

**Workshop Proposal for the 2011 ECPR Joint-Sessions**  
**Migration Politics. From Politics and Policy to Citizens' and Migrants' Behaviour**

**Title of proposed workshop:**

**Migration Politics. From Politics and Policy to Citizens' and Migrants' Behaviour**

**Subject area:**

**Migration, Comparative Politics, Public Policy, Political Behaviour, Public Opinion**

**Abstract of proposed workshop. Maximum of 250 words (suitable for publication in the academic programme leaflet and on the ECPR web site):**

This WS aims to contributing to fill two important voids in the literature on migration. It lies at the interface of comparative migration politics and policy analysis, public opinion, political behaviour, quantitative data analysis and qualitative case-studies. It will focus on examining, in comparative perspective, the outcomes of migration politics and policies on citizens and migrants' behaviour. It is thus concerned with some basic aspects of migrants' integration in receiving societies – a subject of clear social and political relevance.

The first void in the literature that this workshop will address has to do with the politics and policies of immigration. Most publications on these matters stem from a legal approach and those from a political science perspective only rarely attempt to supply comparable measures. The second research void concerns the effects of migration politics and policies on citizens' and migrants' behaviour, which constitutes a new strand of research. Existing comparative studies are scarce and, save for rare exceptions, of little methodological sophistication; moreover, immigrants are excluded from most of them.

Accordingly, the WS encourages, on the one hand, research on political, welfare, economic and cultural dimensions, including the framing of immigration in political discourse, as well as on the legal dimension. On the other hand, it welcomes papers that elaborate and/or test the hypothesis that contextual factors impinge on attitudes and behaviour – voting included – of the majority of society and/or migrants. Preference will be given to papers focusing on more than one country. However, case-studies and theory building are welcome as well.

**Name of workshop director(s):**

(maximum of 2 persons)

**Enric Martinez-Herrera; Thomas J. Miley**

**Name and address of institution(s):**

Enric Martinez-Herrera  
Dept. CC. Políticas y Relaciones Internacionales  
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid  
C/. Marie Curie, 1 28049 Madrid. Spain  
**Telephone number/s:** +34 914 228 912 / +34 6969 232 51

**Fax number/s:**

**e-mail:** [enric.martinez@uam.es](mailto:enric.martinez@uam.es)

Thomas J. Miley  
Temporary Lecturer of Political Sociology  
Dept. of Sociology  
University of Cambridge  
Free School Lane, Cambridge CB2 3RQ  
**Tel:** 01223 (3)34520  
**Fax** 01223 (3)34550

## Workshop Proposal for the 2011 ECPR Joint-Sessions

### Migration Politics. From Politics and Policy to Citizens' and Migrants' Behaviour

#### Outline of the Topic and Relation to Existing Research:

This WS seeks to advance research around one general hypothesis –admission (inflow control) policies, integration policies and politics (comprising both the views of politicians and the media and the politicisation of migration) impinge on the attitudes and behaviour of citizens and migrants. The point of departure is the assumption that integration is bi-directional – there is both a process of adaptation of immigrants to the host society and one of the host society to immigrants. If this is true, this strand of research is of crucial importance to European societies.

However, research on the politics and policies of immigration and their effect on citizens and migrants' behaviour is uneven. It suffers from two major lacunae. The first concerns the study of the politics and policies of immigration, our independent variable. Most publications on these matters stem from a legal approach and those from a political science perspective only rarely attempt to supply comparable measures (Aleinikoff & Klusmeyer 2001, 2002; Weil 2001). Thus, quantitative research on political behaviour finds exceedingly difficult to factor into its analysis these contextual variables.

The second void concerns the study of the effects of political factors on the attitudes and behaviour of both citizens and immigrants. Whether they analyse attitudes or electoral behaviour, comparative studies on the outcomes of migration politics and policies are scarce and, by and large, in the case of attitudinal research, of little sophistication. In addition, immigrants are excluded from most comparative behavioural studies.

