Network of Excellence that offered a possibility to try to overcome the fragmented nature of research, and in doing so provided a coherent and more comprehensive analytic and empirical basis for policies and for public discourse on international migration and integration.

The first diagnosis that **IMISCOE** made concerning the state of the art of research in Europe had a double message. On the one hand, there was a growing amount of research available; on the other, there were signifi-

7 This phenomenon of embeddedness of research in national contexts was coined “Methodological Nationalism” by Wimmer and N. Glick-Schiller (2003). Such traditions have often developed in a context in which the funding of research is significantly influenced by policy interests. It implies a strong focus on the national case that may lead not only to a lack of cross-national comparison, but also to specific foci of research. In general, more attention is given to migrants as the object of study than to the receiving society. The crucial questions to be researched also reflect the perspectives of receiving countries rather than those of sending countries. See also Ali-Ali and Koser, 2002. Recent publications such as Bommers (2006), Lavenex (2005), and Vasta and Vaddamalay (2006) substantiate (the limitations of) such national traditions.

cant gaps in empirical data and, more importantly, there was the general recognition that research failed to produce comprehensive insights on present migration processes and their consequences for migrants and their communities, and for countries of origin and destination. In other words, research in Europe had not kept pace with developments in the field it studied. The most common weakness of European research on migration and integration issues was that it was fragmented in three forms: a lack of comparative research, a lack of cooperation among disciplines, and a lack of integration of the different levels at which phenomena are studied.

Challenges for the Organisation of Research

Amending such weaknesses necessitates specific efforts in the organisation and methodology of research. The following section will dwell on each of these causes of fragmentation and indicate how these can be remedied.

Lack of Comparative Research

There is a consensus both on the lack of comparative research and on the expectation that systematic comparison will bring a scientific knowledge base a big step forward. However, what are its implications in practice? The challenges lay on different levels that all have relevance in the design of a comparative research framework. The first and most practical level is that of the basic administrative data that are often used by researchers. It was reported that cross-national comparability of seemingly simple data such as those on migration is profoundly problematic. The problem is that administrative data are collected within a specified institutional context for specific purposes, using definitions that reflect their particular tasks, assumptions, and preoccupations. The problem for scientists—apart from the validity and reliability of the data within the system in which they are collected—in using such data for comparative purposes is essentially twofold: Do they measure the same phenomenon? Second, are they complete or representative? Critical assessment of comparability is thus a fundamental requirement here, possibly leading to practical proposals for change. **IMISCOE** has, in the meantime, initiated a number of

projects like “Promoting Comparative Quantitative Research in the Field of Migration and Integration in Europe” (**PROMINSTAT**)⁸ and publications in this field.⁹

The second level is that of the design of comparisons. A research design that compares different immigrant populations within one national or local context will draw attention, by the choice of the design, to factors *within these immigrant populations* that explain the differential outcomes. A design that compares the same ethnic group within different national or local contexts, however, will focus on factors *within these contexts* that explain differences. The same holds true for comparisons in which time is additionally brought into the design. There remains significant work to be done to develop a toolkit of rigid comparison to combine the different but complementary forms of design, preferably in internationally coordinated research programmes. One of the most important initiatives in this field has been the project entitled “The Integration of the European Second Generation” (**TIES** project), a multi-comparative research project on the position of descendants of immigrants in Europe in eight countries and 15 European cities.¹⁰

The third level is that of concepts and terminology. The fact that the same terms are used in different national or local contexts—for example, integration policy or multicultural policies—may create the illusion that the same phenomena are addressed. Empirical research, however, has shown not only that the ideas and assumptions behind such policies are different, but also that the practice and measures of such policies vary considerably in different places and situations (Vermeulen, 1997). Another complication is that academic concepts may acquire a normative connotation in public and political discourse. This makes it difficult for scholars to use such concepts, particularly in communication with a broader audience. This has been described for the concepts of assimilation and

