Introduction. Making a difference

Schrover, M.L.J.C.; Moloney, M.D.; Schrover M., Moloney M.D.

Gender, Migration and Categorisation

Making Distinctions between Migrants
in Western Countries, 1945-2010

Marlou Schrover & Deirdre M. Moloney (eds)

IMISCOE Research

AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY PRESS

1 Introduction

Making a difference

Marlou Schrover and Deirdre Moloney

Introduction

All people are equal, according to Thomas Jefferson, but all migrants
are not. States differentiate explicitly between *categories of migrants*
(e.g., colonial, refugee, labour and family), and they differentiate im-
plicitly according to *categories of analysis*, such as gender, class, religion
and ethnicity. The relationship between gender and categorisation is
twofold. In the first place, the ability to move between the categories
of migrants is different for men and for women. Secondly, ideas about
gender, together with those from other categories of analysis (e.g., class,
religion and ethnicity), shape debates in the media and policies, as this
volume makes clear. The contributions in this volume describe and an-
alyse how in a number of countries – France, the USA, Turkey, Canada,
Mexico, the Netherlands, Sweden and Denmark – distinctions between
migrants were made and justified in policies and in public debates. The
countries examined are similar enough to make valuable comparisons,
while being sufficiently varied to lead to interesting conclusions. Each
of the countries has significant and diverse groups of migrant popula-
tions. Several have large groups of migrants from earlier colonial or
neo-colonial relationships with other societies; and all have developed
important policies on migration and refugees, at least since the mid
20th century. Several of the major migrant groups have religious tra-
ditions that differ from those of the majority population, which often
leads to conflict and controversies about national identities and social
roles. About half of the countries have encouraged multiculturalism,
while the other countries have not.

All authors except Schacher examine the period after the Second
World War. Schacher analyses the Armenian refugee issue in the 1920s,
pointing out striking continuities with more recent debates. All authors
focus on gender as the primary analytical category. In the conclusion,
we make comparisons between the countries and between the catego-

ries of migrants examined. All authors address the intersection of gender with other categories of analysis.

We have selected our subjects for four major reasons. In the first place, (re-)categorisations and processes of (re-)labelling can best be studied at nodal points: moments of debate (Laclau & Mouffe 1985). It is at such times that boundaries are redrawn or justified. Secondly, changes in categorisation typically occur only following longer periods of debate, or after repeated debate. Debates in the media generally lead to policy changes only later (if at all). Thirdly, in order to look at how authorities differentiate between categories of migrants (colonial, refugee, labour and family) it is necessary to study debates that relate to these different categories of migrants holistically rather than to look at each in isolation. Lastly, since we want to focus on gender, this is part of the debates chosen, preferably in combination with other categories of analysis, such as class, ethnicity and religion.

The past six decades have witnessed extensive debates on three issues, as we will show in this volume. These are who is a 'refugee', who is 'family' and 'multiculturalism'. We focus on these debates. Generally speaking, scholars, policymakers, politicians and journalists distinguish four main categories of migrants: postcolonial migrants, refugees or asylum seekers, labour migrants and family migrants (migrants who are motivated to cross borders for family reunification or formation). In practice, however, these categories are not static or mutually exclusive. Among, for example, the Portuguese migrants who in the 1970s came to North-Western Europe as guest workers were people fleeing the Salazar regime and the draft for the Mozambique and Angola wars. Many Spanish guest workers opposed the Franco regime. They left their country for political reasons as much as for economic reasons. Guest workers from Morocco left during the so-called 'years of lead', the repressive regime of King Hassan II. They were escaping both poverty and repression. Turkish guest workers sought to escape the 1970s political coups, and ethnic and religious tensions in Eastern Turkey, while many Greek guest workers fled the Regime of the Colonels. They preferred, however, to come within the framework of guest-worker migration, rather than apply for asylum. This changed after 1975, when labour migration was restricted because the guest-worker regime had come to an end. Christians and Kurds from Turkey then started to apply for asylum. As opportunities for labour migration diminished, refugee migration increased, and migration for family reunification and formation became more important. Categories of migrants are like communicating vessels: migrants change categories, and the bureaucrats who decide on entry or residence might allocate them to different categories.

When one route closes, another may open. We analyse when and why this happens. Opportunities to use a different route, furthermore, differ according to gender. Migrant men, for instance, were more likely than migrant women to be accused of 'misusing' the possibilities for family migration when they moved from the category of labour migrants to that of family migrants.

People tend to think in categories because simplification makes the social world understandable and manageable (Boyd & Richerson 1987). According to Bourdieu (1980), categorisation is a struggle to impose definitions of divisions within society and, hence, of making and unmaking social groups. Categorisation does not describe social order but rather shapes and reshapes power relations, according to Foucault (1980). We define categorisation as the grouping of individuals into collective entities that come with rights (or the denial thereof). Authoritative institutions, states above all, use formalised categorisations that are artificial (Brubaker, Loveman & Stamatov 2004: 33). Foucault's (1988, 1991) notion of governmentality depends on these categorisations (Burchell, Gordon & Miller 1991). Governmentality does not refer to the government, but to the many heterogeneous and pervasive ways in which the conduct of individuals and groups is shaped and directed. We define governmentality as practices (mentalities, rationalities and techniques) through which subjects are governed, and the techniques and strategies by which a society is rendered governable. The discursive mechanisms act as technologies of governance by which groups are constituted as a problem in need of a policy response (Gray 2006). Discursive mechanisms make issues visible so that they can be governed (Wiebel 2010: 16). States have the authority to decide who is who and to differentiate rights accordingly (Bourdieu 1994). In doing so, they create gender differences. Categorisation is used to legitimise differences within policies and between groups of people. Categorisations are constantly renewed with the intention to exclude or deny rights (mostly) or to include and grant rights (rarely). Categorisation results in debates and a constant redrawing of boundaries; we address these in this volume. Scholars, as a rule, tend to follow the categorisations that policymakers use. In part, this is the result of the source material that is available and organised according to these categorisations. We take a different approach. By looking at different categories of migrants we analyse how migrants move between categories, how and why policy implementers use categories, and how use of these categories differs according to gender.

In this volume all authors use similar research methods; we trace and analyse public and policy debates in policy documents, parlia-

mentary papers, non-governmental organisation (NGO) archives, court cases and newspaper articles. Policymakers fear public unrest, which as a rule means media coverage. Courts and lawyers know that via media coverage and political debates individual cases can become precedents. We place this public sphere – defined by Habermas (1989) as the theatre for deliberation and debating – centre stage in this volume. We trace how concepts were introduced and used, how demarcations were made and justified, how changes occurred over time, and how these aspects differed according to gender. We show that personification was used as a strategy to change labels, and the ways in which precedent cases were drawn on to force decisions in other cases. By personification, we mean that one person – often a woman or a child – is made the figurehead of a campaign that aims to change policy and frequently leads to (re-) categorisation. Personification as a strategy has had different outcomes for migrant men and women, as we will show.

This introductory chapter accomplishes two things. First, it provides an overview of the literature on gender and migration. It also presents an overview of the literature on three themes that have led to extensive public and political debate: refugee migration, family migration and multiculturalism. Our overview on these themes is not extensive, since Schacher, Walaardt, Boyd & Nowak, and Oxford, in their respective chapters, provide overviews of the literature on refugee migration; Raissiguier, Van Walsum, Legêne & Jones, and Oxford do so for 'family'; and Cederberg, Andreassen, and Schrover do so for multiculturalism.

There is now a very large literature on gender and migration, and it is not possible, or useful, to offer a synthesis of it. There are, obviously, many differences between migrant men and women. As a result, there is not *one* unified theory of gender and migration (Donato et al. 2006; Sinke 2006). Differences according to gender have been observed, for instance, regarding the trajectories that migrants follow, the networks they use, the ties that they maintain, their employment niches, and the opportunities and restrictions they encounter. Theories have been developed that aim to explain all these differences. These theories are discussed in the first part of this chapter. We add to this body of theory by focusing on gender, migration and categorisation in the public sphere. This is addressed in the second part of this chapter and developed further in our concluding chapter.

The literature on gender and migration can be grouped into seven clusters.

1 Most studies on gender and migration are about women and migration, rather than comparing migrant men and migrant women. Women's roles and femininity are addressed, but men's roles and masculinity rarely are.

2 The concept of intersectionality was introduced several decades ago to emphasise that categories of power and identity – such as class, gender and ethnicity – intersect. The concept has been advocated, but has rarely been applied empirically.

3 The literature pays ample attention to the feminisation of migration, which is presented as a new phenomenon. This occurs without offering much proof and without making clear what feminisation means.

4 Some authors address differences between migrant men and women when it comes to migration patterns, networks and transnational ties.

5 The literature on gender and migration focuses on the private sphere and family, and pays less attention to the work sphere. When the work sphere is addressed, much of that literature concentrates on domestic servants. Furthermore there is an emphasis on prostitution and related issues.

6 There is a rather large literature on gender, citizenship and residency status.

7 In recent years, there has been a shift in the academic literature toward debates about headscarves and veiling which closely follows shifts in political and public discourse.

We address these seven points at some length below. Thereafter, we introduce the core element of this volume: categorisation, differentiation and defining in relationship to gender and migration. Specifically, we present the three issues that we earlier mentioned as having led to extensive public and political debates in recent decades. The issue of who is a 'refugee' is taken up in the main part of this volume by Schacher, by Walaardt, by Boyd & Nowak, and by Oxford. Raissiguier, Van Walsum, Legêne & Jones, and Oxford examine who is 'family', and Cederberg, Andreassen, and Schrover look at debates on 'difference' within multicultural policy. Here, we suffice to highlight the fact that concepts, discourses, strategies, theories and debates travel across time, between categories of migrants, across gender boundaries and between countries (Said 1982; Bal 2002: 24). We will return to the added theoretical value of this point in the concluding chapter. There we also summarise our findings in an explanatory model.

State of the art: The literature on gender and migration

Sex and gender; masculinity and femininity

Since 'gender' has a variety of meanings, it is useful to clarify the term before proceeding. 'Gender' and 'sex' are frequently used as synonyms, with a preference for 'gender' over 'sex' (Haig 2004). 'Gender' is used when actually 'women' are meant (Lenz et al. 2002; Calavita 2006). This is confusing. It is therefore helpful to return to 1955, when Money first used the term 'gender' – which was at that time a grammatical concept – as a category of analysis because the concept 'sex' was inadequate for the description of social identities (Money 1955). 'Sex' relates to the identification of an individual based on his or her biological endowments and functions. Gender is the constitutive element of social relationships, and particularly relationships of power, based on perceived differences between the sexes (Scott 1986).

Gender is concerned with the ascription of social characteristics such as 'womanly', 'manly', 'feminine' and 'masculine'. It is a normative concept, and relates to behaviour that is expected of men or women. Theories on gender emphasise the need to look at who has the power to define which differences are relevant. Gender roles are internalised and institutionalised (in laws and regulations). Gender refers to the construction, organisation and maintenance of masculinity and femininity. Masculinity and femininity describe the roles that men and women are assigned, or assume, and roles that they are expected to perform, which affect how gender is institutionalised and embedded in laws and regulations. Ideas on this differ per country, and by context, and they often change over time. Migrants might adapt and change roles depending on whether they are with co-ethnics or others, or when visiting their country of origin. Roles are situational and fluid. Although masculinity and femininity, and thus gender are fluid constructions, a static male/female binary is implicitly or explicitly used in social life and entrenched in laws and policies (Scott 1986; Scott 1988, 1998; Calavita 2006). Gender is a constitutive element of social relationships, particularly of relationships of power, based on perceived differences between the sexes (Scott 1986: 1067). Characteristics change over time, are culturally variable, and are not necessarily linked to the sex of an individual (Browne 2007: 1).

Early studies on migration either focused on men or described migrants in genderless terms. Models were based on the (heterosexual) male experience, and similar mechanisms were assumed to influence the migration decisions of both men and women. Women were 'added'

later, but without applying gender as an analytical category, and hence, without systematically explaining differences between migrant men and women. Much of the earlier research was descriptive. To compensate for the absence of women in early studies, research on gender and migration originally focused on women rather than on gender (Anthias & Yuval-Davis 1992; Lutz, Phoenix & Yuval-Davis 1995; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2000; Anthias & Lazaridis 2000; Knörr & Meier 2000; Sharpe 2001; Morokvasic, Erel & Shinozaki 2003; Oishi 2005; Donato et al. 2006; Piper 2007). These studies do contribute to our understanding of the gendered nature of migration, but the added value of an approach that compares men to women is widely acknowledged (Lenz et al. 2002; Morokvasic, Erel & Shinozaki 2003).

Rather surprisingly, the idea still prevails that studies about men and migration are not about gender. There was initially little comparison between femininity and masculinity. Recent studies, however, do examine masculinity and migration (Connell 1993; España-Maram 2006; McKay 2007; Hansen 2008; Nobil Ahmad 2008; Ryan & Webster 2008; Nobil Ahmad 2011). Walaardt in this volume looks at how masculinity and migration intersect.

Intersectionality

Gender is still mostly studied in isolation from other constructive elements of power and equality and also in isolation from other defining elements of identity, including social location, opportunity and experience (e.g., class and ethnicity). In reality, these categories intersect. The concept of intersectionality was introduced in the 1960s by the feminist movement to emphasise the interaction between categories of analysis (Davis 2008). The term was new, but the awareness that categories intersected was not. Hollingshead (1952: 685), for instance, observed that 'horizontal strata' 'transect' with 'vertical structures' 'based upon the social values that are attached to occupation, education, place of residence in the community, and associations'. They were 'combined into a complicated status system. The vertically differentiating factors of race, religion, and ethnic origin, when combined with the horizontally differentiating ones of occupation, education, place of residence and so on, produce a social structure that is highly compartmentalized.' Similarly, in her study of women's organisations in New Haven, Minnis (1953) found that women's organisations were born and existed in a complex pattern of interlocking strands of 'cleavage': race, religion, ethnicity and class. Hacker (1951) saw possibilities for 'fruitful analysis' if 'women's roles' were studied in combination with class and race.