For one thing, this WS seeks to further our understanding of the contextual causes of the various states of public opinion in the face of immigration. Whilst the attempts to explain these variations are countless, it is unusual to find studies that attempt to validate hypotheses with a cross-national systematic empirical analysis. Moreover, only a few scholars have studied the impact of certain contextual variables. In this sense, economic contextual factors, such as interethnic competition, growth and unemployment have shown to be of some importance as determinants of attitudes towards immigrants (Citrin *et al.* 1997; Coenders *et al.* 2004). Competition for social and welfare services also plays a substantial part on this regard (Burns & Gimpel 2000; Oliver & Wong 2003). It has also been suggested that the mass media and xenophobic parties, by inducing specific frames of perception, also contribute to shape attitudes towards migration and migrants – albeit this assertion still lacks of proper empirical testing.

This WS will focus specifically on political contextual factors. The hypothesis that politics and policies related to immigration are a key variable for explaining attitudes toward migration can be derived from a strong tradition of research on public opinion and political culture (e.g. Eckstein 1988; Lijphart 1989; Zaller 1992; Muller & Seligson 1994; Rohrschneider 1994, 1999). This research tradition posits that institutions and policies that are sustained over time contribute to shape the attitudes of most citizens. It also contends that parties' positions, when consistent over time, tend to shape the attitudes of their sympathisers.

Concerning the outcomes of policies, previous research has shown that citizens are more favourable to migration influxes as long as their countries select migrants according to skills and the needs of the jobs market (e.g. Canada and New Zealand as compared to other OECD countries) (Bauer *et al.* 2000). Yet the effects of

many other migration policies remain unexplored. The outcomes of politics have received little attention as well. Studying the role of parties, McLaren (2001) has posited that the more vocal but consensual a party system has been concerning immigration policies in a particular direction (for or against), the more the educated and cognitively mobilised citizens come to incorporate these preferences into their own belief systems. Conversely, the larger the conflict between parties (or the presence of sizable xenophobic parties), the more individuals with a left-right self-placement tend, by following the cues of political parties, to differentiate along ideological lines (see also Lahav 2004). Ongoing research by associates to the chairs of this WS has yielded evidence that citizens overestimate the amount of immigrants in their countries, mistrust refugee claims and oppose permissive asylum policies depending on how much party systems have politicised migration, and that prejudice against immigrants is larger as a function of the electoral size of xenophobic parties. Much more work in this area is in order, though.

So far, research has focused on citizens' public opinion. However, the present WS also aims at encouraging analysis on the outcomes of these political factors on migrants' perceptions, attitudes and immigration strategies. Although there is a plethora of qualitative case-studies on migrants integration, more effort is needed in drawing general patterns systematically comparing across existing case studies in different European countries with a view to assessing the effects of policies and politics.

The topic is covered at the ECPR Joint-Sessions for the first time, as the WS pursues a new research strand. Although there was an excellent WS on "Who Makes Immigration Policy? Comparative Perspectives in a post-9/11 World" at the Uppsala ECPR Joint-Sessions (2004), chaired by V. Guiraudon and G. Lahav, its focus was on policy-making and agenda-setting.

### **Participants:**

This WS is open to scholars with different research interests and methods. It lies at the interface of comparative migration politics and policy analysis, public opinion, political behaviour, quantitative data analysis and qualitative case-studies. Consequently, there is room for a wide range of scholars. Many scholars from both Europe and North America will be interested and will be most welcome. In addition, in order to ensure a critical mass, associates to the chairs in two ongoing projects and other well-known scholars will be encouraged to participate, although the final selection will much willingly be made in accordance to the ECPR rules in order to ensure plurality.

### **Type of papers:**

To begin with, the WS would host comparative research on political variables, including welfare, economic and cultural policies, politicisation and the public framing of immigration in political discourse and the mass media, which aims at building comparable measures of these phenomena. The main unit of analysis ought to be the country, although additional subnational-level measures are also appreciated. Attention to agreements and differences across countries and/or along time is our main interest. Additional attention to hypothetical processes of convergence and imitation within the European Union would be welcome too.

Secondly, the WS would host papers that analyse the effects of migration politics and policies on citizens' and migrants' behaviour. The WS wishes to include papers that lend further credence (or reject) the hypothesis that political contextual factors impinge on attitudes and behaviour of the majority of society and migrants themselves. In this sense, we encourage both quantitative and qualitative methods as well as theory-building. Quantitative analysis of attitudes or behaviour – such as voting – ought to be comparative. In the case of attitudinal research, they could rely on comparative surveys such as European Social Survey (ESS), Eurobarometer, World Values Survey (WVS) and International Social Survey Project (ISSP). Electoral studies, in turn, ought to encompass at least two countries and show clear variation in contextual factors. Qualitative studies about the outcomes of migration politics on migrants' behaviour are also encouraged. In this case, a

systematic review of existing case-studies in at least three countries in order to draw empirical generalisations could be suggested.

