

CONFERENCE NEWS

Social Policy and Migration

*Report of the UNRISD/IOM/IFS International Workshop
22–23 November 2007, Stockholm, Sweden*

Contents

Introduction	1
The Migration— Social Policy Nexus	2
Migration and Poverty	3
Remittances and Social Development	5
Human Resource Flows: Brain Drain or Brain Gain?	7
The Implications of Migration for Gender and Care Regimes	8
Migration and Social Development: Organizational and Political Dimensions	10
Regional Dynamics	12
Concluding Remarks	16
Agenda and Papers Presented	18
Participants	19

Introduction

Migration is both a central, and a cross-cutting, theme in research on social policy in a development context.¹ So it is surprising that, so far, researchers have made little effort to analyse this relationship systematically and comprehensively. In an effort to begin addressing this gap, the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), International Organization for Migration (IOM) and Institute for Futures Studies (IFS) drew on their respective areas of expertise to organize a workshop on the intersection between social policy and migration from the perspective of migratory flows among developing countries. At the workshop, held in Stockholm on 22–23 November 2007, researchers presented six commissioned issues papers and three regional papers, and exchanged ideas and innovative approaches with other workshop participants, including practitioners, government officials and representatives from international organizations and donor agencies.

¹ See, for example, the UNRISD research agenda for 2000–2009, published as *UNRISD 2000+: A Vision for the Future of the Institute*, UNRISD, Geneva, April 2000; and *Social Development Research at UNRISD 2005–2009*, UNRISD, Geneva, July 2006.

Frank Laczko (IOM) and Joakim Palme (IFS) opened the workshop, welcoming participants and emphasizing the need to engage in informed debates on the impact of migration on social development in general, and on implications for social policy in particular. One of the key objectives of the research commissioned for the workshop, Laczko said, was to begin filling conceptual and data gaps related to South-South migration. In their opening statement, research coordinators Katja Hujo and Nicola Piper added that one of UNRISD's broader objectives is to stimulate dialogue and contribute to policy debates within and outside the United Nations system, and this collaboration is one example of how this can be done. They explained that UNRISD research has demonstrated how social policy can serve as a powerful instrument to foster economic development, social inclusion, cohesion and rights. This workshop was guided by questions related to the impact of migration on social development in Southern contexts. Specifically, it examined the implications for all spheres of social policy, including gender roles and care regimes, social protection and redistribution as well as the relationship between citizens and the state in both destination and origin countries. Migration impacts on all the spheres with



which social policy is concerned, and because it has both a national and an international, or transnational, dimension it also affects policy at all levels.

The Issue and its Relevance

Current academic and political debates in countries across the world identify international migration as a key aspect of contemporary social and economic life. Increasing attention is being devoted to a variety of social and development problems linked to migration, as well as to the opportunities for the countries, communities and migrants involved. Much existing research, however, has focused on a specific flow of migration, namely from South to North, whereas the consequences of South-South and internal migration are under-researched. Studies on the development impacts of out-migration on developing countries have tended to focus on financial and human resource flows, particularly remittances and skilled labour migration (“brain drain”).

Assessing the relationship between migration and social policy raises several crucial questions.

- What is the nature of the migration–social policy nexus in developing contexts?
- In these contexts, what impact does migration have on poverty, and vice versa?
- How does migration affect social policy and service provisioning in developing countries, and vice versa?
- What variation, if any, exists between South-North and South-South migration contexts in terms of social policy and development?
- How applicable are the analytical frameworks for phenomena like remittances, brain drain, the global care chain, or transnationalism for contexts of South-South migration, and what is their relevance to social policy?
- What organizational and political linkages have a bearing on social policy and service provisioning?
- Are there visible trends in Southern regional contexts in terms of an evolving cooperation on migration policy?

These questions formed the backbone of the research that was discussed at the workshop.

The Migration–Social Policy Nexus

Migration affects social policy and service provisioning in multiple ways in developing countries. While research has emphasized aspects like remittances and brain drain, it is also important to examine other linkages, such as the impacts of migration on patterns of welfare provisioning and social protection systems; issues of access to social benefits and services, redistribution and social inclusion; and broader questions of citizenship and the relationship between the resident population and the state. The first session explored how migration affects social policy and service provisioning in developing countries and what sort of variation, if any, exists between South-North and South-South migration contexts in terms of social policy.

Jane Pillinger’s presentation explored the social policy implications of migration, and how research and policy developments in this area are shaping the thinking and direction of social policy in both industrialized and developing countries. Pillinger showed that to date, the main focus of research and policy debate has been the social policy implications of migration for industrialized countries of destination, with a particular emphasis on the integration of migrants into these societies, and their adaptation to and impact on the countries’ welfare systems. This has been to the neglect of social policy analysis of the implications of migration for the welfare systems of developing countries. Furthermore, limited attention has been paid to the implications for developing countries’ often rudimentary but evolving welfare systems of the increasing reliance on migrant workers to provide services in the West (particularly in welfare services where labour shortages exist: health care, child care, elder care and so on).

Pillinger argued that in order to understand and improve the linkages between migration policy and social policy, there is a need for a new research agenda that addresses the impact of international migration on the development of welfare systems, particularly in developing countries. A central question is the extent to which migration impacts on government social policy and programmes, and how government programmes impact on migration decisions. Such a research agenda would need to link migration to welfare in the broadest sense, including poverty,

inequality, service provisioning and related issues of human capital.

According to Pillinger, existing research and policy debate in the areas of social policy and migration policy tend to be located in separate domains, with studies that integrate them the exception rather than the rule. The need for a new research agenda also reflects the fact that little is known about how welfare systems in developed and developing countries adapt to and are affected by international migration and globalization. Moreover, a transnational approach to social policy and an interest in the social impacts of migration policy has developed. As a result, today there is a greater interest among researchers and practitioners in both fields to develop analytical frameworks that improve the coordination and understanding of global social policy connections on the one hand, and socially focused migration policy on the other.

Pillinger also cited the growing interest in transnational and global social policy, as well as how Northern welfare regimes have dealt with international migration. This raises a number of questions about the need for greater bilateral and multilateral policy coordination in the area of migration and social policy. Consequently, social integration as a determinant of international migration is an area that merits new research. In the same vein, new research should explore the extent to which migrants can become agents of development, and how this agency is enabled or constrained by the immigration and integration policies of countries of transit and destination.

As discussant for Pillinger's paper, Kristof Tamas focused on two aspects: first, the fact that employment and labour markets link migration and social policy issues; and second, the recent European Union (EU) development cooperation policy in the area of migration. With regard to the latter, he reported that the social dimension of globalization was increasingly recognized as part of external policies in an EU framework, and that the issue of regional cooperation, also with regard to social policy, was to be included. With respect to the former, Tamas referred to the challenge of integrating informal sector workers into the formal protected labour market, as this was of particular importance for the well-being of these

workers in general and for informal migrant workers in particular. He added that labour market developments in the EU, such as ageing or shortages in specific sectors, have a crucial impact on migration patterns, especially from the South. He said that close cooperation and partnership with developing countries was essential to manage these processes in the interest of all.

During the plenary discussion, participants raised the problem of imposing Western-derived notions on developing countries. The fact that most developed countries encourage high-skilled migration from the South was also identified as a problem, not only for sending countries, but also in relation to the status of often undocumented, low-skilled migrants (many of them women) in Northern destination countries. In response to this, Tamas stated that the EU aimed to develop clear recruitment guidelines for migrant labour and that, at the same time, the intention was to collaborate closely on national development strategies with Southern partners.