Recent literature has emphasised the importance of simultaneously studying the multiple dimensions of durable social inequality (for an overview of the literature see Schrover & Yeo 2010). The concept of intersectionality emphasises that an interaction between power relations works to include or exclude people (Crenshaw 1989; Tilly 1998; McCall 2005; Boris 2005; Phoenix & Pattynama 2006; Sassen 2006; Davis 2008). Changes in power, equality (or inequality), and identity can thus be explained only when categories of exclusion and inclusion are studied together (McCall 2005).

In practice, it has proven difficult to think about two or more categories simultaneously. Rather than thinking from a cumulative perspective, as the theory of intersectionality stipulates, researchers tend to think first in terms of hierarchies, and then move towards answering questions, such as 'in this case does gender trump ethnicity' or vice versa. Furthermore, individuals' identity goes beyond merely their class, gender and ethnicity. People can be defined by their sexual orientation, familial role (mother/father, daughter/son, sister/brother), religion, nationality, ability/disability and age. Including an increasing number of categories, however, makes the concept of intersectionality cumbersome to use (McCall 2005; Boris 2005; Davis 2008). Not all differences are similarly important at all times. Which differences are (deemed to be) important depends on who is asking the question, as well as when and where it is asked. The reply to the question 'who are you?' differs depending on whether a potential employer or a lover is asking it. Identities are fluid, situational and relational. Migrants can switch between identities depending on, for instance, whether they are at that moment oriented towards the country of origin or settlement (Mahler & Pessar 2006). Nevertheless, it is possible to group and analyse identities and power relations by bracketing time, space and personal or institutional setting. Gender, class and ethnicity are generally accepted as key aspects of identity, and dimensions of durable social inequality (Tilly 1998; McCall 2005; Boris 2005; Davis 2008). Yet each of these categories are of more or less importance in different contexts. As the authors in this volume illustrate, it is possible to identify which categories are made important in political and public debates at certain points in time. Oxford's chapter illustrates this for sexuality, and Schacher does so for religion.

Feminisation of migration

Migration researchers and policymakers repeatedly claim that a feminisation of migration has taken place (see, e.g., Wihtol de Wenden 1998;

King & Zontini 2000; El-Cherkeh et al. 2004; Kawar 2004; Oso Casas & Garson 2005). Authors use phrases like 'women workers form the majority in movements as diverse as those of Cape Verdians to Italy, Filipinos to the Middle East and Thais to Japan' (Castles & Miller 2003: 7-9, 188). The countries mentioned are not chosen randomly, although the phrase 'as diverse as' might suggest this. These are the countries in which migrant women *do* outnumber men. Examples of precisely the opposite could as easily be given. In 2005 men outnumbered women among immigrants in Saudi Arabia (70% men), Cuba (73% men) and Bangladesh (86% men). Note that there is a difference between the first set of countries, which refers to emigrants from one country, and the second set, which speaks on immigrants (presumably from various countries) to one country.

In some countries, the number of documented migrant women *has* increased. Data are, however, difficult to interpret. In 1978, Singapore, for instance, introduced the Foreign Maids Scheme, which made it possible for women from the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, Burma, Sri Lanka, India and Bangladesh to enter Singapore as 'live-in' domestic workers. As a result, that country's migrant domestic worker population grew from 5,000 in 1978 to 150,000 in 2005 (Human Rights Watch 2005: 19). This does not necessarily mean that the actual number of migrant domestic workers increased. The scheme was introduced to counter the exploitation of foreign domestic workers, and registration was part of that effort. The data therefore partly reflect an increase in the number of *documented* domestic workers. Women who migrated to Singapore as domestic workers prior to 1978 were not registered. Women currently make up half of the migrant population in Singapore. There are no data available that allow us to compare the current percentage of migrant women with that of the past.

Frequently it remains unclear what authors mean when they use the term 'feminisation'. The term may indicate that women outnumber men in migration. Or it might suggest that the number of women now equals the number of men, while that was not the case in the past. It is also used to refer to (assumed) changes in migration: an increase in long-distance migration of women (as opposed to the mostly short-distance migration that was common in the past), or an increase in the number of women who are pioneers or single migrants (as opposed to the dependent migrants of the past). Authors generally offer no proof of feminisation, but simply observe that women today form about half of migrants. They then quickly move on to issues such as migrant women's health hazards, the problems of care workers, domestic servants and mail order brides, or prostitution, trafficking and illegality (Wihtol

de Wenden 1998; Biemann 2002; Hoerder 2002: 517-519; Sassen 2003: 61; El-Cherkeh et al. 2004: 13; Yamanaka & Piper 2005; Dodson 2008: 152). As such, the feminisation of migration is linked to problems (Ryan 2002; Lepp 2002; Piper 2003; Dannecker 2005; Labadie-Jackson 2008).

Providing a historical overview of trends in international migration is difficult because many countries either lack a system of continuous registration of international migration or, if they have such a system, they do not process and publish the data. Only a handful of countries gather data on the inflow of foreigners (Zlotnik 1998; Jennissen 2004; Oso Casas & Garson 2005). Claims about the feminisation of migration are based on ambiguous data, weak statistical evidence or no statistics at all (Kempadoo & Doezema 1998; Lepp 2002). A lack of data does not prevent some authors from claiming that the feminisation of (labour) migration has become a well-established fact (Piper 2003: 726). Data that are presented are frequently highly selective. Authors write about feminisation of migration in Australia, for instance, but produce data on the percentage of women among the Asian-born Chinese only (and even those do not pass the 60% mark) (Ryan 2002: 96). Authors suggest increases when there are none (Alcalá 2006: 22). Graphs are presented with *y*-axes that start at 45% and terminate at 55% to emphasise increases (Orbeta & Abrigo 2009: 7 and 11; Donato et al. 2011). Data refer to labour migration only, or to the migration from specific countries, such as the Philippines. In fact, the Philippine government encourages the migration of women, and the percentage of migrant women is exceptionally high compared to other countries. Even in the Philippines, however, it did not exceed 60% in the period between 1993 and 2007 (Orbeta & Abrigo 2009: 7 and 11).

The percentages of women and men in migration *did* change during the last century. Fast economic growth in North-Western European countries between 1945 and 1975 led to guest-worker migration. Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Luxemburg, Sweden and the Netherlands actively recruited guest workers, while Southern European countries supplied labour. About 70% of the recruited guest workers were men. Eastern European countries recruited guest workers from Cuba, Mozambique and Vietnam. About 85% of these were men. Similarly, the US Bracero Program mainly recruited men (Rosas 2011). Earlier, around 1900, Chinese and Asian migrants to the USA and Canada were forbidden to bring wives. As a result, some ethnic groups developed into 'bachelor societies', including, for example, Chinese communities in California and Western Canada. These masculinisations of migration were not labelled as such at the time, or later.

The literature on the feminisation of migration presents the migration of women as new (Schrover 2013). Such novelty both calls for and justifies specific measures or policies aimed at migrant women. Yet, it is not so much the migration of women that has increased. Rather, there has been an increased focus on migrant women. In migration policies this heightened focus is used to justify restrictions and controls. In this volume, we show how juggling numbers and percentages is a favoured strategy in the problematisation of migration.

Migration patterns, networks and ties

The differences in men's and women's migration patterns have often been explained using the concept of perceived profitability; that is, people move if a cost-benefit analysis points to gains (Stark 1991). This idea is used in the neo-classical, or push-pull, model and the family strategy model (Sjaastad 1962; Stark 1991). These models acknowledge that calculations and consequences of a decision can be different for men and women (Brettell 1986). The assumption is that, as a rule, men can earn more than women, and it is therefore advantageous to let men migrate. When women migrate in equal numbers to men, or in greater numbers, this is explained as a family strategy. It is also interpreted from a remittance perspective. Women may earn less than men but they might send more money home, meaning that it could be more profitable for families left behind if they migrate instead of men (Grasmuck & Pessar 1991; De Jong, Richter & Isarabhakdi 1995; Davis & Winters 2001; Curran 2012). The problem with these models is that it is difficult to assess profitability, because men and women do not have the same (access to) resources, the labour market, power, agency, interests, knowledge and networks. Those factors affect any cost-benefit analysis migrants might make. A decision to migrate is, furthermore, not necessarily a product of collectively made, rational, economic calculations. In some cases it is an individual decision made *outside* of and *against* the wishes of the household or family. Fostered within communities of young men, it is borne out of a lust for adventure, which is associated with locally entrenched masculine ideals (Nobil Ahmad 2008, 2011). Some migrations result in the creation of a culture of migration, in which (temporary) migration is seen as a standard stage of adult life. In Morocco, for instance, there are villages where migration is so common among men that those who do not migrate are ridiculed and equated with children, women or the elderly (De Haas & Van Rooij 2010: 45).

There is consensus among scholars of migration that women migrate through older, more mature networks than men do (Boyd 1989; Tacoli

1995). Migrant men and women have access to different networks, value those resources differently, have different exchange opportunities and develop different exchange relations (Moch & Fuchs 1993). Networks of immigrant men and women are not the same. Furthermore, non-kin networks of immigrant men and women seldom overlap (Ross 1983). Networks of women tend to be less formalised and less visible than those of men. Women are more inclined to form networks than men, because networks reduce their feelings of vulnerability (Accampo 1993). Immigrant men and women use their networks for different purposes. Women make frequent use of weak ties (Moch 2003b). Men move through the family network to find work, while women move through job networks to find a family (Bertaux-Wiame 1979). Women move and live in familial contexts more often than men (Schrover 2003), and they developed more kin-based networks. Men develop more non-kin networks. While this all may be true, the networks of men and women are not that different. Benhabib and Resnik (2009) point out that women's networks consist of dependent children, dependent elderly and the men they are involved with. They fail to point out that this is also largely true for migrant men, whose primary networks are equally formed by children, parents and partners.

Men tend to join or establish organisations that are oriented towards the country of origin, whereas women favour organisations that are aimed at the country of settlement (Jones-Correa 1998). Immigrant men experience status loss due to downward social mobility, which they compensate for by joining organisations where their (former) status is recognised and bolstered. Those immigrant women who did not work prior to their migration, but enter the workforce in the new country, experience a gain in status (ibid.).

The process of cumulative causation has been used to explain the migration of women via older networks (Massey 1990). Cumulative causation is the process whereby the propensity to migrate grows with each additional migrant. Networks and accumulated migrant experience demonstrate benefits, diminish familial resistance and increase security by providing information about and access to labour market opportunities. Networks make migration less risky for individuals by circulating information among potential migrants. As a result, the nature of migration changes over time. The initial high risk, resulting from a lack of information, declines when more family and friends migrate. Denser networks of migrants provide potential migrants with more and increasingly reliable information (DaVanzo 1978; Portes & Bach 1985). Tight knit networks, arising from physical and social proximity, make it easier to enforce trust and support (Portes & Sensen-

brenner 1993). This facilitates the choice to migrate, making migration progressively more likely (Massey 1990). Thus, networks are thought to play a crucial role in reducing perceived vulnerability (Granovetter 1973; Grasmuck & Pessar 1991; Moch & Fuch 1993; Curran & Saguy 2001).

This network theory is related to theories on forms of embeddedness or modes of incorporation (Stewart 2005). Migrants may compensate for their lack of embeddedness or status in one sector – for instance, in the labour market – by increasing their embeddedness in another sector, for instance, by maintaining wide networks (Mahler & Pessar 2001; Pessar & Mahler 2003). Differences in how migrant men and women maintain ties with their countries of origin are explained by the fact that doing *kinwork,* or caring for the maintenance of family relations, is commonly characterised as women's work – though not only among migrants. Furthermore, differences in ties relate to status loss. In countries with larger numbers of emigrant women, there are discussions about the children who are left behind and about so-called transnational mothering (Yeates 2004; Mongaya Hoegsholm 2007; Pajnik & Bajt 2012). Rather surprisingly, this debate is not matched by similar debates about men who leave their children behind, or use of the concept of transnational fathering (Kraler et al. 2011).

The literature on migration patterns, networks and ties focuses on the choices and deliberations of migrants, and less on how states (both countries of origin and those of destination) create frameworks in which choices are made. The literature follows political categorisations and hardly discusses issues of choice or deliberation, strategies, networks and ties in the context of refugee migration. According to Boyd & Nowak, Schacher, and Walaardt in this volume, these frameworks are important, as migrants use strategies, networks and ties in different ways.

The private sphere, prostitution and risk

Research on gender and migration places strong emphasis on family and household, suggesting that gender is enclosed in the private sphere. The literature on gender and migration reflects political ideas about the household as private and the labour market as a political domain (Palmary et al. 2012). Migration of women is mostly described from a family perspective (for a recent overview of the literature on family, gender and migration see Kraler et al. 2011), while men's migration is described from a labour perspective (Phizacklea 2003). If the migration of women is discussed in the context of work, it usually relates to domestic work and care (Henshall Momsen 1999; Ehrenreich & Hochschild 2002;

George 2005; Moya 2007 gives good overview of the literature). In the past, domestic work was important to migrant women, and it remains so today. The labour market is strongly segregated by gender and ethnicity (Schrover, Van der Leun & Quispel 2007). Migrant women and men both tend to cluster in a restricted number of sectors, but migrant women cluster in fewer sectors than men. The literature on domestic servants is characterised by discussions about restricted rights, poor labour conditions, abuse and exploitation (Constable 1997; Anderson 2000). Much less attention is given to the opportunities that this work offers to migrant women. The huge concentration of research has given domestic service a greater importance than it has in reality and diverts attention away from migrant women's work in other sectors.

