

1 Introduction

Issues and debates on family-related migration and the migrant family: A European perspective

*Eleonore Kofman, Albert Kraler, Martin Kohli
and Camille Schmoll*

1.1 Introduction

In recent years there has been growing interest in research and policy about family migrations and migrant families, resulting in an increasing number of projects,¹ publications and specialised conferences.² In all European states the migration of family members, which includes those accompanying workers as well as those joining citizens and settled migrants, is significant in migratory flows. In Southern Europe, there has been a dramatic increase in family flows due to larger numbers of economic migrants, regularisation programmes and introduction of legislation for family reunification. However, family migration has generally not led to debates on this topic. In Northern European states, public debate has focused on the supposedly problematic and traditional migrant family, whether it be the subordinate spouse who does not participate in the labour market, unruly and easily radicalised boys or girls being forced to conform to backward practices, such as forced and arranged marriages (Grillo this volume; Hester, Chantler, Devgon, Sharma & Singleton 2008; *Migrations Sociétés* 2008; Preller 2008; Rude-Antoine 2005; Sauer & Strasser 2008). In some instances female migrants are considered as being a more easily 'assimilated' group compared to the stigmatisation of male migrants, particularly the second generation who are frequently viewed as deviants.

The family in question (Grillo 2008) probes into the family as a contested and politicised terrain, as well as a moral order and marker of difference in multicultural societies, exploring the multiple representations of family life and practices. Whilst family migrations are complex, immigration regulations have sought to contain their geographical reach and structures; they define the composition of the family and restrict its flexibility, frequently reinforce gender inequalities and truncate the cohabitation of generations. States have institutionalised families and through juridical and political instruments constructed the modern family (Bourdieu 1996). A certain concept of family and family life has been an essential part of the conception of what constitutes a good citizen and the

moral order (Schmidt 2007). This does not mean that only those forms favoured by the state exist, or that groups are unable to broaden the range of familial forms supported by the state, for example, the recognition of civil partnerships and marriage between same-sex partners.

However, by stigmatising migrant families through representing their forms and relationships as a threat to Western modernity and a burden on the welfare system, the state is able to define and mould a permissible migrant family in extremely narrow terms. Thus the entry regulations laid down by the state construct family membership, its roles and functions (Strasser, Kraller, Bonjour & Bilger 2009; Toner 2007). In defining rights and obligations amongst family members, immigration and associated social policies contribute to the construction and reconstruction of the boundaries between the public and the private and between productive and reproductive spheres. These conditions both constrain what the migrant family can do and the opportunities it has to reshape and reconstitute itself and maintain links with its broader kin across national boundaries.

As many of the chapters in this volume demonstrate, the effect of restrictions and opportunities upon family members varies and is stratified by nationality, class, educational levels and age, to list some of the significant social divisions. So, too, does the family's ability to reproduce itself transnationally differ considerably according to the social capital and resources possessed by migrants.

For several decades in the post-war period and until the 1990s, family migrations were depicted as consisting primarily of family reunification with the pioneering male being followed by the dependent female who only marginally, if at all, participated in the labour market. Bohning's typology (1984), based on a simplistic periodisation of a labour recruitment phase followed by family reunification phase, demonstrates this view. However, there were relatively few studies of the diverse relationships between labour migration, family structures and gender relations (Ryan & Webster 2008; for early examples of studies of the impact of labour migration on gender and family relations see Mirdal 1984, Münscher 1984 and Neyer 1986; Abadan-Unat synthesis of her own early research in Abadan-Unat 2005). Yet family migration was already significant during the labour migration period in France, Germany and the United Kingdom, and became even more so in other countries as well once mass labour migration was stopped in the early 1970s (González-Ferrer 2007; Kofman, Phizacklea, Raghuram & Sales 2000). Thus, at the end of labour recruitment in Germany in 1973, women accounted for more than 30 per cent of migrant stocks from the main countries of recruitment (Italy, Spain, Greece, Turkey, Portugal, Yugoslavia), clearly contradicting the perception of guest worker migration as involving predominantly single men. Their presence was seen as enabling men to settle down in stable communities. Pictorial representations of migrant life, as seen in Berger and Mohr's

(1975) aptly titled book, *Seventh man*, reaffirmed the role of women in home life. This was of course the image of migrant communities before studies of female migration began to highlight their presence in the labour market (Morokvasic 1984), showing that 'birds of passage' were also female.