Migration and Poverty

There is a growing interest in the relationship between migration and poverty. On the one hand, migrants are typically not from the poorest population strata, as a certain amount of resources—human, social and financial—are necessary in order to move across borders. If this is the case, positive returns from migration (such as remittances) are likely to benefit the relatively better-off and might reinforce patterns of inequality. On the other hand, the causal relationships are highly context specific (for example, voluntary versus forced migration) and change over time. The effects of migration on poverty are likewise ambiguous: poverty can be alleviated as well as exacerbated by population movements. The second panel was concerned with the links between migration and poverty in general and the effects of migration on poverty in particular; the implications for aid policy and donor-driven processes like Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs); and the challenges for policy makers at national and regional levels.

Poverty research offers several established understandings of the nature, dimensions and complexity of

poverty, according to Shahin Yaqub, and that research is a good place to start framing the linkages between migration and poverty.² Yaqub argued that context-dependency must be central to attempts to understand migration-poverty linkages. Much of how migration manifests itself in poor families might be misperceived or underestimated unless it is rooted in the socio-economic structures of disadvantage that the poor face, and the resulting compromises and choices they make to secure life and livelihood.

While he and De Haan had reviewed both international (cross-border) and internal migration, their paper focused on the latter as being more tied to global poverty. Yaqub explained that while the literature on internal migration and poverty is still evolving and quite controversial, it nevertheless has a long tradition, and has shown the main channels by which migration might reduce consumption poverty. This literature also offers analytical tools that can be applied to less-studied areas and are integral to understanding poverty.

Yaqub then discussed existing research gaps by drawing attention to the fact that poverty research has long recognized that poverty is multidimensional, dynamic over time and different among household members. Intra-household risks, dynamics and effects across generations have received some theoretical attention in migration research, but empirical inquiry in this area is limited. A particular generational issue relates to children's migration, which is often wrongly perceived. For example, one such idea is that children's well-being in the context of migration can be lumped together with that of adults, without recognizing the distinctiveness of childhood, in terms of its socio-legal norms and constructions, and the biological processes of growing up. Children have specific vulnerabilities and needs, and enjoy specific provisions under the Convention on the Rights of the Child that are portable and borderless. Moreover, as the next generation, the well-being, care and nurture of children as they grow up is an important factor in the persistence of poverty over generations.

With regard to migration scholarship, Yaqub went on to explain the distinction in their paper between "migration optimists" and "migration pessimists". The former argue that where migration does not lead to reduction in disparities, this tends to be due to barriers for migrants, such as international borders or labour market inefficiencies. The latter, by contrast, emphasize that there is very little empirical evidence to show that migration does in fact lead to reduction in disparities. According to Yaqub, the conclusions of optimists and pessimists are not necessarily incompatible. Migration has different impacts in different contexts. It should be seen within a larger strategy of poverty reduction and not as an optimistic "solution" or as a pessimistic "problem". The key is finding the right balance between the two approaches. The challenges for policy makers at the national and regional levels include practical ways of integrating migrants into development processes, but also more entrenched issues related to the way social policy interacts with citizenship.

By way of conclusion, Yaqub returned to the complexity of analysing migration and poverty. Much is known about the motives of migrants and their contexts, especially if they are viewed as a largely homogenous mass within the black box of the household. But less is known once the focus shifts to intra-household processes in gender and childhood. Empirical findings about linkages between migration and poverty differ greatly, and there is a sense—although difficult to prove at this stage—that there may be a causal link between simplified theoretical assumptions and conflicting empirical results.

Frank Laczko, the discussant for this presentation, emphasized the general problem of a lack of data with regard to both internal and international migration and their impacts on poverty, whether measured in terms of income or more qualitative social indicators like education. He mentioned that migration can have ambiguous effects on poverty, as it can alleviate or exacerbate it. The lack of systematic research on these questions is especially apparent in the discussion of PRSPs and national development strategies, he said. Migration is still not mainstreamed into the big development agendas. According to Laczko, it is also important to take note of the fact that governments could restrict access to

² Yaqub's presentation was based on the paper *Migration and Poverty: Linkages, Knowledge Gaps and Policy Implications*, which he co-authored with Arjan De Haan for his workshop.

welfare systems in order to discourage migration. On the other hand, there are governments that promote migration and are concerned with the welfare of their citizens living abroad.

Several important issues were raised in the plenary discussion, such as the need to differentiate between household and family, as social policies targeted at families often do not reach family members lacking legal status—either regarding marriage or the recognition of children—or the difference between children’s agency and adults’ responsibility for children’s well-being. One participant pointed out the apparent contradictions between development and migration policies, as reflected in the need for cheap labour in deregulated and liberalized labour markets on the one hand, and the call for qualified labour migrants on the other. In addition, there is a general failure to identify clearly the links between specific economic reforms, such as trade liberalization in sub-Saharan Africa, and increased out-migration from affected countries due to deteriorating economic opportunities.

Remittances and Social Development

Scholars often assess the impact of migration on developing countries by way of migrants’ remittances (that is, the portion of their income sent home). Remittances have often been approached from the viewpoint of regular migrants—those who have secure residential status, and who remit through institutional arrangements that exist mainly in Northern countries. But it is also important to examine remittances associated with the temporary migrants, and unskilled or semi-skilled workers, who constitute the majority in many parts of the world and who generate a greater total volume of remittances than migrants in the highly skilled and professional categories. This session sought to identify the implications of remittances for how developing countries finance social provisioning, and to explore how remittance volumes, channels, investments and institutions differ in a South-South context.

Hein de Haas started his presentation by pointing out that the past few years have witnessed a remarkable renaissance in the interest in remittances, triggered no

doubt by a striking increase in remittance flows. As a result, after years of relative neglect, they have been rediscovered as a potential source of development finance. Registered remittances now amount to well over twice the amount of official development assistance and are 10 times higher than net private capital transfers to developing countries.

However, de Haas argued, the current debate on migration, remittances and development suffers from a number of shortcomings. First, the current “remittance euphoria” often coincides with a certain perception that it concerns a “new” issue. Yet, any suggestion that the topic is new suffers from historical amnesia of decades of prior research and policies, and it is important that the findings from previous empirical research and policies on migration, remittances and development be taken into consideration.

Second, according to de Haas, there has been a one-sided focus on remittances and their direct economic consequences. Less systematic attention has been paid to the non-pecuniary impacts of remittances—on health, education, gender, care arrangements, social structures and ethnic hierarchies in migrant communities and countries. The non-remittance-related effects of migration, such as the role of migration and migrants in cultural and social change in origin societies, have also been neglected.

Related to the two previous points, de Haas observed that the recent empirical and policy literature on remittances has been poorly embedded in more general theoretical frameworks on migration and development. Many empirical studies have not been designed to test hypotheses and, even more importantly, make little if any reference to broader theoretical debates on migration and development. This renders the often-conflicting findings from empirical studies difficult to interpret theoretically, when in fact they would be extremely useful in building more sophisticated frameworks that could account for the heterogeneity of interactions among migration, remittances and development.