There is an emphasis in the literature on women as trafficking victims (Phizacklea 1998; Soderlund 2005; Gould 2010). This literature shows great continuity since the 1850s, with its focal points on youth, innocence, whiteness, corruption and foreignness (Doezema 2005; Moloney 2012). Trafficking is used as a synonym for prostitution, which, in turn, is equated with abuse. The migration of women is described in terms of hardship and suffering, often dramatised with heart-breaking personal stories (Agustín 2003, 2005; Brennan 2004; Haynes 2004; Soderlund 2005; Outshoorn 2005; Doezema 2005). Recently, scholars have taken a critical stance towards this profusion of scholarship about trafficking, which is part of what Agustín (2007) calls 'a rescue industry'. Authors have pointed out that claims about the number of trafficked women, are based on poor and inadequate research, that all migration of women is regarded as trafficking, and that tragic stories are used to mobilise support for control and restrictions on the mobility of women (Fehér 2000; Kapur 2005; Brennan 2008; Wooditch, DuPont-Morales & Hummer 2009; Deane 2010; Weitzer 2010; Oude Breuil et al. 2011; Brysk 2011; Blanchette & Da Silva 2012). Previous scholars have emphasised that sex-trafficking discourse, involving innocent victims, violated borders and criminality, is part of problematising migration and is used to justify restrictive migration policies (Berman 2003), but that has not led to changes in the literature.

In part, the emphasis on victimhood of migrant women can be explained by a policy-driven, sameness-difference dilemma. Basically this conundrum involves the recognition that migrant women may be disadvantaged in comparison to migrant men (e.g., in laws or their application), but attempts to address inequalities – by politicians, lawyers and pressure groups – tend to backfire (Oxford 2005; Calavita 2006; see also Schrover, Cederberg, and Andreassen in this volume). It is difficult to escape from a sexualised-victimised image once

it has been established (MacLeod & Saraga 1988; Connell 1997; Utas 2005). The (often unintended) result is that differences between men and women are accentuated, and the victimhood of women is emphasised. Sexualisation and victimisation have been used to legitimise government policies or the strategies of organisations (including migrant organisations and churches) (Connell 1990). Schrover, Cederberg, and Andreassen address this point in this volume.

Within this victimhood discourse, women are presented as vulnerable. Vulnerability is the subject of an entire field of study, which developed several decades ago, initially to explain how and why people move in and out of poverty (Beck 1992; Moser 1998; Alwang, Siegel & Jørgensen 2001; Bustamante 2002; Hogan & Marandola 2005). Later, ideas from the field of vulnerability studies were applied to migration research (Waddington & Sabates-Wheeler 2003). Vulnerability is – of course – a staple element in the construction of (Western) femininity, as is the construction of women as mothers and wives, while men are not constructed primarily as vulnerable, or as fathers and husbands. Raissiguier and Van Walsum, Legêne & Jones address this point in this volume.

In the victimhood discourse, women are portrayed as victims and men as perpetrators (Beck 1992; Moser 1998; Alwang, Siegel & Jørgensen 2001; Hogan & Marandola 2005; Stewart 2005). Since the 1980s, several authors have criticised this perspective because it works to disempower women and denies them agency (MacLeod & Saraga 1988; Connell 1997; Utas 2005). Recent authors have moved beyond the critique and point to the functionality of the continued use of that discourse. Some people base their identities on victimhood or injury (Brown 1995; Doezema 2001). That, in turn, results in a politics that seeks protection from the state, rather than power and freedom, and ultimately in a politics that reaffirms structures of domination. Other people profit from ascribing a victimhood identity. For instance, in the 1970s white middle-class Western women justified their own claims to equality by constructing 'third-world women' as helpless subjects of 'barbaric traditionalism'. The 'other' was seen as equal in Christian rhetoric, but not in reality (Doezema 2001). Schrover, Cederberg, and Andreassen in this volume describe how this has affected policies. If we look at who profits from a certain discourse and in what ways – as we do in this volume – we can understand how, why and by whom differences between migrant men and women were created, maintained and entrenched in laws and regulations. This volume discusses why policymakers, as well as certain migrants and immigrant organisations, had an interest in making differences. Many Western feminists eagerly bought into the construction

of 'third-world women' as 'powerless', 'exploited' and 'sexually harassed' (Mohanty 1988). 'Third-world women' were, as a category, automatically and necessarily defined as religious, as well as oriented toward the family and the domestic sphere. Their victimisation played a role in the construction of a counter identity of 'Western' women, who were everything that 'third-world women' were not (Doezema 2001). Schrover, Boyd & Nowak, and Andreassen build on this idea in this volume.

Victimisation can be used as a successful strategy; it is possible to claim rights for women by presenting them as victims (see Schacher in this volume). The price of this success, however, is that migrant women come to be seen as vulnerable and in need of protection. The 'successful' use of the victimhood discourse explains a change in migration and integration policy that has taken place in the past decades (Roggeband & Verloo 2007). In the 1970s, integration policy stressed the rights of migrants as distinct from the rest of the people in the receiving society. In the 1990s, the diversity framework was replaced by a vulnerability framework, which focused on migrant women, as described by Schrover, Andreassen, and Cederberg in this volume.

Citizenship and residency

There is a large literature about gender, citizenship and residency (see, e.g., Soysal 1994; Ackers 1996; Bredbenner 1998; Kofman et al. 2000; Sinha 2006; Lister et al. 2007; Pawley 2008; Benhabib & Resnik 2009; Rygiel 2011). There are two systems for delegating citizenship: via birth to a citizen (*jus sanguinis*), as in the case of Germany, for example, or via birth on national soil (*jus soli*), as, for instance, in the USA. While these definitions seem straightforward, they are not. Current political and public discourse equates citizenship with integration, civil society and active societal participation. The conflation of immigrant integration with citizenship has caused a shift from the state's control over its national borders to control of the borders of society (Schinkel 2008). This conflation of controlling borders with controlling society results from the definition of citizenship at two levels: the juridical level and the discursive level (membership of the nation-state and membership of society). People with juridical citizenship can be denied discursive citizenship. At the juridical (or formal) level, citizens have rights that non-citizens do not share (e.g., voting rights) (Marshall 1950). At the juridical level, a sharp distinction is made between citizens and non-citizens. Discursive (or moral) citizenship relates to being (seen as) part of a community or society and being a virtuous citizen (Kennedy 2005). In recent decades, the sovereignty of nation-states has eroded because

of globalisation and the creation of larger political units such as the European Union. Yet, this has not reduced the discursive or moral importance attached to citizenship (Bader 1999). Discursive citizenship is a vague and flexible notion (Schinkel 2008). The distinction between internal and external borders can be sharp at the discursive level, but it is not static and it changes continuously over time.

In many countries, women automatically experienced a change in their nationality when they married men with a different nationality than their own (though this was not true for men) (Boris 2005; De Hart 2006). Many countries introduced so-called 'marriage rules' and 'derivative citizenship' in around 1900, consolidating earlier practices. Derivative citizenship is based on a gendered conception of belonging. Women marrying men outside of their community or nationality are often described in sexually disapproving terms, even if they are in a stable monogamous relationship. That judgement implies that by crossing one boundary – that of ethnicity – they also cross a boundary of moral acceptability (Stoler 1992, 1995; Breger & Hill 1998).

When countries changed rules regarding derivative citizenship (Studer 2001; De Hart 2006; Volpp 2006) discussions moved to dependent residency (Sterett 1997; Côté, Kérisit & Côté 2001). In the former, women derived citizenship from their husbands, while in the latter women derived the right to remain in a country through their husbands (although in theory husbands could also derive the right to remain through their wives). Discussions on dependent residency arose when possibilities for labour migration were reduced (Schrover et al. 2008; Schrover & Yeo 2010). Debates about derived citizenship were interwoven with those about multiculturalism as Cederberg, Andreassen, and Schrover show in this volume.

Veiling

In recent years there has been an increase in the number of publications on headscarves and veils (with many publications coming out of the large VEIL project on values, equality and differences in liberal democracies (Molokotos Liederman 2000; McGoldrick 2006; Brems 2006; Winter 2008; Berghahn & Rostock 2009; Lettinga 2011; Rosenberger & Sauer 2012). The shift in the academic literature parallels changes in public and political debates about headscarves and veils, as reflected in the so-called 'burqa bans' introduced by countries in which very few women actually wear face-covering veils (Herrera & Moors 2003; Joppke 2007; Schrover in this volume). Current political arguments against veiling are remarkably similar to those used by British and French colo-

nial authorities in their attempts to legitimise their colonial rule (Fanon 1965; Abu-Lughod 2002). Modernising, liberating and emancipating Islamic women, by forcing them to unveil, or allowing them to do so, was a key aspect of the colonisers' claim of moral superiority. In a similar fashion, the US 'war against terror' in Afghanistan was justified by emphasising the right of women to discard their burqas (Stabile & Kumar 2005; Van Walsum & Spijkerboer 2007; Bush 2010). The British and French unveiling campaigns were comparable to the 1927 Soviet *Hujum*, a campaign in Soviet Central Asia in which mass unveiling was meant to lead to the social and intellectual liberation of women (Kamp 2008). That campaign aimed to enforce and legitimise Soviet rule over Uzbekistan.

Rather surprisingly, current debates in Turkey run counter to debates in Western Europe. The Turkish government first outlawed the wearing of headscarves for women working in the public sector (as teachers, lawyers and politicians) in 1924, when Atatürk introduced the secular Turkish state (Gökariksel & Mitchell 2005). From the 1980s onwards, this ban increasingly led to debates. In Turkey some women harbour hopes that future membership in the EU might give Turkish women the right to wear headscarves if they wish. This intersects with the paradoxical situation in which Western feminists occasionally find themselves. While they generally favour women's choices, they find it very hard to view the wearing of headscarves or other veiling as a choice, despite what is said by the women who make this choice. They find themselves being accused of colonialist paternalism. Furthermore Western feminists find themselves allied with Western populist, right-wing politicians, who in the Western context, do not generally support women's rights (Winter 2006).

The move towards placing headscarves and veils at the centre of political debates is part of a shift towards minority integration policies. Yet, such policies have been labelled a failure in several European countries, which have moved on to issues of religion rather than class position, discrimination or socio-economic factors. This renders integration a personal choice and removes responsibly from authorities (Roggeband & Verloo 2007; see also Cederberg, Andreassen, and Schrover in this volume).

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

Overall the large literature on gender and migration reflects certain biases with great consistency. Countering some of those unbalances is long overdue. In this volume, we move away from attempts to take

stock of differences between migrant men and migrant women, and from describing migrants or focusing on the private sphere. We look instead at political and public debates about categorisation, differentiation, and how and why boundaries have been drawn and redrawn. As pointed out earlier, our exploration focuses on three primary fields in which this boundary drawing has led to extensive debates: who is a 'refugee' (Schacher, Walaardt, Boyd & Nowak, and Oxford), who is 'family' (Raissiguier, Van Walsum, Legêne & Jones, and also partly in Oxford), and who has the right to be different according to multicultural policy (Cederberg, Andreassen, and Schrover). The sections that follow present a state of the art on these points.

State of the art and contributions to the literature: Defining the true refugee

The 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees built on earlier, ad hoc policies, including those related to Jewish refugees in the 1930s and Armenian refugees in 1917. Policies regarding Armenians, described by Schacher in this volume, should be viewed in the context of more general developments. Since the 1880s, mobility from Europe has been affected by US restrictions on migration. US authorities wanted to prevent paupers and criminals from arriving by introducing controls and barriers at the borders, as well as in the countries of departure (Zolberg 2006). These developments are important for understanding how people fleeing the Armenian genocide from 1917 onwards, were received in the USA and elsewhere, as Schacher describes. Thirty years prior to the 1951 Refugee Convention, policies were not that different, nor were the responses to refugee migration, as Schacher illustrates. Some Armenian refugees were women travelling alone. As in the case of other migrant women travelling alone, this immediately raised suspicions regarding their involvement in prostitution and other immoral behaviour. Christian relief organisations in Turkey and the USA were well aware of this potential stigma and tried to steer clear of cases that might disadvantage the whole group of refugees.

Schacher contributes to the literature by emphasising four arguments, each of which recurred in later periods (as described by Walaardt, Boyd & Nowak, and Oxford in this volume). First, there was a strong fear among decision makers about setting precedents. People were allowed to enter if their case could be presented as an exceptional one. Armenian refugees were characterised as special, and different from the many other people adrift in the same period. Secondly, long

before the 1951 definition of a refugee came to be accepted, there was a clear idea about who was an 'honest refugee'. Decision makers involved in the Armenian case were as suspicious as later decision makers. They feared they would be deceived by 'non-deserving refugees', who told fabricated stories, masterminded by their (US-based) advocates. Those fears were very similar to suspicions in later periods. Thirdly, policies phrased in gender-neutral terms, such as a literacy test, had divergent consequences for men and women. Women fleeing the Armenian genocide were, to a large extent, illiterate and were disadvantaged by the test. A vague reference in the rulings to religious persecution as the grounds for exemption dampened the gender-specific effects in practice. It further created differences between men and women in how policies were applied: religion surfaced more frequently in women's cases. Here, there are also clear similarities to later decades: bending the rules in cases involving women proved easier than changing the rules (Schrover 2009b). In the fourth place, civil servants and others were afraid of publicity. Deporting women – especially in the company of their children – led to negative publicity, even in this period when communication was slow. Negative publicity could be expected if Christian women were deported to a Muslim country, where, according to newspaper reports, Christians were being systematically discriminated against, killed and deported. Women were at risk of being kidnapped and raped, as well as being forced to marry a Muslim and convert to Islam. Anti-Islam rhetoric, deployed in later decades, was already in full force by 1917, and the stereotypes were the same as those used in pervasive 1990s flight and recue stories (De Hart 2001).