While the debate on family migration was largely absent during the periods of post-colonial and classic guest worker migration, a number of related issues were raised. The first was that of binational marriages,³ exemplified by the debates in the Netherlands in the 1950s on the admission and non-admission of non-Dutch women married (or formerly married) to Dutch men from Indonesia (see Van Walsum this volume). Similarly there was public campaigning for divorced wives and widows of Dutch men in Indonesia (Schrover 2009). Such discussions were particularly pertinent until the 1980s, when a woman would lose her citizenship or become stateless upon marrying a foreigner (De Hart 2006; Studer 2001; Reinecke 2008). Furthermore, being dependants themselves, women could not bring in men as their 'imported dependants' (Bhabha & Shutter 1994). Nor could women pass on their citizenship to children (De Hart & Van Oers 2006).

Children, too, were also significant in these flows. In the UK in the 1960s, for example, they formed 60 per cent of dependants (Kofman et al. 2000: 53) within family flows, which outnumbered labour entries. At the same time, concerns were expressed about the children left behind; their proportion in a migrant population varied considerably according to nationality (Charbit & Bertrand 1985). And the more that women have migrated alone, so, too, has the number of children left in the care of others in the country grown and become a major academic and policy concern (Parreñas 2005; Pratt 2008; Verseck 2008).⁴ After the cessation of labour recruitment, many labour migrants who had not yet reunified with their families increasingly did so. However, numbers of separated or partly separated families remained high in some countries, reflecting legal obstacles to reunification, lack of resources as well as educational strategies in the case of children left behind (Kraler 2010b but, for contrasting examples, see González-Ferrer 2007 on Germany). The cessation of recruitment, however, not only led to increased levels of family reunification, but the number of children born in the country of immigration also increased. Thus, the percentage of births of children born to two foreign parents in the total number of births in West Germany increased from 3.6 per cent in 1965 to 7.8 per cent in 1970, and rose to 20 per cent of all births in 1975 (Wilpert in Bilger 2010).

As migrant families began to settle, they were often represented as being caught between two cultures (Fernandez de la Hoz 2002; Watson 1977). Too often the migrant family was reduced to its problematic aspects, focusing on the conflict between husband and wife and between genera-

tions. French research, for example, drew attention to polygamy amongst African women, parental violence, forced marriages amongst North African and Turkish girls and the authoritarianism of husbands (Vatz Laroussi 2001). However, more recent research has called into question the generalised image of dependant family members and, in particular, female family members as potential victims in processes of family reunification. These studies show that similar outcomes of family-related migration are experienced differently by different categories of migrants (Strasser et al. 2009). Thus, the 'shrinking' of the family as a result of migration and the consequent absence of wider kin networks in the country of immigration is experienced as liberating by some migrants; others may experience the absence of wider kin networks as disturbing and restricting, contributing to isolation and, in some cases, to increased material and emotional dependency on the sponsor (Strasser et al. 2009). Importantly, recent studies have also shown how the concrete outcomes of family migration are shaped by the legal and policy framework in place in the countries of immigration. Thus, the legal dependency of reunifying family members frequently plays an important role in exacerbating familial conflict, authoritarianism of the husband and domestic violence (Abraham 2008), and not only when women are in a dependent position (see George 2005 and Strasser et al. 2009 for a discussion of family dynamics in the case of female sponsors).

For a long time the family constituted the forgotten dimension of migration in policy terms and in migration theory predicated upon methodological individualism (Kofman 2004), in which the unit of analysis and action is the individual. This was reinforced by the assumption in economic theory that migration primarily involved transactions between the individual and the state (Zlotnik 1995). As authors in this volume highlight, the family and its everyday and transnational practices serve as a crucial dimension in migratory circulation and integration (Bailey & Boyle 2004; Herman 2006; King, Thomson, Fielding & Warnes 2004). In particular, the circulation of skilled migrants within a global economy is often considered as being entirely determined by economic reasons beyond the family (Ackers & Stalford 2007; Guth 2007). Yet the return from the United States of Indian information technology (IT) specialists, seen as the quintessential knowledge workers, undermines this simplistic view of contemporary migration (Varrel this volume). Equally in skilled families, the road to integration is influenced by family dynamics and strategies (Raghuram 2004). Here the family, usually conceived as belonging to the reproductive sphere and irrelevant for the economic activities of family members, may play a valuable part in the transfer of social and cultural capital and socio-economic integration (Creese, Dyck & Tiger McLaren this volume).