8 See www.prominstat.eu

9 See for example Fassmann et al. 2009. For more **IMISCOE** publications see <http://www.imiscoe.org/publications/imiscoe/index.html>

10 See www.tiesproject.eu

integration and for the concept of multiculturalism. Therefore, scholars need to design analytical frameworks in which abstract concepts and notions are operationalised in a way that allows the collection of empirical data in the same manner in different contexts.¹¹ An interesting project in this respect is the project entitled “European Network of Cities for Local Integration Policies for Migrants” (CLIP project) that systematically compares local integration policies of around 30 European cities.¹²

Working on systematic comparative research is thus, scientifically, a significant challenge, and a costly one in practice, but it will advance research a fundamental step further. At the same time, it will provide a sound basis for policymakers who are increasingly looking across borders to see how other countries are dealing with the dilemmas they are confronted with.¹³

Multidisciplinarity/Interdisciplinarity

Critiques on the (non-)involvement of various disciplines in the study of migration and settlement refer to two factors. The first is the observation that in the past the research field was dominated by a limited number of disciplines, often anthropology, sociology, social geography, economics and law, while other disciplines, such as political science and history, came in relatively late. The second is that disciplines often develop their

-
- 11 On a still relatively abstract level, the **INTPOL** study by Heckmann and Boss-
wick (2006) has delivered an analytical framework for the comparative study
of integration processes of immigrants.
 - 12 See <http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/populationandsociety/clip.htm>
 - 13 The key phrase in such international exchanges has become “to learn from best
practices elsewhere.” However, there is a problem here, too, of comparability,
since any practice—bad, good, or best—is rooted in a local and national
institutional setting; the crucial question is whether a good practice is transfe-
rable from one institutional setting to another. It is the knowledge about the
mechanisms of a good practice and the conditions under which it works that
makes it transferable, rather than the specific form it has taken at a certain
moment and place. See for example Penninx (2009) on the transferability of
One-Stop-Shops for service provision to immigrants.

research in relative isolation—this point is made strongly for economists, for example, but it can also be applied to other disciplines like history and law—and that we rarely see comprehensive multidisciplinary research, let alone interdisciplinary research projects.¹⁴

The challenge for future research is thus to transcend the old divisions of disciplines in research on international migration and settlement of migrants. Such cooperation across disciplines can be done most fruitfully when participants in such endeavours work from the strength of their own disciplines. This means that researchers should not be isolated or isolate themselves from their disciplines (to form another isolated thematic field of research on migration and settlement), but should act as active links between their discipline and the thematic field stimulating research on the thematic field within the discipline and bringing special expertise from the discipline to the thematic field.

In practice, this should be done at two levels. The first is to create multidisciplinary organisational structures, such as **IMISCOE**, which bring disciplines together and stimulate exchange and cooperation. The second, deeper level is to conceive and implement interdisciplinary projects and programmes in which such cooperation is built *ex ante* into the central questions and design, the collection of material, the analysis and reporting. **IMISCOE** has taken the first steps along this complicated trajectory in its nine Research Clusters, but much work is still to be done.

Integrating Levels of Analysis

Another form of fragmentation relates to levels (of units) of analysis and the lack of integration of these levels. This may express itself in a form where (mostly qualitative) research on the micro-level of small groups

14 For practical purposes, the author prefer to use “multi-disciplinary” as a quality of research institutes, team, and programmes indicating that researchers of several disciplines are involved. I use “interdisciplinary” specifically as an adjective for research projects, indicating that the central questions and the design of the project are conceived as an integrated and complementary work across disciplines beforehand, which expresses itself in the coordinated collection of material, integrated analysis, and reporting.

does not seem to have any relation with (mostly quantitative) research on the aggregate level of groups or categories.¹⁵ This classical kind of fragmentation is not unique to the field of migration and integration, but this observation does not make the challenge to overcome it less urgent or easier.