For de Haas, another fundamental issue is the almost total absence of a foundational debate in migration studies on what the concept of development actually

means. While this concept is almost never explicitly defined, most approaches to migration and development tend to be based on notions of development that focus on (gross) income indicators. Consequently, the focus has been the impact of remittances on income growth and on investment in productive enterprises. This conventional focus is arbitrary, since remittances and, more generally, migration, impact on a wide range of societal issues beyond income. De Haas elaborated this point, stating that these issues may include income risks (rather than levels alone), income inequality, investments in human capital (for example, education), gender inequality, birth and death rates, ethnic relations, political change, the environment and so on. Migration impacts may also differ significantly across these various dimensions of social and economic change. Therefore, according to de Haas, evaluating “the” impact of migration and remittances is far from straightforward, as it depends on which dimensions of socioeconomic change are considered as developmental and the relative weight attached to them. What is seen as developmental, moreover, depends on the disciplinary, cultural and ideological perspectives of researchers and policy makers, who tend to project their own norms, preferences and expectations onto the communities and societies that they study or on behalf of whom they are making policy.

De Haas advocated a broad view of human or social development in the context of remittances in order to highlight the necessity of looking beyond income indicators, and also to study the multifaceted ways in which migration and remittances affect the well-being and capabilities of people in migrant-sending societies. This point also brings out the importance of looking not only at how remittances affect migrants and their families, but also how they affect sending communities and societies *as a whole*. For de Haas, the following questions remain largely unaddressed.

- How do remittances affect equity and inequality in social and economic opportunities within communities?
- Do remittances increase people’s capabilities to protect themselves from income shocks?
- How do remittances affect people not receiving them? Do some remittances accrue to them indirectly through investments and income multipliers, or do

they instead deepen the poverty of these individuals and exacerbate inequalities?

- How do remittances affect ethnic and gender inequalities? What are the consequences for social reproduction and care regimes?
- How do migration and remittances affect institutional change as well as the capabilities of people to participate in public debate in countries of origin?

De Haas raised one important caveat: the remittance focus of his presentation did not by any means imply that migration does not affect development in ways other than through remittances. For instance, migration often has important effects on (transnational) identity, cultural change, social structures and political debate. In fact, his analysis exemplified the fact that remittance impacts are seldom isolated from other migration impacts.

Andrés Solimano was the discussant for this presentation. He acknowledged the balanced approach and the volume of literature surveyed in the de Haas paper. He then questioned the extent to which remittances could truly be considered an external transfer to countries of origin, as the export of people and related costs had to be taken into account. As remittances are money earned by nationals, they could be seen as compensation for lost resources. Solimano said the sustainability of the upward trend of remittances in recent years was unclear, because the amounts being sent home tended to decline over time. However, as research on average amounts sent home by Latin American migrants in the United States shows, remittances in the beginning could be as high as a monthly minimum wage for receiving families. Solimano also raised the issue of the use of remittances for investment or consumption expenses. Only 20 per cent of remittances are used for (mainly small-scale) investment; the rest is used for consumption expenditures, sometimes as collateral for loans. Lastly, he cited the problem of the high administrative costs of sending money home, as well as the need to give migrants access to banks regardless of residence status.

In his response, de Haas recognized both the relevance of the compensation element of remittances, and the difficulty of quantifying it. With regard to a potential

decline of flows over time, he pointed to the fact that world migration would probably not slow down in the near future, and that it could not be taken for granted that remittances decline over time. De Haas did not think the fact that 80 per cent of remittances were used for consumption purposes constituted a problem, since consumption expenditures have important beneficial effects for household well-being and for local economies.

Human Resource Flows: Brain Drain or Brain Gain?

The consequences of migration for labour markets in developing countries have so far been studied primarily under the conceptual framework of “brain drain”, involving a numerically small number of “elite” migrants moving South to North. But the bulk of migratory flows within Asia, for instance, take place under temporary contract schemes involving mostly semi- and unskilled workers, or migrants in an irregular situation. As a result, return or circular migration is far more prominent. The transient and fluid nature of such forms of migration has different implications for social policy and social services in sending countries than other migration streams (that is, highly skilled and/or permanent). Furthermore, the concept of brain drain has not been examined from an intraregional or South-South perspective. The guiding questions for this session, therefore, revolved around how migration between developing countries affects key social service sectors like health and education, and whether the concept of brain drain is applicable in these contexts.

In his presentation, Jean-Baptiste Meyer used the mobility of health professionals and resulting shortages of medical staff in a number of developing countries as one example that has received recent attention. In the health sector, flows between countries have mainly been from the South to the North, more specifically to a small number of receiving countries in North America and Western Europe. However, new analyses show a trend toward diversification of destinations and of providers of health personnel, with some recent data indicating an increase in South-South flows. Using the same data and comparing the magnitude of outflows with local shortages, however, shows that the outward

mobility of medical staff is but a small part of the countries’ deficit. Nonetheless, Meyer noted that the impact of such outflows on training, education, and the sustainability and reproduction of local capacities in health should be discussed beyond mere quantitative evaluation.

Meyer contended that conventional wisdom on brain drain—that it entails long-term or even permanent loss of human resources—is partly outdated. This is due to significant changes in mobility and communication patterns, including cheaper transportation that facilitates short-term migration and cross-border commuting; increasing return, transmigration and information flows through media satellites; and diaspora contributions to home country initiatives. Thus, Meyer argued, a circulation paradigm has emerged, and the notion of “brain gain” came to the forefront in the 1990s with basically two options: return or diaspora. Return migration has been particularly successful in the case of the Asian newly industrialized countries since the late 1980s, but conditions for replication elsewhere (a prerequisite is strong economic growth) have often been lacking. During the mid-1990s, the diaspora option—that is, the connection of highly skilled expatriates with their country of origin in order to contribute to its development—emerged as a way to mitigate brain drain and the shortage of adequate human resources in the South. As a theoretical paradigmatic shift and alternative policy option, it has come under scrutiny and faced a number of critiques that question the magnitude of the phenomenon, the sustainability of diasporic initiatives and their real impact on the development of the origin countries.

Meyer further explained how the exploration of a public and social policy framework to deal with migration and development leads to a complex picture. There are no recipes for general management since networks, countries, conditions and development processes are multiple and diverse. A clear understanding of the network dynamics and the mediation instruments, or institutions, that connect heterogeneous entities together is required in each specific case.

Meyer suggested that sociological concepts may aid understanding of these dynamics and mediation processes. The specialized literature on social capital,

socioeconomics of innovation and networking provides keys for the interpretation of what happens in diaspora networks. Traditional entities—such as national and local public (state) institutions as well as firms, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and inter-governmental organizations—could be involved in the process of building sustainable diaspora networks.

Discussant Binod Khadria picked up on the issue of the diaspora option having emerged as a possible mitigation of brain drain in the South during the 1990s, while also facing a number of critiques. In this context, he asked, why was the diaspora option not receiving the support that the return option was? Were there vested interests of Northern countries involved in this?

According to Khadria, the double challenge inherent in the diaspora option needed to be brought to the fore and, in so doing (i) convince Southern diaspora leaders in Northern countries to prioritize the diaspora option as a bottom-up strategy of development; and (ii) convince host countries and intergovernmental organizations about the merits of the diaspora option vis-à-vis the return option.