After the Second World War, feelings of guilt and a sense of failure towards Jewish refugees, combined with the geopolitical tensions of the Cold War, led to creation of an international refugee policy. This point has been addressed extensively in the large literature on refugees and asylum seekers (see, amongst others, Grahl-Madsen 1966, 1982-1983a, 1982-1983b, 1983; Holborn 1975; Takkenberg & Tahbaz 1989; Salomon 1991; Loescher 1993; Carruthers 2005). At the time there were still many displaced persons living in camps in Europe. At the Yalta Conference of 1945 it was agreed that displaced persons were to be repatriated to their countries of origin, but Western states refused to repatriate some of those who came from Eastern Europe during or after the war. The continued arrival of Eastern Europeans in the West served as a refutation of communist governments and their policies.

The 1951 Refugee Convention defined a refugee as follows:

> any person who, owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for
> reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular so-
> cial group, or political opinion, exists outside the country of his na-
> tionality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to
> that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the
> country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is
> unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it (art. 1a).

The Convention's drafters conceived of flight motives as political,
public and collective, rather than as personal and private.

From the 1950s to the 1970s, providing asylum to the victims of
one's enemies demonstrated the antagonists' immoral value system,
as Zolberg (2006: 18) emphasised. Over the past 50 years, the number
of antagonists, and evils, has increased, changed and blurred. Politi-
cally, the benefits of a lenient refugee policy have become less obvious.
That has reduced the willingness to deal with the refugee problem at
an international level and resulted in a restrictive discourse. While asy-
lum cases are no longer used to prove that capitalism trumps commu-
nism, they now highlight the failure of the newly decolonised, Islamic
or third-world countries to protect their citizens. They are used to con-
trast a superior (enlightened) West against a failing Rest.

Walaardt, in this volume, adds to the literature by describing the
arrival in the 1970s in the Netherlands of what he calls the 'New Ref-
ugees'. They sought asylum after Cold War rhetoric started to wane.
They came from NATO countries (Portugal and the USA) and were flee-
ing right-wing, rather than left-wing regimes. The arrival of the New
Refugees might have resulted in changes in policy, as they came from
different countries than the earlier post-war refugees, and they had dif-
ferent claims and different lobby groups. Remarkably, however, policies
hardly changed. Cold War refugees had been treated with suspicion
and authorities feared setting precedents and the arrival of numerous
others (as had earlier been the case for Armenian refugees). New Ref-
ugees encountered the same fears and restrictions. Men fleeing com-
munism and those fleeing from military service in the colonial wars
were similarly portrayed. Both groups were cast as masculine actors
who had courageously opposed – in the eyes of many Dutch – detest-
able regimes. Both were cast in the image of protest heroes. Such heroic
images of male refugees dominated the asylum discourse. Only decades
later, with the migration of new groups of New Refugees, would public
attention shift away from men and the hero-refugee and toward women
and the victim-refugee.

Differences between men and women refugees or asylum seekers have been addressed in the literature. Under certain conditions, women are much less likely than men to be granted refugee status (cf. Spijkerboer 2000; Calavita 2006). Currently, discussions do not centre on whether the grounds *are* the same, but on whether they *should* be, and whether gender-related violence should be grounds for asylum. Gender or gender-related harm was absent from the 1951 definition as a category of persecution. Gender-related violence is understood in current discussions as something that affects women alone. If reference is made to men, it is to homosexuals (Oxford 2005). It is much more common for women than for men to be the victims of sexual violence. Those who have been victims of what is called accidental or arbitrary rape (which is seen as an unfortunate, but common, part of regular warfare) are not regarded as persecuted. Women who were raped in order to retrieve information about their families (such as the whereabouts of husbands or sons) were not granted asylum in the past. In recent years, there has been a change in asylum policies and laws. In the USA, immigrant women can gain asylum by proving they have been persecuted on account of female circumcision, honour killings, domestic violence, coercive family planning, forced marriages or repressive social norms. This is also true for some European countries, such as Germany. Asylum seekers in the USA stand a better chance of having their request approved if they mention female circumcisions at the hearings rather than explaining their role in a resistance movement. Stories about resistance are almost never acknowledged as grounds for women's asylum (while they are for men), whereas the mentioning of female circumcision is (Oxford 2005).

The drafters of the 1951 Convention did not conceptualise rape, female circumcision, domestic violence, enforced family policies, or compulsory veiling in their definition of rights. In fact, they did not conceive of women applying for refugee status based on gender issues at all. In recent decades, however, women have been granted refugee status for each of those reasons (Spijkerboer 2000; Oxford 2005; Calavita 2006). The Convention tried to target states that failed to protect, or denied protection to, a minority of their citizens. Today, refugees or asylum seekers arrive from states – including Liberia, Angola, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Somalia and Sierra Leone – where the government does not have the power to protect citizens. They come from African countries where states do not prevent their populations from leaving, as was earlier the case with Eastern European countries. Or they come from countries such as Afghanistan, where the state

never extended civil rights to half of its citizens, simply because they are women.

Women took centre stage in human rights debates and in asylum cases for a few years. This volume adds to the literature by looking specifically at these debates. However, as Boyd & Nowak discuss in this volume, this focus on women was not long-lived, nor did it apply to all refugee groups in equal proportions. Boyd & Nowak describe the Canadian media's attitudes toward Mexican refugees. Canadians find it difficult to comprehend that a democratic country such as Mexico, with which Canada maintains economic and political ties, would produce refugees. Similarly, European states did not define Portuguese and US citizens as refugees, as Walaardt discusses. Women from Islamic countries more fully embody the victim-refugee image than do Mexican Catholic women subject to domestic violence. Mexico is not defined as a failed state. Yet, a state may provide protection to some of its citizens, but not to all of them. It is precisely this type of failure that shaped the 1951 Refugee Convention. In Canada there is little awareness that the situation for migrant men and women from Mexico might differ, as Boyd & Nowak describe. The current media refugee script focuses on refugee management and reduction, rather than on refugee protection and welcome. The economic costs of accepting what is portrayed as increasing numbers of Mexican refugees or asylum seekers have taken centre stage in public discussions, pushing aside any discussions of political benefits. With potential benefits, the Canadian image of the 'true' refugee also shifted.

Oxford, in this volume, adds to the literature by focusing on homosexual and transgender refugees. Homosexuals have claimed refugee status in the USA, based on their membership in a persecuted social group, using arguments similar to those used by battered women seeking refuge. Fourteen countries have granted homosexuals political asylum as members of 'a particular social group', a key phrase from the 1951 Convention (Austria, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, the UK and the USA). The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has decreed that its policy is to consider those homosexuals who are persecuted for their sexual orientation as refugees. For at least a decade, gay advocacy groups have made immigration one of the fronts on which they fight for their agenda. They adopted the rhetoric of the civil rights movement (compare McKeown 2008, who shows how the anti-slavery discourse – as an early form of human rights discourse – played a major role in shaping exclusionary US labour migration policies in the 19th century). As observed earlier, people travel between countries,

and migrants move between categories, but concepts and discourses travel as well (Forsdick 2001). Strategies that proved to be successful in one context, were copied, adapted and applied in other contexts. We see similarities between social movements. Refugee war resisters of the 1970s were important to the anti-Vietnam or anti-'colonial' war movement. Abused migrant women were important to the women's liberation movement in the 1980s (Schrover 2009). Gay asylum seekers were important to the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered) movement of the 1990s, as Oxford shows in this volume. Over time campaigns became increasingly personalised: personal stories and gruelling details were drawn on to strengthen a case. Advocacy groups instructed asylum claimants so that they could make a successful appeal, as they had done with Armenians in 1917.

In 2009, some officials in the UK argued that homosexual asylum seekers might be able to live safely in their country of origin as long as they were 'discreet' about their sexual identities. That perspective shared similarities with the highly controversial US military 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy. The argument was clearly inspired by fears of large numbers of homosexuals seeking refuge in Western countries. If they were discreet, officials argued, there would be no well-founded fear of persecution. In a 2009 court case this became known as the 'Anne Frank' principle. Requiring discretion from homosexuals would be the same as claiming that Anne Frank would have been safe as long as she remained in her annex (Gower 2010). According to Walaardt, in this volume, references to the Second World War and the Holocaust are strong arguments in refugee claims. In July 2010, a court overturned the argument that homosexuals would be safe if they remained discreet. Asylum was granted to homosexuals under the Refugee Convention in order to prevent an individual from suffering persecution. Persecution was understood to mean treatment resulting in death, torture or imprisonment, sponsored or condoned by the state. Simple discriminatory treatment on the grounds of sexual orientation, or the risk of family or societal disapproval, did not amount to persecution, a court ruled.

As Oxford highlights in this volume, differences at both ends of the scale are clear, but most cases fall into a grey, middle ground. Migrants must convince immigration officials that they either face persecution or fear persecution based on their sexual or gender identity. Immigrants are required to prove that they are part of the social group of homosexuals. It is not necessary that applicants were open about their sexuality or experienced persecution in their countries of origin, but it is essential that applicants clearly describe their homosexual identity,

and particularly their well-founded fear of persecution because of that identity. Homosexuality is constructed very differently in various countries. Asylum seekers may have had (occasional) same-sex partners, but need not necessarily identify as homosexuals, or be identified by others as such. However, acknowledging one's sexual identity is a necessary component of gaining asylum.

Schacher, Walaardt, Boyd & Nowak, and Oxford, in this volume, offer a new perspective on this topic through their analysis of advocates' organising and executing campaigns on behalf of refugees and asylum seekers, and the consequences of those campaigns. Overall, asylum regimes place a strong emphasis on exceptionalism. As detailed above, all countries fear establishing precedents. As a result, refugee claims are more successful when presented as exceptions, and when campaigns are highly personalised. Furthermore, there has been a strong tendency towards victimisation narratives. Victimisation has been a successful strategy for claiming rights. The price of this success, however, is that migrants came to be seen as vulnerable and in need of protection by the state. Their victimisation played a role in the construction of a counter identity of the 'Western' advocates, who formed the support groups. It explains and shapes the link with the rights movements (women's rights, gay rights). This othering worked as a disadvantage in the long term.

State of the art and contributions to the literature: Defining family

When options for labour migration diminished in Western countries, beginning in the 1970s, family migration became more important. The shift to more restrictive labour migration regimes eventually cumulated in debates about what constitutes a family and who are family members. Family migration is usually discussed in relation to labour migration. This is surprising since it is also relevant for other categories of migrants, such as refugees and asylum seekers. Family discourse was rooted in human rights discourse, like in the case of refugees. The debates were furthermore influenced by decolonisation and adoptive practices under colonialism. In the first half of the 20th century, in many Asian colonies domestic and international adoptions were a widespread but mostly informal practice. The motives of the mothers of Asian adoptees were not always altruistic. In the 1930s and again the 1950s there were intense debates (mostly within the context of the League of Nations or United Nations) about the extent to which adopting mothers exploited their adopted children, selling them into slavery

and prostitution. Colonial authorities fought these practices, legitimising their authority on the basis of these efforts (Pedersen 2001).

In the 1960s, babies from Korea were adopted in the USA, and shortly after, also in Europe. The discourse on these adoptions intertwined familial love, child rescuing, anti-communism and US paternalist responsibility. Adoptions became part of the justification for US intervention in the region. Adopting Korean babies became the US domestic equivalent of fighting communism in Asia. Korea profited financially from what became a well-organised adoption industry. Between 1953 and 2004, 156,000 to 200,000 international adoptions took place in Korea. Some 100,000 children went to the USA and about 5,000 to Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Europeans adopted almost 50,000 Korean children (Kim & Carroll 1975; Sarri, Baik & Bombyk 1998; Oh 2005; Kim 2009; Hübinette & Arvanitakis 2012). This migration was unprecedented in nature and scale. Soon other Asian countries started to 'export' children. Currently China is the largest supplier of children for adoption. Between 1991 and 2007, American parents adopted almost 60,000 Chinese children, 95% of them girls (Cheng 2007). In the literature on these adoptions, there are no references the Chinese adoption cases of the 1930s.

The current adoption practices are widely accepted. This contrasts starkly with the distrust that migrant families encounter in Europe when they try to bring adopted children or foster children to their new country of residence. Both literatures – that on adoption and that on family migration (for more references, see Kraler et al. 2011; see also Van Walsum, Jones & Legêne in this volume) – are large, but they are seldom combined. Migrant families are regarded with suspicion, and have to prove that children are biologically theirs. The issue is complicated by the fact that more than 20, mostly Muslim countries in Asia and Africa (including Algeria, Egypt, Mauritania, Morocco, Afghanistan, Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen) do not recognise the institution of adoption (Indonesia, Tunisia and Turkey do recognise it) (United Nations 2009). Migrants from countries in which adoption has not been formalised cannot bring as family members those children who have been placed in their care.

Within the framework of migration, the family is usually defined as a nuclear family. In the early days of European guest-worker migration, there was some debate about the right of men to bring more than one wife, although very few migrant men were actually involved in polygamous marriages (Bonjour 2010). Members of the extended family (grandparents for instance) were denied the right to migrate within

the framework of family reunification, thereby depriving many families of existing care arrangements (Grillo 2008). Migrant families also found that leaving their biological children behind in the care of others for long periods of time led to debates about so-called 'broken bonds'. In some cases the idea that ties had ceased to exist after years of being apart resulted in the loss of the rights for children to join their families (Benhabib & Resnik 2009: 235; Schrover 2009b).

In the 1980s and 1990s, several Strasbourg international court cases revolved around the right to family life (Schrover 2009b). Article 8 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (adopted by the Council of Europe in 1950) states that children have the right to grow up with their families. What was disputed in these court cases was the right of children to join their families; the parents, it was suggested, had the choice of leaving in order to reunite with their children.