### **Funding:**

The WS chairs lead a closely related project funded by the Spanish National Plan for R+D. The project involves 10 scholars in total, from various countries. The budget covers the travel costs of the participants in the project to attend international conferences, and they will be encouraged to apply to this WS. Moreover, the chairs have applied for funds to the British ESRC and also intend to apply to the European Commission FP together with colleagues from Europe at large.

### **Biographical notes:**

**Enric Martínez-Herrera** is Lecturer at University Autónoma de Madrid and at University Pompeu Fabra (Barcelona). PhD in Political and Social Sciences, European University Institute (Florence); MA in Social Science Data Analysis, University of Essex. Enric has been a J.W. Fulbright Senior Fellow at the University of Maryland and research fellow at the Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales (Madrid). He has led and participated in several national and international research projects. His interests lie in the intersection of political behaviour, institutions and policies in comparative perspective. Recent publications have appeared in both academic journals – such as *European Journal of Political Research*, *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* and *Nations and Nationalism* – and numerous edited books.

Thomas J. Miley is Temporary Lecturer in Political Sociology at the University of Cambridge. He received his Ph.D. in Political Science from Yale University. Jeff has been a 'M. García Pelayo' research fellow at the Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales (Madrid) and a lecturer at Yale University. His research interests include nationalism, migration, democracy and language politics. His publications include the edition of *Obras escogidas de Juan J. Linz* (with J.R. Montero, 7 vols., CEPC 2008-2010). He is the author of *Nacionalismo y política lingüística: el caso de Cataluña* (CEPC 2006), as well as articles in the *European Journal of Political Research*, *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* and *Nations and Nationalism*.

### **Basic References**

- Aleinikoff, T.A.; D. Klusmeyer (eds.) 2001. *Citizenship Today. Global Perspectives and Practices*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- . 2002. *Citizenship Policies for an Age of Migration*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Bauer, T.K.; M. Lofstrom; K.L. Zimmermann. 2000. Immigration policy, assimilation of immigrants and natives. IZAD
- Citrin, J.; D.P. Green; C. Muste; C. Wong. 1997. Public opinion toward immigration reform: the role of economic motivations. *Journal of Politics* 59: 858-881.
- Coenders, M.; M. Lubbers; P. Scheepers. 2004. Majority populations' attitudes towards migrants and minorities. Report for the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia. Ref. 2003/04/01
- Eckstein, H. 1988. A culturalist theory of political change. *American Political Science Review* 82(3): 789-804.
- Lahav, G. 2004. *Immigration and politics in the new Europe: reinventing borders*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University.
- Lijphart, A. 1989. The structure of inference [1980], in G.A. Almond and S. Verba (eds.) *The civic culture revisited*. London: Sage.
- Martínez Herrera, E.; D. Moualhi. 2006. Predispositions to discriminatory immigration policies in Western Europe: An exploration of political causes. *Portuguese Journal of Social Science* 5(3): 27-46.
- McLaren, L.M. 2001. Immigration and the new policies of inclusion and exclusion in the European union. The effect of elites and the EU on individual-level opinions regarding European and non-European immigrants. *European Journal of Political Research* 39: 81-108.
- Muller, E.N.; M.A. Seligson. 1994. Civic culture and democracy: the question of causal relationships. *American Political Science Review* 88(3): 635-652.
- O'Connell, M. 2005. Economic forces and anti-immigrant attitudes in Western Europe: a paradox in search of an explanation. *Patterns of Prejudice* 39(1): 60-74.

Rohrschneider, Robert. 1994. Report from the laboratory: the influence of institutions on political elites democratic values in Germany. *American Political Science Review* 88(4): 927-41.

----. 1999. *Learning Democracy. Democratic and economic values in unified Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Weil, Patrick. 2001. Access to citizenship: a comparison of twenty-five nationality laws. Pp. 17-35 a: T.A. Aleinikoff & D. Klusmeyer (eds.)

*op. cit.* Zaller, John R. 1992. *The nature and origins of mass opinion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.