In response, Meyer reiterated the importance of the diaspora option, based in particular on evidence from Asian migrant communities in North America. He acknowledged that greater state involvement and facilitation can reinforce the social orientation of diaspora efforts. In general, though, data constraints are severe and make it difficult to determine what kinds of migrants (labour, refugees, family members of previous migrants and so on) are involved. Furthermore, the ways that migrants socialize in receiving countries depends in large part on their skill levels. For example, while highly skilled migrants tend to rely heavily on networks based on epistemic communities, low-skilled migrants tend to resort to ethnic or kinship ties as a basis for socialization in the host country. Meyer noted that the propensity of diasporas to contribute to development in their home countries depends largely on attitudes in both sending and receiving countries.

One participant urged the plenary to treat the issue of circular migration—and policies designed to promote

it—very carefully, saying that circular migration policies have the potential to hamper development and generally do not allow families to settle permanently. In addition, said this participant, migration cannot be separated from labour market demands and the very concrete structures underlying the organization of production in a society. In this sense, migration cannot be “planned”. This point was exemplified by Japanese labour recruitment, which is characterized by a “just-in-time” approach that corresponds to the just-in-time production imperative.

Following up on these comments, other participants again called for the need to better understand the role of the state in migration and development processes. Discussion of social policy tends to assume a role for the central state, and indeed, Hein de Haas noted that the central state has a fundamental role to play in social development, given that the phenomenon of migration highlights the weakness of states in providing basic social security in the first place. However, as another participant noted, many social impacts of migration occur at the local level, as is the case, for example, with remittances. Migration today often occurs in the context of decentralized or decentralizing social policies, in which local governments are called to play a key role and local populations are expected to participate in decision making. In response, Meyer emphasized that successful efforts by states to coordinate development-oriented investment by diasporas depend on the engagement of many actors beyond the state.

The Implications of Migration for Gender and Care Regimes

With the feminization of migration an increasingly global phenomenon and male out-migration impacting households in sending countries, gender dimensions of migration and social protection demand special attention. The implications of migration for family care remain underexplored. Research on global care chains has focused primarily on female domestic and care workers, with the buoyant global trade in care services fuelled by demand from richer countries and a supply of labour from less affluent countries. But what are the implications of migration for care provisioning in sending countries? This session explored the implications

of migration for gender relations and care provisioning in developing countries, and the relevance of the notion of the global care chain for migration in countries of the South.

In setting out the context of their presentation, Eleonore Kofman and Parvati Raghuram reminded participants that the past decade had seen considerable interest in issues of funding and provision of care in public and social policy. The analytical focus of much of the literature on care activities, concepts and models has, however, largely been limited to countries in the global North. Yet the importance of the social realm in mitigating some of the effects of neoliberal economic policies in the global South is now being acknowledged, and the role of social policy in wider development processes is increasingly recognized.

The presenters alluded to the broader picture, referring to the global shift in the mix between private and public provision that marks neoliberal policies and has caused the role of the state to decrease in terms of direct care provision. Highlighting the gendered nature of care giving, Kofman and Raghuram argued that the impacts of these changes have been felt most acutely by women, who have become incorporated into both formal and informal labour markets as care-givers in many parts of the world. However, this rising labour market participation of women has also resulted in substantial labour shortages in unpaid informal care provision that women had often provided, intensifying demand for paid care-givers. This demand is increasingly being met by migrant female labour.

Thus, according to Kofman and Raghuram, large numbers of female migrants move to provide care in a range of contexts and sites: as domestic workers and as care professionals, such as senior carers, nurses and social workers, who facilitate the care of children, adults, the disabled and elderly within households, in residential homes and hospitals. Women also move for other reasons—as family migrants, petty traders, agricultural and manufacturing workers, sex workers and entertainers, and a range of other professionalized occupations. The mobility of these women also leads to care deficits in the areas they leave behind. Hence, care demands are being both sparked and met through women's employment; this fact highlights the complex

causal relations that tie together migration, gendered labour and care regimes.

The presenters explained that initially the relationship between gender and care was the focus of feminist economics, sociology of work and social policy. More recently, the transfer of labour from the South to the North has captured the attention of researchers and begun to be incorporated into analyses of gendered labour and care regimes that explore the nexus between the three, especially through the concept of global chains of care. Some of this work has also drawn on a rich vein of theorization around feminist ethics of care by feminist philosophers.

But Kofman and Raghuram suggested that knowledge of these three fields has significant gaps and omissions, especially as they relate to the global South. Many aspects of the care regimes of the North have been implicitly assumed to be universal, or have been extrapolated to other contexts without recognition of their limited applicability. Conceptual questions around the nexus of migration, gender and care have also been framed, and models developed, with a primacy of South-North migration in mind. It is important to unsettle some of the assumptions that underlie this analysis and to lay out some questions that might need to be addressed to make questions of care in the South reflect local realities.

Drawing attention to the household and the community, for example, Kofman and Raghuram described how the household throughout the North is growing more complex due to commodification, the changing presence of the private, community and state sectors, and the increasing deployment of migrant labour to provide care under different kinds of employment contracts. Unpaid and paid labour coexist, at times generating hybrid forms of formal and non-formal. The household is weakly regulated and the state seems more concerned with ensuring the rapid circulation of labour, especially in certain Asian states. At the same time, the role of the third sector, community, as a care provider has grown at the formal end. At the less formal end of the spectrum are the voluntary activities, organized by religious and other associations, or by neighbours. As the discussion on remittances had highlighted, the relationship between family and community requires closer attention.

By alluding to the shifts that have occurred in care regimes in the North and South and by highlighting similarities and differences of processes and arrangements, Kofman and Raghuram concluded that neither of the categories of North and South should be treated as homogeneous. The North comprises a number of welfare regime types that are continually being reshaped—by neoliberal restructuring of the welfare state, for example, as well as by dissemination of European norms and policies, especially in relation to child care. The South too is heterogeneous: it includes middle-income countries that are poles of migration, and have begun implementing active social policies and/or intervened in the provision of care; countries largely exporting care labour; and countries where the care system has been devastated by the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Development of social policy and care in countries of the South is more likely to take the form of subsidies, and regulation of the voluntary and private sectors, than any direct provision. It will also be driven by care deficits generated by women working outside the home in both sending and receiving countries, primarily but not exclusively in the care sector (domestics and carers in the home; or carers and nurses in the private, voluntary and public formal sector).

Thanh-Dam Truong and Diane Sainsbury were the discussants for this presentation. First, Truong agreed with Kofman and Raghuram that the usual analytical models tend to be too Eurocentric; they emerged in Europe, and derived from theorizing about restructuring of the European welfare state and the defence of “the social” as culturally experienced. More anthropological (micro-level) work is needed, she said, on “circles of support” to provide supplementary insights into an economic-centred model. She called for studies on care as “a lived experience of care receivers and providers”, and suggested that the nature of circles of support could enhance or depreciate its quality.

In her remarks, Diane Sainsbury defended the usual analytical models as useful tools, but commented that in the presentation, the discussion of “care regimes” seemed to be overshadowed by the notion of “care chains”. She also made the much broader point (relevant to all the presentations) about the problem of “travelling concepts” when engaging in comparative, or even global, studies. How useful is a concept or

analytical framework that has been formulated for analysis of a particular context when it is transposed to other contexts?