Closely related to these debates were cases in which children were brought to the country of origin of one parent (mostly the father), against the wishes of the other parent (mostly the mother). Betty Mahmoody's book, on which the 1991 film 'Not Without My Daughter' was based, is emblematic of both the type of stories and the media coverage. Mahmoody's book, and several others like hers, presented Western women who had married non-Western men as victims, but also as survivors who stood up for themselves and their children against alien (mostly Islamic) cultures of oppression (De Hart 2001). The parenthood rights of women, especially if they were Western, trumped those of men, especially if non-Western.

Such situations, as discussed by the authors mentioned above, suggest that the West tried and succeeded in imposing on others its dominant ideas about family, via the regulation of family migration. This is only partly true. Van Walsum, Jones & Legêne in this volume show that ideas developed in a colonial setting travelled back to the former mother country. In the Dutch colony of Suriname, Dutch authorities allowed plurality in family formation and marriage. This arose in part from the period of slavery, when slaves were not allowed to marry, where a child born from an enslaved woman was legally classified as a slave (regardless of its paternity), and enslaved parents could not recognise a child as theirs. It was also in part the result of later migrations of indentured labourers from Asia, who were encouraged to hold to their own rules regarding marriage and family formation. The ruling white and Creole elite upheld the 'nuclear' family (husband-wife-children) model, with spouses who married in accordance with civil law. Groups that attained or aspired to middle-class status appropri-

ated this model. Other family systems were allowed to exist alongside
the nuclear model. Those included Hindu and Islam marriage models,
the dual marriage structure and the extended family. In some of these
family systems, the husband-wife-children model was absent. In the
Creole working-class matrifocal family, for example, mother-child and
sibling relationships formed the durable and dependable network. They
could function as the locus for *matiwerk* relationships: socio-economic
support networks between women, in which 'same-sex' relations could
occur. Before Suriname's 1975 independence, 'parallel' family systems
had been enacted in law, for example, in the case of marriage in accord-
ance with Hinduism or Islam. Laws recognised the authority of women
over their biological children (which is of particular importance for
matrifocal families), along with the rights of foster children and con-
cubinage.

In debates leading to Suriname's independence, Dutch authorities
sought to foster a smooth transition to independence (unlike the tran-
sition of the Dutch East Indies to independent Indonesia, which was
far from smooth). This, along with the leniency that Dutch authorities
had demonstrated towards mixing and plurality in the colonial context,
led to the inclusion of a remarkable article in the final text of the treaty
between Suriname and the Netherlands. That treaty addressed the
admission of their respective citizens, effective on 25 November 1975.
Article 5 allowed for admission of the person with whom a citizen of
one of the State Parties, legally resident on the territory of the other, 'has
a long lasting and exclusive personal relationship'. This rule also applied
to same-sex relationships. It was the first statutory ruling in Dutch law
in which persons involved in non-marital relationships were granted
the same rights as married couples, and it allowed for the migration of
people involved in same-sex relations. According to Van Walsum, Jones
& Legêne, in contrast with the assumptions of earlier studies, defini-
tions of family can travel both ways in the migration process. This is
surprising, since in the colonial context marriages, especially when they
were regarded as mixed – were looked upon with suspicion, or met with
disapproval. Rather paradoxically, the disapproval continued, despite
the redefinition of family, as Van Walsum, Jones & Legêne show.

Earlier literature has emphasised that family migration is frequently
suspected as being a cover for labour migration, especially when the
migrating partner is a non-Western man (Grillo 2010). In the UK, offi-
cial policy discriminated mainly against Asian men between the late
1960s and 1985, when the European Court terminated it. Asian men
were suspected of seeking entrance to the UK through marriages of con-
venience. The Home Office assumed that men were coming for work

and were abusing the arranged marriage system (Lutz 1997b; Kofman 1999). Current discussions equate marriage migration with arranged and forced marriages. Governments have increasingly introduced age and income bars to restrict marital migration. Through income requirements, family migration is collapsed into economic migration, with an emphasis on fraud and misuse, moving it away from debates about (human) rights.

Migrating men are often suspected of having economic motives for marriage, rather than migrating for love. That is especially the case when they come from poor countries, are low skilled and marry non-migrant women. Thus, ethnicity, class and gender intersect. Denmark, the Netherlands and Germany screen prospective marriages with non-EU spouses in an attempt to discover fictitious marriages, using criteria that have been disputed in court (De Hart 2006; Kontos, Haferburg & Sacaliuc 2006). Authorities examine age differences between partners and their ability to communicate and try to establish how well partners know each other. Denmark, Germany, Austria, France, the Netherlands and the UK have introduced age restrictions (with minimum ages of 18 to 24), housing and income requirements, and tests to be taken before migration. Yet, migrants who are well educated, highly skilled and wealthy can circumvent the increasingly complicated restrictions on family migration.

Recently, the concept of 'love exiles' has appeared in debates. That term refers to people who migrate to a country where they can marry, often because they are prevented from marriage in their country of residence (Wieringa 2011). This typically applies to marriages between same-sex partners. Differences in laws between neighbouring countries lead to another type of love exiles as well. Migrants, who cannot marry in the Netherlands, move to Belgium, take up temporary residence, marry and after a while move back to the Netherlands. This is called the Belgium route. Similarly there is Irish route, which some UK migrants use, and a so-called Swedish model, which is used by migrants in Denmark. In recent discussions of this type of migration the emphasis has shifted from understanding family migration as a spin-off of labour migration, to portraying family migration in terms of exile, adopting the language of refugee migration.[1] The Love Exile Foundation in the USA writes, 'Love Exiles is giving attention to the hidden group of refugees because of lawlessness at home elsewhere "in exile" life'.[2] And:

> US immigration law effectively forces the couple to leave the country,
> to become 'love exiles' and seek refuge abroad. … We can choose to
> leave the US and seek refuge elsewhere. Sadly, many of us have done

this, taking our property and skills to benefit the countries where our families are recognized. We are the Love Exiles.[3]

By using refugee rhetoric, rather than terms associated with labour migration, the organisations and advocates seek to reinforce their plea.

Raissiguier, in this volume, adds to this literature by examining how family life became contested in France. She illustrates that the family was defined within racialised paradigms. French national culture, not race, was central to debates about French identity. For decades the dominant notion was that being French was something that could be learned. French peasants had learned to become French in the past, and immigrants could do so as well. This 'open' national identity did not mean that subcultures were respected, or accepted, as was the case within a multicultural model (Beriss 2000). Recent changes are striking because for decades France has prided itself on its 'French model' of socialising and assimilating via schools, the military, employment and workers' unions. However, as Raissiguier points out, the old French model had elements of exclusion, based on ethnicity and gender, within its relatively generous and liberal understanding of nation and nationality. These exclusionary elements were de-emphasised when 'the French model' was contrasted with the German one and found 'generous' in comparison.

Current discussions in France about who is allowed to enter and stay are influenced not only by ideas of belonging, but also by changing possibilities in exercising control (compare to Schrover 2008). Biomedical techniques have become important tools for regulating migration. Age determination and other technical procedures offer an aura of objectiveness, and simultaneously call into question the trustworthiness of migrants and the governments in their countries of origin, as well as ideas about, for example, adoption. In the case of contesting family ties, discussions are influenced by the new possibilities of genetic testing. The 2007 French immigration law introduced DNA testing, and thus reinscribes 'blood' and 'bloodlines', into discussions of national belonging. Genetic tests target African immigrants, who are required to prove that kin are related by blood. Immigrants in France are expected to prove that they are the biological parents of the children they seek to bring into the country. That policy denies the fact that 3% to 10% of children – migrant and non-migrant alike – are not the biological offspring of one or both of their parents (as a result of adoption, in vitro fertilisation or adultery). The law that established the DNA testing policy was combined with a discursive denationalisation of migrants and their children who were, according to some, only 'French by law',

according to Raissiguier. Because of these changes, a social unit that is essentially private – family – has become very public and a subject of state concern.

In France, 'family' has, for migrants, been re-labelled and narrowed down to an exclusively biological definition. That redefinition was made possible partly by DNA testing. Recently, in Norway technical possibility and distrust have led to DNA testing of spouses who are believed actually to be siblings (UDI 2012). Suspicion leads to testing, and testing to more suspicion.

The authors in this volume make a vital contribution to the literature by showing how, when and why 'family' has been redefined. The concept is not as static as policymakers would like it to be or as previous authors have believed it to be. Postcolonial trauma led to a surprising widening of the concept of family, as Van Walsum, Jones & Legêne describe, and new techniques for narrowing it, as Raissiguier points out, while in all cases distinctions are made according to class, gender, ethnicity, religion and skill level.

State of the art and contributions to the literature: Defining difference

Beginning in the 1960s, in numerous countries, including the UK, Sweden, Germany, Australia, the Netherlands, the USA and Canada, multiculturalism emerged as an ideology and a policy for managing the cultural diversity that had resulted from migration. There is a large literature on this (see, e.g., Runblom 1994; Volpp 1996; Moller Okin 1999; Shachar 2001-2002; McGoldrick 2005; McKerl 2007: 204-205; Joppke 2007). Originally, multiculturalism held that there could be equality, despite difference. Later, this was largely replaced by the idea that equality could occur only without difference (Coleman 1996; Kurien 2004). In all countries, debates about migrant women played a crucial role when policies shifted. In this volume, Cederberg, Andreassen, and Schrover address changes in policy and in debates, which were similar in the three countries described by the respective authors (Sweden, the Netherlands and Denmark). Those changes are explained in the current literature mostly from a country-specific perspective.

Multiculturalism was introduced as a policy to facilitate integration, but in practice it often had the reverse effect (Kurien 2004; Leiken 2005; Engelen 2006: 72). It granted groups the right to make claims for (financial) support from the state, based on a conception of groups as homogenous, and having unique and innate characteristics (Parkinson

1994; Phillips 2003: 517; Uitermark, Rossi & Van Houtum 2005: 624; Salaff & Chan 2007: 126; Bhabha 2009: 57). Multiculturalism was morally and politically acceptable because ethnic minorities were seen as actual groups with inherent characteristics (Verkuyten & Brug 2004). It demanded the construction of a *public* ethnic identity (as opposed to a private one), and group formation on the basis of perceived cultural similarity (Kurien 2004). The struggle for recognition spurred ethnic formation, organisation and mobilisation. Crucial to multiculturalism is that integration was seen as a group process, which implied subsidies for immigrant organisations.

In the 1970s, Sweden was generous, relative to other countries, in granting rights to foreign citizens. As Cederberg in this volume describes, Sweden's social democratic ideology, the country's corporatist structure and the strong position of trade unions explain this. Unions and social democratic governments were concerned about workers' rights and wage-dumping. Therefore, the Swedish government granted immigrants rights in the form of employment, social welfare and political participation. Immigrant organisations were considered important and were given state support. Consequently, immigrants pursued their cultural and political interests; they also acquired the attitudes and skills needed to do so. Multiculturalism in Sweden (as elsewhere) implied collective rights for migrants and collective identities. Gender roles and family relations, which were labelled traditional and unequal, were nonetheless seen as 'authentic' elements of these collective identities. Rather paradoxically, Swedes pride themselves on gender equality, and that attitude constitutes an important element of Swedish identity. In the early days of multiculturalism, differences were introduced, maintained and subsidised. They were problematised only decades later.

In the 1980s and 1990s, the Swedish labour market was liberalised and the welfare state dismantled. When unemployment rose – among immigrants and non-immigrants alike – retaining minority culture came to be seen as hampering migrants' incorporation into majority society, and the cause of problems such as unemployment. Demands on immigrants increased, in terms of language and adaptation to Swedish norms and values, as was true in other countries. The Swedish 'value dialogue' targeted patriarchal and oppressive gender relations in 'other' – mostly Muslim – communities. Oppression of women within Islam emerged as a major issue in Sweden, according to Cederberg (this volume). It also became important in other countries (Penninx, Münstermann & Entzinger 1998; Kofman 1999). This problematisation built on ideas about protectionism and Orientalism that

were formulated in the 19th century within a colonial context. That view portrayed the superior Christian societies as the rescuers and liberators of Muslim women from Muslim men (Said 1978; Stabile & Kumar 2005). These ideas were integrated into a perspective in which European women serve as the standard against which women from elsewhere were measured (Lutz 1997b). Muslim women are currently viewed, in a number of North-Western European countries, as the prototype of migrant women. They are perceived as exploited victims, handicapped by their cultures of origin. Islam and Western values are presented as incompatible (Korteweg & Yurdakul 2009). Issues such as the wearing of headscarves hold centre stage in current integration debates (Molokotos Liederman 2000; McGoldrick 2006; Brems 2006). The debates are characterised by gross overestimates of the number of women wearing headscarves. This discourse – to which some West-ern feminists and right-wing politicians contribute – uses well-worn stereotypes about non-Western women as religious, family-oriented, traditional and backward (Mohanty 1988).

After the headscarf debates dissipated (and after new laws had been introduced in several European countries), attention moved to the wearing of face-covering veils or niqabs. This practice was presented as the next step away from European values. The niqab was seen as a refusal to integrate, and a security risk, linked to radical Islam and ter-rorism (Herrera & Moors 2003). Andreassen, in this volume, describes the problematisation of veiling in Denmark. Crucial in this debate is that niqabs are frequently referred to as burqas. A burqa is the tradi-tional Afghani garment that covers face and body. In contrast, niqabs cover the face, except for the eyes. The use of the inaccurate term is not simply a result of ignorance. By using the term burqa, an associa-tion is made between the wearing of veils and the highly subjugated position of Afghani women and other problems plaguing that coun-try. In Denmark – and in Europe as a whole – very few women wear burqas, though some wear niqabs. Their numbers are grossly overesti-mated and do not warrant widespread political and public controversy, as Andreassen shows.