The fragmentation also takes a more space-based form, particularly when the unit of analysis refers to the different levels at which societies are politically organised and policy efforts are involved: the borough, the city, the region, the national state, and supra-national or international agents. While the nation-state dominated in research from the beginning, there is a growing body of research on the local level on the one hand, and on the international and supra-national level on the other. The relations between these levels and the complex ways in which they influence each other, however, are yet to be explored.

This form of fragmentation has a special dimension in the European context. Since the start of Europeanization in the form of the European Economic Community up to the present European Union, an ever more significant supra-national level has developed. Migration and mobility within the European Economic Community and later the European Union has been a topic of complicated interaction between national governments and European administrations—starting as far back as the 1950s (Goedings, 2005). Discussions focusing on immigration from outside the EU have grown in importance since the late 1990s and integration policies since 2003.¹⁶

There is a growing awareness among researchers of the need to overcome this fragmentation, and at the same time, an expectation that this will greatly enhance our understanding of policies and policy-making in the

15 Admittedly, in migration studies this cleavage has been discussed since the late 1980s and “meso-level” mechanisms have been introduced to bridge the gap, particularly in the form of networks of different kinds. In integration studies, however, there is much less of an effort to bridge between the micro- and macro/aggregate level.

16 For a concise overview see Van Selm and Tsolakis (2004).

field. The theme of “multi-level governance of migration and integration” has been the focus of a special cluster of researchers within **IMISCOE**. Some work has been done, but it is only a start of a promising field of research.

New Perspectives on Immigration and Integration Research in Europe

Apart from improvements in the organisation of research by involving relevant disciplines, using comparison as a strategic tool and designing research that comprises more levels and takes into account the interaction between them, the original diagnosis of the State-of-the-Art of research in Europe suggested also that we urgently need new theoretical and analytical perspectives. The term “perspective” here means looking at the field from a different angle and thus asking different questions, taking other units of analysis as a starting point, and collecting new kinds of empirical material. Specifically, three kinds of new perspectives are suggested.

Rethinking the Relation between Migration and Settlement

International migration and integration (or its alternative terms such as assimilation, incorporation or settlement) have established themselves in the past as more or less independent fields of research and theory. This is also partly reflected in the way the **IMISCOE** network has initially structured its research clusters. The first—international migration—is then defined as the spatial movement, voluntary or forced, of persons across political borders as a process, together with its causes and consequences. The second pertains to the process of settlement and integration of immigrants and their descendants in the society of destination and the consequences this has for these societies. Most of the existing body of theories in these fields is being developed on the basis of experience in traditional Anglo-Saxon immigration countries and by researchers from these countries.

Though it is useful to start from that knowledge and build on it, at the same time it transpires from the outline of developments in migration and integration in Europe that there are at least two kinds of problems stemming from such definitions and the implied division between migra-

tion and integration research. The first kind of question arises when we see migration and integration as self-contained and independent fields of research, thus decoupling migration from settlement. As noted earlier, international migration has changed in character: the migration process has become more complex, more fluid, and less permanent. The implicitly assumed one-off movement and the time sequence of migration followed by a settlement process are increasingly blurred.

The second set of issues refers to a specificity of the European context: the fact that most European countries define themselves as non-immigration countries has far-reaching consequences both for international migration and integration as separate fields, and also for the nexus between the two fields, as it is mentioned above.

There is thus a need to reformulate the research field as one complex field rather than two separate ones and to introduce new perspectives and questions that focus on this more complicated interconnectedness. Focusing on the migrants themselves, one of these new perspectives is that of transnationalism. This notion basically challenges the above-mentioned assumptions of one-off movements, followed by gradual settlement, by asking pertinent questions about the nature and continuity of the ties of migrants with several places and communities and thus their simultaneous “integration” therein. Focusing on both sending and receiving societies, a number of new questions that interconnect migration and integration also arise (or are put in a different light). For example, how are migration and development issues influenced by new migration patterns, by the formation of transnational communities and by the integration policies of destination countries? How do arguments related to integration (and concrete policy measures in that field) influence admission and immigration policies and practices and the patterns of continued immigration and return?