Several participants took up the discussion on the meaning and usefulness of the regime approach for analysing welfare, social policy and care patterns, as well as on the significance of the care chain concept as a means to trace exploitation with regard to migrants employed in the domestic and care sectors of receiving countries. Kofman and Raghuram acknowledged the limitations of traditional welfare regime approaches and the transferability of the notion of welfare states to the developing world. They also underlined that the concept of regime is not a static one, but open to change. Furthermore, they noted, using social policy and welfare concepts might enrich discussions in the South because they provide a language of rights and entitlements, regardless of whether or not the policies can actually be implemented.

Migration and Social Development: Organizational and Political Dimensions

Migrants also impact social policy and service provisioning through organizations, in both sending and receiving countries, that defend the interests of migrants, their families and their communities. Through various formal and informal mechanisms, migrants are also increasing their influence on political structures and local- and national-level decision-making processes in sending countries. This panel looked at the organizational and political linkages that have a bearing on social policy and service provisioning; tried to identify visible trends in cooperation on migration policy in Southern regional contexts; and explored the applicability of transnationalism or transnational networks (and their relevance for social policy) in a South-South context.

Nicola Piper began her presentation by pointing to the important role played by migrant associations, trade unions and other relevant civil society organizations in providing crucial services and political advocacy for migrants, given the general absence of public policies targeting migrant

populations. The gap in service provisioning and advocacy has, therefore, largely been filled by civil society, and this role has been recognized by academics as well as policy makers.

Piper highlighted the different types of organizations involved in migrant issues. All of these organizations have their respective strengths and weaknesses, based on their organizational “histories”, structures and the different political regimes under which they operate. These characteristics both provide opportunities for and place limitations on migrants’ advocacy and political organization.

Piper argued that in order to have some influence on policy making at the global, regional and national levels, political participation and collective organizing of, and by, migrants, as well as the formation of alliances between various organizations, are vital to build up a stronger movement. This, however, only works on the basis of governments’ recognition of migrants’ rights to organize, join trade unions or form other types of organizations.

Against this backdrop, Piper explored the various formal and informal mechanisms and processes through which migrants can, and do, attempt to influence political structures and decision-making processes at local, national and regional levels. These processes, and the choice of or obstacles to certain institutional channels, are shaped by varying opportunity structures. Migrants face obstacles based on multiple factors: their specific migration “story” (for example, mode of entry, labour market positioning, skill level, ethnicity, gender and so on); political space for joining existing, or establishing new, organizations; differing strengths and weaknesses of the different organizations that engage with migrant issues.

What has emerged in recent scholarship is that self-organizing by migrants and cross-organizational alliances are vital to struggles for better policies and services to protect migrants and their families. Also, there is some evidence (especially from research in Asia) that intraregional networks are being formed. Piper highlighted important conceptual and empirical gaps in the existing literature, including (i) the feasibility and practicality of transnational policy making, and (ii) the

role of organizations in advocacy and service provisioning aimed at migrants and their families at all stages of the migration process (including pre-migration, migration/left-behind stage and return). She called for further exploration of the meaning(s) of “trans-national”, ideally from a multisited set of data. As it stands, country-specific case studies still predominate and truly transnational methodologies are rarely employed.

Piper went on to address the following questions, in the context of temporary contract schemes:

- How is the cross-border nature of migration reflected in the transnational operation of trade unions?
- How can the serious limitations of conventional trade unionism in organizing migrant workers be overcome?
- What is the specific nature of social movement unionism? Are alliances formed among the myriad of civil society organizations?
- What is the significance of other civil society groups (for example, lawyer associations or faith-based organizations) as actors in promoting migrants’ rights, and what is their positioning within existing nodes and networks?

On the issue of the migration-development nexus, Piper argued that the celebration of migrants as “agents of development” is laudable at one level, in the sense that they are not considered merely victims of underdevelopment, but it is not sufficient to limit inquiry to the economic sphere. Migrants want to be recognized beyond their role as *economic* agents by being given more say in policy-making processes and thereby also becoming players in the *political* process. Diaspora and other migrant associations need to be considered as partners in development, not as clients. Therefore, the notion of “co-development” must also be applied to the political sphere. In other words, more dialogue is needed among scholars working on social policy, social movements and transnational politics, development and migration studies.

As the discussant for this presentation, Dan Gallin suggested that overarching issues of exploitation and power relations also need to be considered when discussing the condition of migrant workers. He welcomed the emphasis on the need for migrant workers

to organize collectively, as only then can they become agents of development and not only “victims” of underdevelopment. This is a rights-based approach, inasmuch as rights are not something bestowed upon people by superior forces but rather something people must fight for and be able to claim from a position of strength. However, he took issue with the “overly general” statement on the “global decline” of unions based on economic restructuring, and the difficulties unions have with informal workers. He argued that although real, these issues should not be overstated; there are plenty of examples indicating that the dire situation of the 1980s and 1990s has been somewhat reversed. Furthermore, Gallin said, the factor of repression is understated. In essence, criticizing the failings of unions amounts to blaming the victim. In many countries, unions would be stronger if labour rights and freedom of association were fully respected.

Workshop participants raised a number of other issues in the plenary discussion, including the importance of taking into account local research and literature on migration in order to gain new insights; the difference between legal entitlement and practical access to social protection and services; and the relationship between different types of organizations like NGOs and trade unions, and their respective (or joint) capacity to influence policy and the political process. In her response, Piper referred to the changing landscape of migrants’ political organizations and the importance of context when making judgements about the role and effectiveness of different organizations like trade unions or NGOs.

Regional Dynamics

The final panel of the workshop was devoted to presentations and discussion of overview studies on intraregional migration patterns and dynamics in Latin America, Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, to explore differences and commonalities with reference to migration in Southern regional contexts and the implications for social policy.

Latin America

Andrés Solimano presented the case of Latin America, a region of net emigration (that is, where emigration

outpaces immigration) to the rest of the world. At the same time, he said, intraregional migration is growing among economies sharing common borders and common language but with large differences in per capita income, such as Peru and Chile or Bolivia and Argentina. In Central American countries, major South-South migration flows take place from Nicaragua to Costa Rica, from Haiti to the Dominican Republic and from Guatemala, Honduras (and others) to Mexico, which in turn may be a transit step to get to the United States or Canada. South-South migration in Latin America is, thus, chiefly dominated by intraregional migration: 3.4 million people live and work in a different Latin American and Caribbean country from where they were born. The bulk of Latin American flows are South-North migration, although the proportion of South-South migration is far from small.

Solimano then outlined the common factors that drive both South-North and South-South international migration flows. In the Latin American context, development gaps, both with respect to developed countries and among developing countries, affect the magnitude and direction of migration flows. Moreover, recurrent economic instability, growth and financial crises, poverty, inequality and informal employment are characteristics of the regional economic and social landscape that have affected migration flows, in spite of the recovery of economic growth—largely associated with a boom in commodity prices—in the last five years. Political factors have also been important in driving migration flows in Latin America both in the past and, in some countries, at present, blurring refugee and economic migration streams. The military regimes in the 1960s and 1970s in Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay propelled exile and emigration, mainly of professionals and intellectuals. On the other hand, the four-decades-old conflict in Colombia and the current political change and turbulence in Venezuela have led to middle and upper class emigration from these countries to the United States and elsewhere.