Danish lawmakers' efforts to ban certain head coverings arose from perceptions that Muslim women were oppressed, that Danish law could liberate them and that Muslim traditions threatened Danish values. The Danish debates present ethnic minority women as victims of a patriar-chal culture, while ethnically Danish women are presented as liberated within an emancipated culture. In Denmark the Conservative Party wanted to introduce a 'burqa ban', but suggested it without first deter-mining – as is customary – whether such a ban would violate the consti-

tution. The Conservative Party realised that the proposal was unlikely to pass, but sought to benefit politically from suggesting the legislation. In the end the Conservative Party did not propose the ban in parliament, but the right-wing populist Danish People's Party planned to. It is notable that this party, and others like it elsewhere, argue for such bans by claiming that they favour equality and women's rights. However, these parties have in the past not voted in favour of laws or proposals aimed at limiting the oppression of women or increasing gender equality. They advocate women's rights and feminism only when it can be used as an anti-Muslim tool. In the veiling debates, 'being Danish' became synonymous with practicing gender equality, despite the fact that gender discrimination in Denmark continues to exist. By arguing that others are not practicing gender equality because of veiling, anti-veiling policies become a tool for excluding Muslims, especially women, from participating equally in Danish society.

Schrover, in this volume, describes developments similar to those in Denmark and Sweden. In the Netherlands multiculturalism in part builds on older Dutch ideas about 'living apart together'. This rendered multiculturalism acceptable to Dutch society, but also made it blind to differences between the older forms of separatism and those related to migrants. Within Dutch multicultural policy, immigrant organisations were subsidised, as was common in many countries. Subsidies were granted to a Turkish women's organisation in the Netherlands as well. When ideas about multiculturalism and policies regarding subsidies changed, and many of the subsidies were cut or disappeared, the Turkish women's organisation continued to be subsidised because the women were believed to be 'triple disadvantaged': as women, as migrants and as Muslims. Because the Turkish woman's organisation was one of the few organisations still subsidised, it became the object of a hostile takeover. In the case of the Turkish women's organisation, perceptions of a coherent and unified entity and the belief in an underlying essence, along with the search for 'authentic' cultural differences and public ethnic identities, denied differences within groups and increased competition between groups.

In the Netherlands, multiculturalism backfired. It created and emphasised differences and led to the problematisation of the position of migrants and ethnic minorities, who were believed to be unable to adapt because they were fundamentally different. This idea was fortified by several cases, which received widespread media attention. In the first place there were campaigns for Turkish women who had a dependent residence status and were to be deported to Turkey after their husbands left them. Turkey was presented as different and backward. Sec-

ondly, there were cases related to so-called 'honour killings'. From the mid-1970s onwards, crimes of passion among Turks were discussed in very different terms than those among non-Turks. Again, the emphasis was on fundamental differences, which very much fitted ideas about multiculturalism.

Cederberg, Andreassen, and Schrover describe aspects of those debates as country specific, but others are shared, despite differences between the three countries described. In all of the countries, the debate about multiculturalism eventually became a debate about Islam. Discussions about how migrants were different, or how different they should be allowed to be, progressed from subsidies for immigrant organisations (which enabled migrants to maintain 'their culture') to discussions about Swedishness, Dutchness and Danishness. Static ideas about migrants' culture led to static ideas about the dominant culture. In all of these countries, gender equality was seen as key to the dominant culture, and as lacking in the immigrants' own culture. In all three countries right-wing parties that had in the past opposed or ignored women's rights came out in support of gender equality when it concerned Muslim migrants.

Final remarks

A concluding chapter at the end of this volume summarises what this review and the various chapters that follow it contribute to theory. This volume moves away from taking stock of differences, towards examining the functionality of those differences. We analyse debates, rather than describe migrants. Furthermore, we move away from the private sphere, and its highly personalised and dramatised stories, towards the public sphere, where boundaries are redrawn. We show how the personalised and dramatised stories, which are part of the private sphere, are used in the public sphere. We also analyse how strategies, concepts and debates travel across time, between countries, and across and between categories. Finally, we move away from the over-studied sectors of domestic work and prostitution, and the stress on victimisation, feminisation and problematisation. Instead, we analyse why differences are emphasised. Much of the academic literature on gender and migration, as well as much of the other literature on migration, closely ties in with political or policy debates. It takes a strong moral stance, which we try to avoid. Many publications present the migration of women as new, as well as their alleged problems. By taking a long-term perspective, we demonstrate that many current debates are rooted in historical trends.

Notes

1   See www.loveexiles.org/home.htm (accessed 3 September 2012).
2   See http://madikazemi.blogspot.nl/2004/05/launch-of-love-exiles-group.html (accessed 3 September 2012).
3   See http://loveexiles.wordpress.com/tag/uafa/ (accessed 3 September 2012).

References

Abu-Lughod, L. (2002), 'Do Muslim women really need saving? Anthropological reflections on cultural relativism and its others', *American Anthropologist* 104 (3): 783-790.

Accampo, E. (1993), 'Gender relations in the city: A response', *French Historical Studies* 18 (1): 50-56.

Ackers, L. (1996), 'Citizenship, gender, and dependence in the European Union: Women and internal migration', *Social Politics* 3 (2 & 3): 316-330.

Agustín, L. (2007), *Sex at the margins: Migration, labour markets and the rescue industry*. London: Zed Books.

Agustín, L. (2005), 'Migrants in the mistress's house: Other voices in the "trafficking" debate', *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society* 12 (1): 96-117.

Agustín, L. (2003), 'A migrant world of services', *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society* 10 (3): 377-396.

Alcalá, M.J. (2006), *UNFPA state of the world population: A passage to hope. Women and international migration*. New York: United Nations Population Fund.

Alwang, J., P.B. Siegel & S.L. Jørgensen (2001), *Vulnerability: A view from different disciplines*. Washington: Social Protection Discussion Paper Series, Social Protection Unit, Human Development Network, World Bank, no. 0115.

Anderson, B. (2000), *Doing the dirty work? The global politics of domestic labour*. London: Zed Books.

Anthias, F. & N. Yuval-Davis (1992), *Racialized boundaries: Race, nation, gender, colour and class and the anti-racist struggle*. London: Routledge.

Anthias, F.C. & G. Lazaridis (eds) (2000), *Gender and migration in Southern Europe: Women on the move*. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Bader, V.M. (1999), 'Citizenship of the European Union: Human rights, rights of citizens of the Union and of member states', *Ratio Juris* 12 (2): 153-181.

Bal, M. (2002), *Travelling concepts in the humanities: A rough guide*. London: University of Toronto Press.

Beck, U. (1992), *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. London: Sage.

Benhabib, S. & J. Resnik (2009), *Migrations and mobilities: Citizenship, borders, and gender*. New York: New York University Press.

Berghahn, S. & P. Rostock (eds) (2009), *Der Stoff, aus dem die Konflikte sind. Debatten um das Kopftuch in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.

Beriss, D. (2000), 'Culture-as-race or culture-as-culture: Caribbean ethnicity and the ambiguity of cultural identity in French society', *French Politics, Culture and Society* 18 (3): 18-47.

Berman, J. (2003), '(Un)popular strangers and crises (un)bounded: Discourses of sex-trafficking, the European political community and the panicked state of the modern state', *European Journal of International Relations* 9 (1): 37-86.

Bertaux-Wiame, I. (1979), 'The life history approach to the study of internal migration', *Oral History* 7 (1): 26-32.

Bhabha, F. (2009), 'Between exclusion and assimilation: Experimentalizing multiculturalism', *McGill Law Journal* 54 (1): 5445-5490.

Biemann, U. (2002), 'Remotely sensed: A topography of the global sex trade', *Feminist Review* 70 (1): 75-88.

Blanchette, T.G. & A.P. da Silva (2012), 'On bullshit and the trafficking of women: Moral entrepreneurs and the invention of trafficking of persons in Brazil', *Dialectical Anthropology* 36 (1 & 2): 107-125.

Bonjour, S. (2010), *Gezin en grens: Beleidsvorming inzake gezinsmigratie in Nederland, 1955-2005.* Amsterdam: Aksant.

Boris, E. (2005), 'On the importance of naming: Gender, race and the writing of policy history', *The Journal of Policy History* 17 (1): 72-92.

Boris, E. (1995), 'The racialized gendered state: Constructions of citizenship in the United States', *Social Politics* 2 (2): 160-181.

Bourdieu, P. (1994), 'Rethinking the state: Genesis and structure of the bureaucratic field', *Sociological Theory* 12 (1): 1-18.

Bourdieu, P. (1980), 'L'identité et la representation', *Actes de la Recherché en Sciences Sociaux* 35: 63-72.

Boyd, M. (1989), 'Family and personal networks in international migration: Recent developments and new agendas', *International Migration Review* 23 (3): 638-670.

Boyd, R, & P.J. Richerson (1987), 'The evolution of ethnic markers', *Cultural Anthropology* 2 (1987): 65-79.

Bredbenner, C.L. (1998), *A nationality of her own: Women, marriage, and the law of citizenship.* Berkeley and London: University of California Press.

Breger, R. & R. Hill (1998), 'Preface', in R. Breger & R. Hill (eds), *Cross-cultural marriage: Identity and choice,* pp. 1-32. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Brems, E. (2006), 'Above children's heads: The headscarf controversy in European schools from the perspective of children's rights', *The International Journal of Children's Rights* 14 (2): 119-136.

Brennan, D. (2008), 'Competing claims of victimhood? Foreign and domestic victims of trafficking in the United States', *Sexuality Research & Social Policy* 5 (4): 45-61.

Brennan, D. (2004), 'Women work, men sponge, and everyone gossips', *Anthropological Quarterly* 77 (7): 705-733.

Brettell, C.B. (1986), *Men who migrate, women who wait: Population and history in a Portuguese parish.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Brown, W. (1995), *States of injury: Power and freedom in late modernity.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Browne, J. (2007), 'Introduction', in J. Browne (ed.), *The future of gender,* pp. 1-15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brubaker, R., M. Loveman & P. Stamatov (2004), 'Ethnicity as cognition', *Theory and Society* 33 (1): 31-64.

Brysk, A. (2011) 'Sex as slavery? Understanding private wrongs', *Human Rights Review* 12 (3): 259-270.

Burchell, G., C. Gordon & P. Miller (eds) (1991), *The Foucault elect: Studies in governmentality.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bush, G.W. (2010), *Decision points.* New York: Crown Publishing.

Bustamante, J.A. (2002), 'Immigrants' vulnerability as subjects of human rights', *International Migration Review* 36 (2): 333-354.

Calavita, K. (2006), 'Gender, migration, and law: Crossing borders and bridging disciplines', *International Migration Review* 40 (1): 104-132.

Carruthers, S.L. (2005), 'Between camps: Eastern Bloc "escapees" and Cold War borderlands', *American Quarterly. Special issue: Legal borderlands law and the construction of American borders* 57 (3): 911-942.

Castles S. & M.J. Miller (2003), *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world.* Basingstoke and New York: Guilford Press.

Cheng, E. (2007), 'Sentimental journey: Transnational adoption from China and post-World War II US liberalism'. PhD dissertation, University of California, San Diego.

Coleman, D.L. (1996), 'Individualizing justice through multiculturalism: The liberals' dilemma', *Columbia Law Review* 96 (5): 1093-1167.

Connell, P. (1997), 'Understanding victimization and agency: Considerations of race, class and gender', *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 20 (2): 116-143.

Connell, R.W. (1993), 'The big picture: Masculinities in recent world history', *Theory and Society* 22 (5) *Special Issue: Masculinities*: 597-623.

Connell, R.W. (1990), 'The state, gender, and sexual politics: Theory and appraisal', *Theory and Society* 19 (5): 507-544.

Constable, N. (1997), *Maid to order in Hong Kong: Stories of Filipina workers.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Côté, A., M. Kérisit & M. Côté (2001), *Sponsorship … for better or for worse: The impact of sponsorship on the equality rights of immigrant women.* Ottawa: Status of Women Canada.

Crenshaw, K. (1989), 'Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics', *University of Chicago Legal Forum*: 139-167.

Curran, S.R. (2012), *Shifting boundaries, transforming lives: Globalization, gender and family dynamics in Thailand.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Curran, S.R. & A.C. Saguy (2001), 'Migration and cultural change: A role for gender and social networks?' *Journal of International Women's Studies* 2 (3): 54-77.

Dannecker, P. (2005), 'Transnational migration and the transformation of gender relations: The case of Bangladeshi labour migrants', *Current Sociology* 53 (4): 655-674.

DaVanzo, J. (1978), 'Does unemployment affect migration? Evidence from micro data', *Review of Economics and Statistics* 60 (4): 504-514.

Davis, B. & P. Winters (2001), 'Gender, networks and Mexico-US migration', *Journal of Development Studies* 28 (2): 1-26.

Davis, K. (2008), 'Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful', *Feminist Theory* 9 (1): 67-85.

De Haas, H. (2007), *The myth of invasion: Irregular migration from West Africa to the Maghreb and the European Union*. Oxford: International Migration Institute.

De Haas, H. & A. van Rooij (2010), 'Migration as emancipation? The impact of internal and international migration on the position of women left behind in rural Morocco', *Oxford Development Studies* 38 (1): 43-62.

De Hart, B. (2006), 'The morality of Maria Toet: Gender, citizenship and the construction of the nation state', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 32 (1): 49-68.

De Hart, B. (2001), 'Not without my daughter: On parental abduction, orientalism and maternal melodrama', *European Journal of Women's Studies* 8: 51-65.

De Jong, G., K. Richter & P. Isarabhakdi (1995), 'Gender, values, and intentions to move in rural Thailand', *International Migration Review* 30 (3): 748-770.

Deane, T. (2010), 'Cross-border trafficking in Nepal and India: Violating women's rights', *Human Rights Review* 11 (4): 491-513.

Dodson, B. (2008), 'Gender, migration and livelihood: Migrant women in Southern Africa', in N. Piper (ed.), *New perspectives on gender and migration: Livelihood, rights and entitlements*, pp. 137-158. London: Routledge.