Shifting the Focus from Migrants to Society

There is another observation on the state of the art of migration and integration research that hints at the need to introduce new perspectives: nearly all research in receiving societies focuses primarily on immigra-

tion and immigrants themselves and their integration, while the societal systems into which the phenomenon of immigration and the immigrants themselves are to be integrated are taken for granted.¹⁷

It is interesting to observe that the opposite is the case when the effects of migration on the societal structures of sending countries are studied. These effects have been studied under headings such as “brain drain,” effects on families and households, on peasant economies, local markets, etc. More recently, the potential of migration and migrant communities for the development of regions of origin found much attention. Migration and development are apparently topics that are relevant and applicable for countries that send migrants, rather than for countries that receive them.

To put it ironically, migration research has looked more at the societal effects of the “absence of migrants” in sending countries than at the societal effects of the “presence of migrants” in receiving ones. However, if there is need to make sense of the difficult terms “integration” and “social cohesion”—beyond the political attractiveness of their semantics on a global, European, and nation-state level—we must include in our analysis the effects of migration on societal structures in Europe, as well. Europe with its nation-states has become—in an uneven process—a world region of international migration. If migration is linked to major social transformations, as is claimed by migration researchers and increasingly accepted as commonsense knowledge, then it needs to be demonstrated to what extent migration has affected the core structures of European immigrant-receiving societies themselves.

This general perspective leads to a focus on such issues as the short-term and long-term effects of migration and the presence of immigrants on the various societal realms such as politics, the economy, law, science,

17 Although in the new rhetoric of integration policy, the statement that integration is a two-sided process of change for migrants and the receiving society is accepted nowadays (see for example the Communication of the European Commission on Integration (European Commission, 2003) and the Common Basic Principles for integration policies have been approved by the Conference of Integration ministers in Groningen (European Commission, 2004), in practice we see the same strong focus on immigrants.

education, health, religion, mass media, arts, sports, and the family. In asking such questions for each of the mentioned domains, several social levels, such as the institutional level and that of organisations and networks, and their interactions should be taken into account.

Perspectives “From Outside”

The foregoing observations on new perspectives refer to imbalances within the thematic field of international migration, integration, and social cohesion and suggest ways to address them. However, this thematic area should not be regarded as an isolated one. New issues and questions arise when the thematic field is seen in a broader perspective. Only three examples are mentioned below.

The first perspective looks at international migration as just one of the forms that spatial mobility may take. Systematic comparison with other forms of mobility that do not imply crossing national borders, such as internal migration, or that have a shorter time horizon, such as cross-border commuting, tourism and business travel, may bring the special characteristics and underlying mechanisms of international migration to the fore.

A second, much broader perspective is the one that nowadays goes under the term “globalisation.” From such a perspective, important questions arise as to how physical migration of people across borders relates to the “travel” of other things—money, goods, ideas, and cultural and religious meanings and practices, some of which are physical, others much less so, or not so at all—across the same borders. What do such relations mean for viewing the process of settlement of immigrants?

A still broader perspective is to look at international migration, its causes and consequences as part of the study of the transformation of societies. This means that the phenomenon is then looked at as part of more general transformations, and the question becomes how it fits into the broader study of social change. Again, interesting beginnings have been made in exploring such new perspectives, but much work has yet to be done.

By Way of Conclusion

The foregoing analysis of the weaknesses and possible remedies of research in the West is primarily an internal critique. Within **IMISCOE**, a serious programme of revision was devised. An implicit assumption in doing so is that the more diversity we bring into the academic community that works on such a programme, more warrantees are necessary to make progress in renewing and improving our research.

It is in that light that the new **IMISCOE** Research Network has recently invited new members that can bring new perspectives and experiences. One of these invited institutes is MiReKoc. MiReKoc was the first new member of the **IMISCOE** Research Network. MiReKoc will bring in its special contribution into **IMISCOE**, whether that is “a perspective from the East” or any other relevant contribution.