Solimano contended that international migration poses a challenge to social policy delivery in both sending and receiving countries. On the one hand, governments in Latin America are starting to recognize the requirements of social protection and

legal support for their own nationals residing abroad (emigrants). On the other hand, in receiving countries migrants without full legal status may face difficulties accessing stable jobs and social services, such as health, education, housing, pensions and unemployment insurance, for themselves and their families. In addition, migrants often work in informal activities in recipient economies (in domestic service, food service or agriculture), and as such are unlikely to be covered by formal systems of social protection. They have high levels of exposure to adverse employment and income shocks, and limited possibilities to cope with risks through market and social insurance. Low-income migrants also find financial and insurance markets more difficult to access. In general, the social protection coverage provided by the state is higher for nationals than it is for immigrants. Solimano explained that social policy always has a component of redistribution attached to it, as those who pay taxes are not exactly the same as those who receive social benefits. Because international migrants tend to have limited political clout in receiving countries, their demand for redistribution is weaker than nationals'. This may affect the receipt of tax-financed social benefits by migrants.

Solimano showed that these risks can be mitigated through a variety of private, public and community mechanisms such as self-insurance, family and network support, market insurance, and social insurance by the state or by NGOs and civil society organizations. He added that migration often leads to increases in demand for social services in receiving countries in both North and South.

The discussants for this presentation were Annelies Zoomers and Philip Muus. Zoomers raised some complementary issues, including the importance of South-South migration from Asia to Latin America; the particularity in the Latin American context of a common language, which facilitates migration; the neglect in most analysis of transit migrants and indigenous migrants as unique categories; and the fact that simplifying migration motives in the region to an ex-ante risk-spreading strategy does not cover migrants who leave their country as a response to crises and natural disasters (ex-post decisions). Muus emphasized the importance of former

colonial ties for migration patterns, also in terms of dual citizenship, which is not accessible for most indigenous people. He reiterated the importance of local governments, communities and NGOs in delivering social protection in a context of decentralization or weak coverage of local populations by centralized state agencies. Finally, Muus emphasized the need to study possible differences in the use of remittances and risk management between different countries in the region.

In his response, Solimano acknowledged the importance of disaggregating different types of migrants and migration destinations, although such analysis is often hampered by a lack of data. He further noted that although migration induced by crises and catastrophes might not appear to be part of a risk-reducing strategy, it still fit into the framework as risk diversification with regard to the sometimes uncertain impact of crises on individuals and households in the short and medium term.

Asia

Binod Khadria started his presentation by stressing the enormous regional heterogeneity of Asia, arguing that it comprises distinct subregions, including Central, Eastern, Southern, South-Eastern and Western Asia. This changes the scope required for an examination of migration in Asia, from a broad brush approach toward one that highlights its "intra-subregional" character. In his analysis, he focused on social policy in South Asia, because it presents a uniquely balanced case accounting for half of all outward migration, the other half being South-North migration. In fact, he said, the subregion presents a microcosm of complex social realities arising from an interaction between both South-South and South-North migration.

Khadria then outlined the implications of these dimensions by grouping them into three distinct categories: remittance costs (for example banking fees), safety nets and post-return re-assimilation. He explored how the relatively smoother and lower-cost remittances between the countries of South Asia enhance state capacity for social service provisioning; what social safety nets are necessary for combating the negative effects of temporary migration and its corollary of return migration; and what social policy measures are available for re-assimilation of migrants

and returnees in their home countries, communities and families. He cited examples of social welfare policies and interventions in selected countries: Bangladesh, China, India, Pakistan, the Philippines and Sri Lanka.

Khadria recommended a more holistic approach to social policy aimed at establishing Asia's link with its diaspora for sustainable social development in the region as a whole, alongside economic and political development. In this context, he suggested that regional economic groups, like the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) should envisage a common platform for social development. If "diasporic resources" were used to better advantage, he said, it could be possible to attain the proverbial "win-win-win" situation for all three stakeholders—Asian countries of origin, Asian migrants as a regional diaspora and migrant-receiving countries. In Khadria's view, this might entail a trade-off between promoting trade and business in the short run, and long-run reduction in two kinds of social poverty in the region—the "poverty of education" and the "poverty of health"—both very potent areas for social policy to make a sustainable contribution to overall development.

Khadria argued that the vulnerabilities in Asian developing countries that arise from the unstable migration policies of Northern countries can be ameliorated through interventions in social service provisioning and social policy, without which the economic policies of growth will always remain lopsided. These vulnerabilities affect both the migrants and their families at the micro level, and the societies and countries of migrants at the macro level. Khadria argued that the first concrete steps toward bridging this gap would be for Southern countries to cooperate and show solidarity based on research and evidence.

The comments by discussants Gabriele Köhler and Eskil Wadensjö echoed concerns about the wide diversity not only within the Asian region, but also among different categories of migrants. Köhler pointed to the differences between formal and informal sector migrants, those migrating South-North and those migrating South-South. She commented that the high prevalence of internal migration, especially in South Asia, was not taken up in

Khadria's presentation. According to Wadensjö, the different geographical areas in Asia at times reflect wide variations in levels of economic development, political regime, dominant form of migration as well as current policies toward migration and migrants. Adequate social policies, while relevant to all groups in all areas, will necessarily mirror this diversity. Khadria agreed that subsequent research must focus more closely on these intraregional differences, and he emphasized the need for more and better data availability across the region.

Confronted with this immense intraregional variation, Köhler's discussion centred more specifically on South Asia, and further focused on the impact on children of labour market migration, an area for which the vital role of social policy is perhaps most apparent. According to data from the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), migration impacts on children in different ways. There are children who migrate on their own, those who migrate with their parents, and those who are left behind when adults migrate. Each situation generates its own policy needs. Köhler highlighted three broad sets of policies to help bridge social policies (especially for children) and migration policies: one set of policies to address migration *indirectly*, through harmonization of labour market legislation or facilitation of employment creation, for example; one to address migration *directly*, such as creating and monitoring labour migration organizations (for example labour bureaus) and bilateral labour market regulatory frameworks; and finally, a set of policies to address the impact of migration on children specifically. These latter policies would include compulsory education, portable and free primary health care services and school meal entitlements, incentives for school enrolment aimed at reducing child labour, and incentives for care provision to address the situation of children left behind.

Africa

Similar to the Asia study, Aderanti Adepoju's paper pointed to the heterogeneity of Africa and focused on sub-Saharan Africa (SSA).³ Within SSA, as in the other regions, internal, intraregional and international migration take place within diverse socioethnic, political and economic contexts. In contrast to the other regions, emigration pressures in SSA are fuelled not only by

³ The paper was presented by Frank Laczko, because the author could not attend the event.

unstable politics, poverty and rapidly growing populations but also by ethno-religious conflicts, blurring the distinction between refugee and economic migrant. Unlike in other regions of the world, these migrations are largely intraregional.

Adepoju further showed that these complex configurations are changing dynamically and are reflected in increasing female migration, diversification of migration destinations, transformation of labour flows into commercial migration, and the emigration of skilled health and other professionals from the region. The formation of subregional economic unions to some extent simulates the kind of homogeneous societies that once existed in the subregions. Such unions are often dominated by a single country's economy toward which people tend to migrate. Many countries are concurrently experiencing challenges as well as opportunities with respect to the emigration of skilled professionals, diaspora links with countries of origin, and migrants' remittances from within and outside the region. At present most countries lack synchronized migration policies and programmes, as well as appropriate data to inform such policies.