Doezema, J. (2005), 'Now you see her, now you don't: Sex workers at the UN trafficking protocol negotiations', *Social Legal Studies* 14 (1): 61-89.

Doezema, J. (2001), 'Ouch! Western feminists' "wounded attachment" to the "third world prostitute"', *Feminist Review* 67 (1): 16-38.

Donato, K.M., J.T. Alexander, D.R. Gabaccia & J. Leinonen (2011), 'Variations in the gender composition of immigrant populations: How they matter', *International Migration Review* 45 (3): 495-526.

Donato, K.M., D.R. Gabaccia, J. Holdaway, M. Manalansan & P.R. Pessar (2006), 'A glass half full? Gender in migration studies', *International Migration Review* 40 (1): 3-26.

Ehrenreich, B. & A.R. Hochschild (eds) (2002), *Global woman: Nannies, maids and sex workers in the new economy*. New York: Holt.

El-Cherkeh, T., E. Stirbu, S. Lazaroiu & D. Radu (2004), EU *enlargement, migration and the trafficking of women: The case of South Eastern Europe*. Hamburg: Hamburg Institute of International Economics, HWWA Report 247.

Engelen, E. (2006), 'Towards an explanation of the performance differences of Turks in the Netherlands and Germany: The case for a comparative political economy of integration', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 97 (1): 69-79.

España-Maram, L. (2006), *Creating masculinity in Los Angeles's little Manila: Working-class Filipinos and popular culture 1920s-1950s*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fanon, F. (1965), *A dying colonialism*. New York: Grove Press.

Fehér, L. (2000), 'International efforts against trafficking in human beings', *Acta Juridica Hungarica* 41 (3 & 4): 181-198.

Fincher, R. & P. Saunders (eds) (2001), *Creating unequal futures? Rethinking poverty, inequality and disadvantage.* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Forsdick, C. (2001), 'Travelling concepts: Postcolonial approaches to exoticism', *Paragraph* 24 (3): 12-29.

Foucault, M. (1991), 'Governmentality', in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*, pp. 87-104. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1988), 'Politics and reason', in L. Kritzman (ed.), *Politics, philosophy, culture: Interviews and other writings, 1977-1984*, pp. 57-85. New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1980), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. 1st ed. New York: Pantheon Books.

George, S.M. (2005), *When women come first: Gender and class in transnational migration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gökariksel, B. & K. Mitchell (2005), 'Veiling, secularism, and the neoliberal subject: National narratives and supranational desires in Turkey and France.' *Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs* 5 (2): 147-165.

Gould, C. (2010), 'The problem of trafficking', in I.E. Palmary, K. Burman, P. Chantler & P. Kiguwa (eds), *Gender and migration: Feminist interventions,* pp. 31-49. London: Zed Books.

Gower, M. (2010), 'Asylum: Claims based on sexual identity', Standard Note SN/HA/5618, 9 July, Home Affairs Section, Library House of Commons (UK).

Grahl-Madsen, A. (1966), 'The European tradition of asylum and the development of refugee law', *Journal of Peace Research* 3 (3): 278-289.

Grahl-Madsen, A. (1983), 'Identifying the world's refugees', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 467 (1): 11-23.

Grahl-Madsen, A. (1982-1983a), 'The League of Nations and the refugees', *AWR-Bulletin* 20-21: 86-96.

Grahl-Madsen, A. (1982-1983b), 'The special regime of refugees', *AWR-Bulletin* 20-21: 159-167.

Granovetter, M.S. (1973), 'The strength of weak ties', *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (6): 1360-1380

Grasmuck S. & P. Pessar (1991), *Two islands: Dominican international migration,* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gray, B. (2006) 'Migrant integration policy: A nationalist fantasy of management and control?', *Translocations* 13 (1): 121-141.

Grillo, R. (2010), 'The family at issue: The forced marriage debate in the UK', in A. Kraler, E. Kofman, M. Kohli & C. Schmoll (eds), *Gender, generations and the family in international migration,* pp. 59-74. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Grillo, R. (ed.) (2008), *The family in question: Immigrant and ethnic minorities in multicultural Europe.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Habermas, J. (1989), *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Hacker, H.M. (1951), 'Women as a minority group', *Social Forces* 30 (1): 60-69.

Haig, D. (2004), 'The inexorable rise of gender and the decline of sex: Social change in academic titles, 1945-2001', *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 33 (2): 87-96.

Hansen, P. (2008), 'Circumcising migration: Gendering return migration among Somalilanders', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34 (7): 1109-1125.

Haynes, D.F. (2004), 'Used, abused, arrested and deported: Extending immigration benefits to protect the victims of trafficking and to secure the prosecution of traffickers', *Human Rights Quarterly* 26 (2): 221-272.

Henshall Momsen, J. (ed.) (1999), *Gender, migration and domestic service*. London: Routledge.

Herrera L. & A. Moors (2003), 'Banning face veiling: The boundaries of liberal education', *isim Newsletter* 13 (December): 16-17.

Hoerder, D. (2002), *Cultures in contact: World migrations in the second millennium*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Hogan, D.J. & E. Marandola (2005), 'Towards an interdisciplinary conceptualisation of vulnerability', *Population, Space and Place* 11: 455-471.

Holborn, L.W. (1975), *Refugees: A problem of our time. The work of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 1951-1972*. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press.

Hollingshead, A.B. (1952) 'Trends in social stratification: A case study', *American Sociological Review* 17 (6): 679-686.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (2000), 'Feminism and migration', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 57 (1): 107-120.

Hübinette, T. & J. Arvanitakis (2012), 'Transracial adoption: The fantasy of the global family', in N. Falkof & O. Cashman-Brown (eds), *On whiteness*, Critical Issues Series 190, pp. 221-233, Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary Press.

Human Rights Watch (2005), *Maid to order: Ending abuses against migrant domestic workers in Singapore*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

Jennissen, R. (2004), *Macro-economic determinants of international migration in Europe*. Groningen: University of Groningen Press.

Jones-Correa, M. (1998), 'Different paths: Gender, immigration and political participation', *Immigration Migration Review* 32 (2): 326-349.

Joppke, C. (2007), 'State neutrality and Islamic headscarf laws in France and Germany', *Theory and Society* 36 (4): 313-342.

Kamp, M. (2008), *The new woman in Uzbekistan: Islam, modernity, and unveiling under communism*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Kapur, R. (2005), *Erotic justice*: *Law and the new politics of postcolonialism*. London: Glass House.

Kawar, M. (2004), 'Gender and migration: Why are women more vulnerable?', in *Femmes et mouvement: genre, migrations et nouvelle division internationale du travail*, pp. 71-87. Geneva: Colloquium Graduate Institute of Development Studies.

Kempadoo, K. & J. Doezema (eds) (1998), *Global sex workers*. New York and London: Taylor & Francis.

Kennedy, J.C. (2005), *De deugden van een gidsland: Burgerschap en democratie in Nederland*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.

Kim, C. & T.G. Carroll (1975), 'Intercountry adoption of South Korean orphans: A lawyer's guide', *Journal of Family Law* 14 (2): 223-253.

Kim, E. (2009), *The origins of Korean adoption: Cold war geopolitics and intimate diplomacy*. us-Korea Institute Working Paper Series wp 09-09. Washington, DC: us-Korea Institute.

King, R. & E. Zontini (2000), 'The role of gender in the South European immigration model', *Papers* 60: 35-52.

Knörr, J. & B. Meier (2000), *Women and migration: Anthropological perspectives.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kofman, E. (1999), 'Female "birds of passage" a decade later: Gender and immigration in the European Union', *International Migration Review* 33 (2): 269-299.

Kofman, E., A. Phizacklea, P. Raghuram & R. Sales (2000), *Gender and international migration in Europe: Employment, welfare and politics.* London: Routledge.

Kontos, M., U. Haferbur & A.V. Sacaliuc (2006), *Mapping of policies affecting female migrants and policy analysis: The German case.* Working paper no. 1 – WP1. Frankfurt: Institut für Sozialforschung an der J.W. Goethe Universität Frankfurt. www.femipol.uni-frankfurt.de/docs/working_papers/wp1/Germany.pdf.

Korteweg, A. & G. Yurdakul (2009), 'Islam, gender, and immigrant integration: Boundary drawing in discourses on honour killing in the Netherlands and Germany', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32 (2): 218-238.

Kraler, A., E. Kofman, M. Kohli & C. Schmoll (eds) (2011), *Gender, generations and the family in international migration.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Kurien, P. (2004), 'Multiculturalism, immigrant religion, and diasporic nationalism: The development of an American Hinduism', *Social Problems* 51 (3): 362-385.

Labadie-Jackson, G. (2008), 'Reflections on domestic work and the feminization of migration', *Campbell Law Review* 31 (1): 67-90.

Laclau, E. & C. Mouffe (1985), *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic practice.* London: Verso.

Leiken, R.S. (2005), 'Europe's angry Muslims', *Foreign Affairs*, 120-135.

Lenz, I., H. Lutz, M. Morokvasic, C. Schöng-Kalender & H. Schwenken (eds) (2002), *Crossing borders and shifting boundaries, vol. II*: *Gender, identities and networks.* Opladen: Carfax Publishing.

Lepp, A. (2002), 'Trafficking in women and the feminization of migration: The Canadian context', *Canadian Woman Studies* 21/22 (4): 90-99.

Lettinga, D.N. (2011), *Framing the hijab: The governance of intersecting religious, ethnic and gender differences in France, the Netherlands and Germany.* Amsterdam: VU University Press.

Lister, R., F. Williams, A. Anttonen, J. Bussenmaker, U. Gerhard, J. Heinen, S. Johansson, A. Leira, B. Siim & C. Tobio (2007), *Gendering citizenship in Western Europe: New challenges for citizenship research in a cross-national context.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Loescher, G. (1993), *Beyond charity: International cooperation and the global refugee crisis.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lutz, H. (1997a), 'The limits of European-ness: Immigrant women in fortress Europe', *Feminist Review* 57: 93-111.

Lutz, H. (1997b), 'Cherchez la femme perdue: Kritsche aantekeningen vanuit een genderperspectief', *Migrantenstudies* 2: 90-96.

Lutz, H., A. Phoenix & N. Yuval-Davis (eds) (1995), *Crossfires: Nationalism, racism and gender in Europe.* London: Pluto Press.

MacLeod, M. & E. Saraga (1988), 'Challenging orthodoxy: Towards a feminist theory and practice', *Feminist Review* 28: 16-55.

Mahler, S.J. & P.R. Pessar (2006), 'Gender matters: Ethnographers bring gender from the periphery toward the core of migration studies', *International Migration Review* 40 (1): 27-63.

Mahler, S.J. & P.R. Pessar (2001), 'Gendered geographies of power: Analyzing gender across transnational spaces', *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 7 (4): 441-459.

Marshall, T.H. (1950), *Citizenship and social class and other essays*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Massey, D.S. (1990), 'Social structure, household strategies, and the cumulative causation of migration', *Population Index* 56 (1): 3-26.

McCall, L. (2005), 'The complexity of intersectionality', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30 (3): 1771-1800.

McGoldrick, D. (2006), *Human rights and religion: The Islamic headscarf debate in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McGoldrick, D. (2005), 'Multiculturalism and its discontents', *Human Rights Law Review* 5 (1): 27-56.

McKay, S.C. (2007), 'Filipino sea men: Constructing masculinities in an ethnic labour niche', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33 (4): 617-633.

McKeown, A. (2008), *Melancholy order: Asian immigration and the globalization of borders.* New York: Columbia University Press.

McKerl, M. (2007), 'Multiculturalism, gender and violence', *Culture and Religion* 8 (2): 187-217.

Minnis, M.S. (1953), 'Cleavage in women's organizations: A reflection of the social structure of a city', *American Sociological Review* 18 (1): 47-53.

Moch, L.P. (2003a), *Moving Europeans: Migration in Western Europe since 1650*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Moch, L.P. (2003b), 'Networks among Bretons? The evidence for Paris, 1875-1925', *Continuity and Change* 18 (3): 431-455.

Moch, L.P. & R.G. Fuchs (1993), 'Getting along: Poor women's networks in nineteenth-century Paris', *French Historical Studies* 18 (1): 34-49.

Mohanty, C. (1988), 'Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses', *Feminist Review* 30: 61-88.

Moller Okin, S. (1999), 'Is multiculturalism bad for women?', in J. Cohen, M. Howard & M. Nussbaum (eds), *Is multiculturalism bad for women*, pp. 9-24. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Molokotos Liederman, L. (2000), 'Religious diversity in schools: The Muslim headscarf controversy and beyond', *Social Compass* 47 (3): 367-382.

Moloney, D.M. (2012), *National insecurities: Immigrants and US deportation policy since 1882.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.

Money, J. (1955), 'Hermaphroditism, gender and precocity in hypera-drenocorticism: Psychologic findings', *Bulletin of the Johns Hopkins Hospital* 96: 253-264.

Mongaya Hoegsholm, F. (ed.) (2007), *In de olde worlde: Views of Filipino migrants in Europe*. Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.

Morokvasic, M., U. Erel & K. Shinozaki (eds) (2003), *Gender on the move, crossing borders and shifting boundaries,* Vol. I. Opladen: Carfax Publishers.

Moser, C.O.N. (1998), The asset vulnerability framework: Reassessing urban poverty reduction strategies. *World Development* 26 (1): 1-19.

Moya, J.M. (2007), 'Domestic service in a global perspective: Gender, migration and ethnic niches', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33 (4): 559-579.