REFERENCES

- Abadan-Unat, N., R. Keleş, R. Penninx, H. van Renselaar, L. van Velzen and L. Yenisey (1976) *Migration and Development. A Study of the Effects of International Labor Migration on Boğazlıyan District*. Den Haag/Ankara: **NUFFIC**.
- Ali-Ali, N. S. and K. Koser (2002) *New Approaches to Migration? Transnational Communities and the Transformation of Home*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Bommes, M. (2006) "Migration and Migration Research in Germany," in *International Migration and The Social Sciences: Confronting national Experiences in Australia, France and Germany*, eds. E. Vasta and V. Vaddamalay, pp. 143-221. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bommes, M. and E. Morawska (eds.) (2005) *International Migration Research: Constructions, Omissions and the Promises of Interdisciplinarity*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- European Commission (2003) Communication on Immigration, Integration and Employment June 3, 2003. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2003:0336:FIN:EN:PDF>, last access date: 02.08.2013.
- European Commission (2004) Common Basic Principles for Integration, adopted by the **JHA** Council on November 19, 2004. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2005:0389:FIN:EN:PDF>, last access date: 02.08.2013.
- Fassmann, H., U. Reeger and W. Sievers (eds.) (2009) *Statistics and Reality: Concepts and Measurements of Migration in Europe*. Amsterdam: **AUP (IMISCOE series)**.
- GCIM** (2005) *Migration in an Interconnected World: New Directions for Action*. Global Commission on International Migration October 2005. <http://www.gcim.org/en/finalreport.html>
- Goedings, S.A.W. (2005) *Labor Migration in an Integrating Europe: National Migration Policies and the Free Movement of Workers, 1950-1968*. The Hague: **SDU**.
- Heckmann, F. and W. Bosswick (2006) Integration and Integration Policies. **IMISCOE** Network Feasibility Study. Working paper. <http://www.efms.uni-bamberg.de/pdf/INTPOL%20Final%20Paper.pdf>, last access date: 02.08.2013

- Lavenex, S. (2005) "National Frames in Migration Research: The Tacit Political Agenda," in *International Migration Research: Constructions, Omissions and the Promises of Interdisciplinarity*, (eds.) M. Bommers and E. Morawska, pp. 243-264. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Penninx, R. (2006) "Après les assassinats de Fortuyn et de Van Gogh: le modèle hollandais d'intégration Hollandais en déroute?," *Critique Internationale*, vol. 33, pp. 9-26.
- Penninx, R. (2009) Evaluation of the One-Stop-Shop Project, http://www.oss.inti.acidi.gov.pt/index.php?option=com_contentandview=articleandid=131andItemid=77andlang=en
- Penninx, R., M. Berger and K. Kraal (eds.) (2006) *The Dynamics of International Migration and Settlement in Europe. A State of the Art*. Amsterdam: AUP (IMISCOE Joint Studies series).
- Penninx, R. and H. van Renselaar (1978) *A Fortune in Small Change: A Study of Migrant Workers' Attempts to Invest Savings Productively through Joint Stock Corporations and Village Development Co-operatives in Turkey*. Den Haag: NUFFIC/IMWOO/REMPLOD.
- Selm, J. van, and E. Tsolakis (2004) EU Enlargement and the Limits of Freedom. *Migration Policy Information Source*, October 2004, <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=224>
- Vasta, E. and V. Vaddamalay (eds.) (2006) *International Migration and the social sciences: confronting national experiences in Australia, France and Germany*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vermeulen, H. (ed.) (1997) *Immigrant Policy for a Multicultural Society: A Comparative Study of Integration, Language and Religious Policy in Five Western European Countries*. Brussels/Amsterdam: MPG/IMES.
- Wimmer, A. and N. Glick-Schiller (2003) "Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology," *International Migration Review*, vol. 7 (3), pp. 576-610.