Moreover Adepoju noted, in spite of its rich and diversified resources, SSA is the world's poorest major region, with most countries ranking low in terms of human development indicators. Illiteracy remains high, and health conditions continue to deteriorate. There are few if any signs of improvement in social conditions, as many countries have failed to create jobs despite pursuing stringent structural adjustment policies. In reality, the already poor social conditions of individuals and families are rendered poorer by stabilization and adjustment measures, and families have borne the brunt of government reductions in spending in the social sectors. Access to education, health and other social services has been curtailed, reducing the overall welfare of the population, particularly the poor.

On the issue of social policy, Adepoju explained, Africa's social policy framework is woven around the key areas of employment, education and health; therefore, the performance of social policies is measured by the level of human and social development, which is in turn determined by the income, education and life expectancy of the population. In the area of health, migrants'

vulnerable conditions and restricted access to health services make them especially susceptible to risk. As elsewhere, migrants in Africa usually experience greater difficulty than other groups in accessing social services and hence in exercising their rights, as a result of problems related to ethnicity and identity, and discriminatory policies and practices in host countries. Migrants and refugees who are not considered citizens with full rights may be denied access to services. The situation of women can be precarious, and that of migrant women more traumatic, as they are also excluded from access to credit and land. Women suffer discrimination at various levels—from birth, at home, in the school, at the workplace and in society—and their access to employment is severely restricted: they further experience discrimination in securing employment and equal pay with men for the same qualification and job profile.

The myriad problems throughout SSA—worsening health condition of the population, poverty, unemployment, and the socioeconomic insecurity and inequalities that aggravate and widen rural/urban disparities, a deficit of decent work, poor quality of social services, lack of popular participation and endemic corruption—are further complicated by unreliable data to track trends in social indicators. Yet, as Adepoju argued, more and more people will be living in cities and require basic amenities (housing, clean water, health care). The challenges of growing urbanization have to be tackled, and traditional attitudes toward women's participation in wage employment and politics must be resolved in order to enhance social policy formulation and implementation in the region. Above all, the interrelations between migration and social policy must be explicitly appreciated and social policies appropriately incorporated into national development and migration policy frameworks. These are challenges, Adepoju concluded, that officials have to confront for the region to develop sustainably.

Joakim Palme summarized the discussant comments that had been provided by John Oucho.⁴ According to Oucho, Adepoju's analysis—although thorough, given that it treats a region that is just beginning to appreciate the interrelations between social policy and migration—

⁴ Also unable to attend.

could be enhanced by greater attention to social policy. In general, it is unclear how migration policy fits within the social policy framework of different countries, and examination of how various regional migration frameworks (such as the African Union or the New Partnership for African Development) are considered in terms of social policy or migrants' rights, or are applied in sub-Saharan Africa, would be especially helpful. Oucho also suggested greater attention to how migrants' rights relating to health, education and housing have been upheld or violated by SSA countries of destination that have acceded to international conventions and protocols guiding international migration, migrants and their families; as well as more sinister issues such as xenophobia and the negative policy changes that have compelled intra-SSA migrants to either return to their countries of origin or emigrate to the North.

Both Adepoyu's analysis and Oucho's comments highlighted the need for more systematic research and data collection in the region in order to strengthen the capacities of African scholars studying the links between social policy and migration. Frank Laczko and others in the plenary noted the difficulty of making intraregional comparisons based on the regional experiences, because social policy and migration tend to be broadly defined. Clear definition of a framework of analysis would benefit future research endeavours.

Concluding Remarks

In the final discussion, the organizers reiterated that migration has both national and international, or transnational, dimensions and therefore affects policy at all levels. Migration also has impacts on economic development, gender roles and care regimes, social protection and redistribution, and relationships between citizens themselves and vis-à-vis the state, in both sending and receiving countries. Migration thus impacts on all spheres of social policy, going beyond the national level, although the national level is still considered to be the point of reference for social policy. Finally, while migrants and their families are often perceived as agents of change, sending financial and "social" remittances (such as knowledge, skills, norms and behaviours acquired in the destination country) back home, they are

also a highly vulnerable group, exposed to very specific risks and hardships, and requiring special protection.

The plenary repeatedly emphasized the need for a better understanding of social development, social policy and policy models, especially with regard to concepts like policy coherence or the role attached to migrants in the current global economic order. In this vein, Katja Hujo suggested that social policy should be placed in a broader context of economic and social development, a fact that clearly emerged out of the regional papers. Nicola Piper recalled that the migration phenomenon is embedded in the context of globalization, or rather, regionalization. In this sense, it is also influenced by external policy and by the engagement of political organizations in advocacy for migrants' rights, nationally and transnationally, through networks. Furthermore, policy responses with regard to migration can only be understood by looking at how they interlink with the development model adopted in the countries concerned.

As the final plenary discussion focused on welfare/policy regimes and how migration influences, contradicts or supports specific welfare or care regimes, Hujo pointed out two important phenomena related to migration and how they can be linked to the policy regime concept: remittances and care regimes. Remittances are private transfers in foreign currency that are usually spent on private consumption and, to a lesser extent, on investment. Investing remittances in the formation of human capital (through health and education, for example) is a form of self-insurance and market insurance, whereas the link to the public social sector is weak (in terms of financing and provisioning). With regard to future research on this subject, Hujo suggested thinking about how migration, and financial and human resource flows, support or challenge specific regimes. In a liberalized context, labour market migration is usually driven by and supports a liberal welfare model (for example, by providing cheap labour for the care sector in receiving countries, or by allowing families in countries of origin to contract paid labour for care activities), but might challenge a more social-democratic or corporatist model (to use Esping-Anderson's welfare categories).

Lastly, on the issue of policy coherence, participants noted that social policies differ, as do economic policies. It is

indeed possible to design “coherent” policy regimes based on different ideologies, paradigms or development models. Post–Washington consensus social policies contradict a social-democratic model, which is based on universalism and a rights-based approach. On the contrary, the post–Washington consensus model combines a liberal market approach to economic policy making with market-based insurance and targeted benefits for the needy. It is not clear from the outset which model would offer greater benefits for migrants. A liberal and more market-based welfare system might be more inclusive to those formal sector professional migrants with ability to pay. A more universal one with free access to health and education is also migrant-friendly, although it depends on how rights to access are defined (as a right on paper and in practice) and on the quality of these services. In terms of the traditional “Western”-style welfare models, the corporatist model could turn out to be the most exclusive one, in particular for illegal migrants and members of the informal sector. However, the applicability of these concepts encounters significant limitations in developing countries where social protection systems are fragmented, incomplete and

of a dualistic nature, or not yet introduced at all; and where they exist, tend to be limited to the formal economy (that is, people working in the informal sector are not covered, regardless of whether or not they are migrants).

The workshop provided a first attempt to explicitly link economic migration, social development and social policy in South-South migration contexts. As evidenced in this report, the presentations highlighted the complexity involved in analysing migration as it relates to transformations in social welfare, social institutions and social relations in origin and destination developing countries. A key objective of this initiative was to expand the range of options available to developing countries faced with increasing migration by integrating social policy and migration debates. As such, the broad regional comparisons between Latin America, Asia and sub-Saharan Africa introduced theoretical and empirical elements that should form the basis for further empirical work on this subject. Such an approach is critically relevant for both South-South and South-North migration contexts.