Nobil Ahmad, A. (2011), *Masculinity, sexuality and illegal migration: Human smuggling from Pakistan to Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Nobil Ahmad, A. (2008), 'The romantic appeal of illegal migration: Gender masculinity and human smuggling from Pakistan', in M. Schrover, J. van der Leun, L. Lucassen & C. Quispel (eds), *Illegal migration and gender in a global and historical perspective*, pp. 127-150. IMISCOE Research. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Oh, A. (2005), 'A new kind of missionary work: Christians, Christian Americanists, and the adoption of Korean GI babies, 1955-1961', *Women's Studies Quarterly* 33 (3 & 4): 161-188.

Oishi, N. (2005), *Women in motion: Globalization, state policies, and labor migration in Asia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Orbeta, A.C., Jr. & M.R.M. Abrigo (2009), 'Philippine International Labor Migration in the Past 30 Years: Trends and Prospects', *Discussion Papers* DP 2009-33, Philippine Institute for Development Studies.

Oso Casas, L. & J.P. Garson (2005), *The feminisation of international migration: Migrant women and labour market diversity and challenges*. Brussels: OECD and European Commission Seminar.

Oude Breuil, B.C. & D. Siegel, P. van Reenen, A. Beijer & L. Roos (2011), 'Human trafficking revisited: Legal, enforcement and ethnographic narratives on sex trafficking to Western Europe', *Trends in Organized Crime* 14: 30-46.

Outshoorn, J. (2005), 'The political debates on prostitution and trafficking of women', *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society* 12 (1): 141-155.

Oxford, C.G. (2005), 'Protectors and victims in the gender regime of asylum', *National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) Journal* 17 (3): 18-38.

Pajnik, M. & V. Bajt (2012), 'Migrant women's transnationalism: Family patterns and policies', *International Migration* 50 (5): 153-168.

Palmary, I., E. Burman, K. Chantler & P. Kiguwa (2010), *Gender and migration: Feminist interventions*. London: Zed Books.

Parkinson, P. (1994), 'Taking multiculturalism seriously: Marriage law and the rights of minorities', *Sydney Law Review* 36 (16-4): 473-505.

Pawley, L. (2008), 'Cultural citizenship', *Sociology Compass* 2 (2): 594-608.

Pedersen, S. (2001), 'The maternalist moment in British colonial policy: The controversy over "child slavery" in Hong Kong 1917-1941', *Past & Present* 171 (1): 161-202.

Penninx, R., H. Münstermann & H. Entzinger (eds) (1998), *Etnische minderheden en de multiculturele samenleving*. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.

Pessar, P.R. &. S.J. Mahler (2003), 'Transnational migration: Bringing gender in', *International Migration Review* 37 (3): 812-846.

Phillips, A. (2003), 'When culture means gender: Issues of cultural defence in the English courts', *The Modern Law Review* 66 (4): 510-531.

Phizacklea, A. (2003), 'Transnationalism, gender and global workers', in M. Morokva-sic-Müller, U. Erel & K. Shinokazi (eds), *Crossing borders and shifting boundaries. Vol. 1: Gender on the move*, pp. 79-101 Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Phizacklea, A. (1998), 'Migration and globalization: A feminist perspective', in K. Koser & H. Lutz (eds), *The new migration in Europe*: *Social constructions and social realities,* pp. 21-38. New York: Macmillan.

Phoenix, A. & P. Pattynama (2006), 'Intersectionality', *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13 (3): 187-192.

Piper, N. (ed.) (2007), *New perspectives on gender and migration: Livelihood, rights and entitlements*. London: Routledge.

Piper, N. (2003), 'Feminization of labor migration as violence against women: Inter-national, regional, and local nongovernmental organization responses in Asia', *Violence Against Women* 9 (6): 723-745.

Portes, A. & R. Bach (1985), *Latin journey: Cuban and Mexican immigrants in the United States.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Portes, A. & J. Sensenbrenner (1993), 'Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action', *American Journal of Sociology* 98 (6): 1320-1350.

Roggeband, C. & M. Verloo (2007), 'Dutch women are liberated, migrant women are a problem: The evolution of policy frames on gender and migration in the Neth-erlands, 1995-2005', *Social Policy & Administration* 41 (3): 271-288.

Rosas, A.E. (2011), 'Breaking the silence: Mexican children and women's confronta-tion of Bracero family separation, 1942-64', *Gender & History* 23 (2): 382-400.

Rosenberger, S. & B. Sauer (2012), *Politics, religion, and gender: Framing and regulat-ing the veil*. Abington: Routledge.

Ross, E. (1983), 'Survival networks: Women's neighbourhood sharing in London before World War One', *History Workshop* 15 (1): 4-26.

Runblom, H. (1994), 'Swedish multiculturalism in a comparative European perspec-tive', *Sociological Forum* 9 (4): 623-640.

Ryan, J. (2002), 'Chinese women as transnational migrants: Gender and class in global migration narratives', *International Migration* 40 (2): 93-116.

Ryan, L. & W. Webster (2008), *Gendering migration: Masculinity, femininity and eth-nicity in post-war Britain*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Rygiel, P. (2011), *Politique et administration du genre en migration, Mondes atlantiques, xixe-xxe siècles.* Paris: Publibook.

Said, E. (1982), 'Traveling theory', *Raritan, A Quarterly Review* 1 (3): 41-67.

Said, E. (1978), *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books.

Salaff J. & P. Chan (2007), 'Competing interests: Toronto's Chinese immigrant asso-ciations and the politics of multiculturalism', *Population, Space and Place* 13 (2): 125-140.

Salomon, K. (1991), *Refugees in the Cold War: Toward a new international refugee regime in the early postwar era.* Lund: Lund University Press.

Sarri, R.C., Y. Baik & M. Bombyk (1998), 'Goal displacement and dependency in South Korean-United States intercountry adoption', *Children and Youth Services Review* 20 (1-2): 87-114.

Sassen, S. (2006), 'The repositioning of citizenship and alienage: Emergent subjects and spaces for politics' in Y.M. Bodemann & G. Yurdakul (eds), *Migration, citizenship, ethnos: Incorporation regimes in Germany, Western Europe and North America,* pp. 13-34. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sassen, S. (2003), 'The feminization of survival: Alternative global circuits', in M. Morokvasic-Müller, U. Erel & K. Shinokazi (eds), *Crossing borders and shifting boundaries. Vol. 1: Gender on the move*, pp. 59-78. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Schinkel, W. (2008), 'The moralisation of citizenship in Dutch integration discourse', *Amsterdam Law Forum* 1 (1) http://ojs.ubvu.vu.nl/alf/rt/printerFriendly/56/77 (Accessed July 2012).

Schrover, M. (2013), 'Feminization and problematization of migration: Europe in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries', in D. Hoerder & A. Kaur (eds), *Proletarian and gendered mass migrations: A global perspective on continuities and discontinuities from the 19th to the 21st centuries*, pp. 103-131. Leiden: Brill.

Schrover, M. (2009a), 'Differences that make all the difference: Gender, migration and vulnerability', in M. Orly, G. Brunet, V. Barusse De Luca & D. Gauvreau (eds), *A female demography: Migration, work, fertility, family*, pp. 143-168. Bern: Peter Lang.

Schrover, M. (2009b), 'Family in Dutch migration policy, 1945-2005', *The History of the Family* 14 (2): 191-202.

Schrover, M. (2008), 'Verschillen die verschil maken: Inleiding op het themanummer over gender, migratie en overheidsbeleid in Nederland en België in de periode 1945-2005', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale en Economische Geschiedenis* 5 (1): 3-22.

Schrover, M. (2003), 'Living together, working together: Concentrations amongst German immigrants in the Netherlands in the nineteenth century', *Continuity and Change* 18 (2): 263-285.

Schrover, M., J. van der Leun, L. Lucassen, & C. Quispel (eds) (2008), *Illegal migration and gender in a global and historical perspective.* IMISCOE Research. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Schrover, M., J. van der Leun & C. Quispel, (2007), 'Niches, labour market segregation, ethnicity and gender', *Journal of Ethnicity and Migration Studies* 33 (4): 529-540.

Schrover, M. & E.J. Yeo (2010a), 'Introduction: Moving the focus to the public sphere', in M. Schrover & E.J. Yeo (eds), *Gender, migration and the public sphere, 1850-2005,* pp. 1-13. New York: Routledge.

Schrover, M. & Yeo, E. (eds) (2010b), *Gender, migration and the public sphere in interdisciplinary perspective 1850-2005*. New York: Routledge.

Scott, J.C. (1998), *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Scott, J.W. (1988), *Gender and the politics of history*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Scott, J.W. (1986), 'Gender: A useful category of historical analysis', *American Historical Review* 91 (5): 1053-1075.

Shachar, A. (2001-2002), 'Two critiques of multiculturalism', *Cardozo Law Review* 23 (1): 253-297.

Sharpe P. (ed.) (200l), *Women, gender and labour migration: Historical and global perspectives.* London: Routledge.

Sinha, M. (2006), 'Gender and nation', in S. Morgan (ed.), *The feminist history reader*, pp. 323-338. Abington: Routledge.

Sinke, S. (2006), 'Gender and migration: Historical perspectives', *International Migration Review* 40 (1): 82-103.

Sjaastad, L.A. (1962), 'The costs and returns of human migration', *Journal of Political Economy* 70 (5): 80-93.

Soderlund, G. (2005), 'Running from the rescuers: New US crusaders against sex trafficking and the rhetoric of abolition', *National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) Journal* 17 (3): 64-87.

Soysal, Y.N. (1994), *Limits of citizenship: Migrants and postnational membership in Europe.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Spijkerboer, T. (2000), *Gender and refugee status*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Stabile, C.A. & D. Kumar (2005), 'Unveiling imperialism: Media, gender and the war on Afghanistan', *Media Culture and Society* 27 (5): 765-782.

Stark, O. (1991), *The Migration of Labor*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sterett, S. (1997), 'Domestic violence and immigration in Britain', *Polar* 20 (2): 63-69.

Stewart, E. (2005), 'Exploring the vulnerability of asylum seekers in the UK', *Population, Space and Place* 11 (9): 499-512.

Stoler, A.L. (1995), *Race and the education of desire: Foucault's history of sexuality and the colonial order of things*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Stoler, A.L. (1992), 'Sexual affronts and racial frontiers: European identities and the cultural politics of exclusion in colonial Southeast Asia', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 34: 540-551.

Studer, B. (2001), 'Citizenship as contingent national belonging: Married women foreigners in twentieth-century Switzerland', *Gender and History* 13 (3): 622-654.

Tacoli, C. (1995), 'Gender and international survival strategies: A research agenda with reference to Filipina labour migrants in Italy', *TWPR* 17 (2): 199-212.

Takkenberg, A. & C.C. Tahbaz (eds) (1989), *The collected travaux préparatoires of the 1951 Geneva Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*. Volumes I, II and III (2nd edition). Amsterdam: Dutch Refugee Council.

Tilly, C. (1998), *Durable inequality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

UDI (2012), *Misuse of the right to family reunification: Marriages of convenience and false declarations of parenthood. Report to the European Migration Network from the Norwegian Contact Point*. Oslo: Norwegian Directorate of Immigration.

Uitermark, J., U. Rossi & H. van Houtum (2005), 'Reinventing multiculturalism: Urban citizenship and the negotiation of ethnic diversity in Amsterdam', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29 (3): 622-640.

United Nations (2009), *Child adoption: Trends and policies.* New York: Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division, United Nations ST/ESA/SER.A/292.

Utas, M. (2005), 'West-African warscapes. Victimcy, girlfriending, soldiering: Tactic agency in a young woman's social navigation of the Liberian war zone', *Anthropological Quarterly* 78 (2): 403-430.

Van Walsum, S.K. & T. Spijkerboer (2007), *Women and immigration law: New variations on classical feminist themes*. Abington: Routledge.

Verkuyten, M. & P. Brug (2004), 'Multiculturalism and group status: The role of ethnic identification, group essentialism and Protestant ethic', *European Journal of Social Psychology* 34: 647-661.

Volpp, L. (2006), 'Divesting citizenship: On Asian American history and the loss of citizenship through marriage', *Immigrant and Nationality Law Review* 52: 397-476.

Volpp, L. (1996), 'Talking "culture": Gender, race, nation, and the politics of multiculturalism', *Columbia Law Review* 96 (6): 1573-1617.

Waddington, H., & R. Sabates-Wheeler (2003), *How does poverty affect migration choice? A Review of Literature*. Sussex: Working Paper T3 Institute of Development Studies.

Weitzer, R. (2010), 'The mythology of prostitution: Advocacy research and public Policy', *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 7 (1): 15-29.

Wiebel, J.C. (2010), *Beyond the border: On rhetoric, US immigration and governmentality*, PhD thesis, University of Iowa, http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/906 (Accessed 18 May 2013).

Wieringa, S.E. (2011), 'Portrait of a women's marriage: Navigating between Lesbophobia and Islamophobia', *Signs* 36 (4): 785-793.

Wihtol de Wenden, C. (1998), 'Young Muslim women in France: Cultural and psychological adjustments', *Political Psychology* 19 (1): 133-146.

Winter, B. (2008), *Hijab and the Republic: Uncovering the French headscarf debate*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Winter, B. (2006), 'Religion, culture and women's human rights: Some general political and theoretical considerations', *Women's Studies International Forum* 29 (4): 381-393.

Wooditch, A.C., M.A. DuPont-Morales & D. Hummer (2009), 'Traffick jam: A policy review of the United States' Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000', *Trends in Organized Crime* 12 (3): 235-250.

Yamanaka, K. & N. Piper (2005), 'Feminized migration in East and Southeast Asia: Policies, actions and empowerment', Geneva, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development Occasional Paper 11.

Yeates, N. (2004), 'A dialogue with "global care chain" analysis: Nurse migration in the Irish context', *Feminist Review* 77 (1): 79-95.

Zlotnik, H. (1998), 'International migration, 1965-1996: An overview', *Population and Development Review* 24 (3): 429-468.

Zolberg, A. (2006), *A nation by design: Immigration policy in the fashioning of America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.