Agenda and Papers Presented

Thursday, 22 November 2007

Opening Session

9.30 – 10.00 *Welcome and Introduction*—Joakim Palme, Frank Laczko

10.00 – 10.30 *Migration and Social Policy in Developing Countries: What Are the Issues?*—Nicola Piper, Katja Hujo

Session 1 *Migration, Poverty and Social Policy: Examining Linkages*

Chair—Joakim Palme

11.00 – 12.30 *Presentation of Thematic Papers*

- *Migration and Social Policy: Implications for Developing Countries*—Jane Pillinger
Discussant—Kristof Tamas
- *Migration and Poverty: Linkages, Knowledge Gaps and Policy Implications*—Arjan De Haan and Shahin Yaqub
Discussant—Frank Laczko

12.30 – 13.00 *Plenary Discussion*

Session 2 *Financial and Human Resource Flows: Issues for Developing Countries*

Chair—Per Lundborg

14.30 – 16.00 *Presentation of Thematic Papers*

- *Remittances and Social Development: A Conceptual Review of the Literature*—Hein de Haas
Discussant—Andrés Solimano
- *Human Resource Flows From and Between Developing Countries: Implications for Social and Public Policies*—Jean-Baptiste Meyer
Discussant—Binod Khadria

16.00 – 16.30 *Plenary Discussion*

Friday, 23 November 2007

Session 3 *Migration: Gender, Actors and Strategies*

Chair – Frank Laczko

8.30 – 10.00 *Presentation of Thematic Papers*

- *The Implications of Migration for Gender and Care Regimes in the South*—Eleonore Kofman and Parvati Raghuram
Discussants—Thanh-Dam Truong, Diane Sainsbury
- *Migration and Social Development: Organizational and Political Dimensions*—Nicola Piper
Discussant—Dan Gallin

10.00 – 10.30 *Plenary Discussion*

Session 4 *Migration in the Developing World: Regional Dynamics*

Chair—Jan O. Karlsson

11.00 – 13.00 *Presentation of the Regional Issues Papers*

- *International Migration, Risk Management and Social Policy: The Latin American Case*—Andrés Solimano
Discussants—Annelies Zoomers, Philip Muus
- *Migration and Social Policy in Asia*—Binod Khadria
Discussants—Gabriele Köhler, Eskil Wadensjö
- *Migration and Social Policy in Sub-Saharan Africa*—Aderanti Adepoju
Discussant—John Oucho

13.00 – 13.30 *Plenary Discussion*

Concluding Remarks

14.30 – 15.00 *Lessons from Thematic and Regional Papers for Research and Policy Making*—Nicola Piper

15.00 – 16.00 *Plenary Discussion*

16.00 – 16.30 *Wrap Up and Outlook*—Katja Hujo

Ms. Eva **Åkerman Börje**
Swedish Ministry of Justice, Sweden

Mr. Måns **Fellesson**
Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sweden

Mr. Dan **Gallin**
Global Labour Institute, Switzerland

Mr. Hein **de Haas**
University of Oxford, United Kingdom

Mr. Peo **Hansen**
Linköping University, Sweden

Ms. Katja **Hujo**
UNRISD, Switzerland

Mr. Jan O. **Karlsson**
Co-Chair, Global Commission on International Migration
Sweden

Mr. Binod **Khadria**
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Ms. Eleonore **Kofman**
Middlesex University, United Kingdom

Ms. Gabriele **Köhler**
UNICEF, Nepal

Mr. Frank **Laczko**
IOM, Switzerland

Mr. Per **Lundborg**
Stockholm University, Sweden

Ms. Kajsa **Marsk**
Sida, Sweden

Ms. Shea **McClanahan**
UNRISD, Switzerland

Mr. Jean-Baptiste **Meyer**
IRD, France

Mr. Philip **Muus**
Malmö University, Sweden

Ms. Ylva Sörman **Nath**
Sida, Sweden

Mr. Thomas **Niedomysl**
Institute for Futures Studies, Sweden

Mr. Esse **Nilsson**
Sida, Sweden

Ms. Minna **Örnéus**
Sida, Sweden

Mr. Joakim **Palme**
Institute for Futures Studies, Sweden

Ms. Jane **Pillinger**
Consultant, Ireland

Ms. Nicola **Piper**
Swansea University, United Kingdom

Ms. Katri **Pohjolainen Yap**
Sida, Sweden

Ms. Parvati **Raghuram**
The Open University, United Kingdom

Ms. Lisa **Román**
Sida, Sweden

Ms. Diane **Sainsbury**
Stockholm University, Sweden

Ms. Anne **Sisask**
Sida, Sweden

Mr. Andrés **Solimano**
ECLAC, Chile

Mr. Welat **Songur**
Sweden

Mr. Kristof **Tamas**
European Commission, Belgium

Ms. Eva **Tobisson**
Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sweden

Ms. Thanh-Dam **Truong**
Institute for Social Studies, Netherlands

Mr. Tsegaye **Tegenu**
Institute for Futures Studies, Sweden

Mr. Eskil **Wadensjö**
Stockholm University, Sweden

Mr. Shahin **Yaquob**
Innocenti Research Centre, Italy

Ms. Annelies **Zoomers**
University of Amsterdam, Netherlands

As the leading international organization for migration, the **International Organization for Migration (IOM)** acts with its partners in the international community to assist in meeting the growing operational challenges of migration management, advance understanding of migration issues, encourage social and economic development through migration, and uphold the human dignity and well-being of migrants. The IOM conducts research designed to guide and inform migration policy and practice, and provides a unique space for consultation between researchers and policy makers.

The mission of the **Institute for Futures Studies (IFS)** is the pursuit of research aimed at encouraging a broad and open debate on significant future threats to and opportunities for societal development. Under its 2005–2008 research programme, “Society and the Future”, the IFS is carrying out multidisciplinary research under five themes: Citizenship and the Transformation of Welfare Institutions; Social Exclusion Processes and Childhood Conditions; Regions in transition; Demographically Based Futures Studies; and Economic Development and Intergenerational Distribution in an Ageing Society. The IFS is also involved in research on migration and development.

The **United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD)** is an autonomous agency engaging in multidisciplinary research on the social dimensions of contemporary problems affecting development. Its work is guided by the conviction that, for effective development policies to be formulated, an understanding of the social and political context is crucial. The Institute attempts to provide governments, development agencies, grassroots organizations and scholars with a better understanding of how development policies and processes of economic, social and environmental change affect different social groups. Working through an extensive network of national research centres, UNRISD aims to promote original research and strengthen research capacity in developing countries.

Current research programmes include: Social Policy and Development; Democracy, Governance and Well-Being; Markets, Business and Regulation; Civil Society and Social Movements; Identities, Conflict and Cohesion; and Gender and Development.

A list of the Institute’s free and priced publications can be obtained by contacting the UNRISD Reference Centre, Palais des Nations, 1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland; phone 41 (0)22 9173020; fax 41 (0)22 9170650; info@unrisd.org; www.unrisd.org.

In addition to seed funding by the three organizing institutions, UNRISD is grateful to the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) for providing the bulk of the funding for the research and workshop. UNRISD also thanks the governments of Denmark, Mexico, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom for their core funding.

This **UNRISD Conference News** was written by Nicola Piper, Shea McClanahan and Katja Hujo.

**United Nations Research Institute
for Social Development (UNRISD)
Palais des Nations
1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland**

**Phone 41 (0)22 9173020
Fax 41 (0)22 9170650
info@unrisd.org
www.unrisd.org**