The problem has been that the family as a collective unit, which is

commonly located in the social and reproductive spheres, does not fit into an analysis of migration as driven purely by economic forces (Kofman 2004). Under such a perspective, the economic is equated with production while market processes and values are supposedly absent from the family as a social entity (but see Catarino & Oso this volume). Furthermore, women, being the dominant group in family migration, were assumed to be uninterested in participating in the labour market or, at best, being involved in supplementing the male breadwinner's income. Such views consigned family migrations to a secondary position not really worthy of investigation and analytical understanding (see González-Ferrer this volume).

By the 1980s, feminism began to foreground the role of women migrants and gender relations (special issue of *International Migration Review* 1984). It not only emphasised the importance of women as independent economic migrants, but also highlighted gender inequalities in immigration citizenship regulations. Thus in the mid-1980s, public policies and legal changes had begun to abolish some of the major gender inequalities, such as the right to bring in spouses and dependants and the right to transmit citizenship to one's children (Van Walsum this volume; Bhabha & Shutter 1994). Yet, rather than equalising at a higher level, these changes resulted in a levelling down of the right to bring in family members.

Feminist insights also began to reconceptualise migration theory. Monica Boyd's (1989) groundbreaking study highlighted the role of familial and personal networks in connecting sending and receiving societies, a theme that would subsequently be taken up in transnational approaches (Basch, Glick Schiller & Szanton Blanc 1994; Faist 2000;⁵ Salih 2003). Families, she argued, were socialising agents that supported geographically dispersed groups and provided assistance and information. Subsequently, further studies in the dynamics of networks over space and time developed into an interest in transnational families, their everyday practices and social networks (see Banfi & Boccagni and Evergeti & Ryan this volume; Bryceson & Vuorela 2002). Family mobility also represented an interface between the individual and the social world and between private and public spaces (Lopes, Pereulou & Balsa 1994).

1.2 Increasing interest in family migrations

A variety of reasons account for the accrued interest in family migrations since the 1990s, and particularly in the past decade. These include the diversification of family migration in recent years, national and European policy developments and the closely related public debates on migrant families and family-related migration, legal studies resulting from European Union involvement in this field, binational and transnational mar-

riages, and transnational families. In this section we shall briefly examine these developments.

1.2.1 *Diversification*

The nature of family migration has shifted from the earlier family reunification type to family formation in older immigration states. Restrictions on labour migration have left marriage as almost the sole means of entry to, and continuing residence in, the EU for third-country nationals, especially those who do not have the recognised skills (see Fleischer and Suksomboon this volume). In older immigration states this may involve second and subsequent generations marrying partners from their parents' homeland or diaspora. Among Turks in Belgium, for example, some 60 per cent of second-generation migrants marry a spouse from their homeland (Timmerman 2008), while in Denmark more than 80 per cent of Turkish and Pakistani second-generation migrants now do so, compared to just 50 per cent in the case of Turks and 74 per cent in the case of Pakistani in 1984 (Çelikaksoy 2008).

At the same time, binational marriages involving persons with a native background and migrants entering for marriage have also been constantly on the rise. Thus, in 2004, 16 per cent of all marriages conducted in Germany were binational (Bilger 2010). Similarly, the share of binational marriages in the total number of marriages conducted in Austria increased more than fivefold between the 1980s (5 to 10 per cent) and the 2000s (just below 28 per cent in 2004). However, largely impacted by legal restrictions on binational marriages and the abolition of the possibility of in-country applications for residence permits for foreign spouses, the share of binational marriages dropped significantly thereafter (Statistik Austria 2008). The greater circulation of students and tourists from OECD countries and the Third World, as well as the incorporation of a growing number of countries of origin, into global marriage markets through long-distance tourism and internet dating have been important factors contributing to an increase in the number of binational marriages, although other factors such as the increasingly globalised career trajectories among the highly skilled are also important.

In Southern European states, family-related migration has grown enormously in the past few years. The older form of family reunification is still the most common mode of family migration to Southern Europe, where it has increased very rapidly in the past few years (see González-Ferrer this volume; Bonizzoni & Cibeà 2009; Fonseca & Ormond 2008). In Spain, the repeated regularisation of irregular migrants has contributed to the growth of formal family reunification. In addition, however, there is significant *de facto* family reunification that largely takes place on the 'fringes of the legal system' and thus remains largely outside the scope of

official statistics. Through a quantitative analysis of administrative statistics and data drawn from the Labour Force Survey (LFS), Gonzalez-Ferrer concludes that the reunification process has often been completed within a very few years after the arrival of the initial migrant, suggesting that the project at the outset was part of the family strategy of relocation (see also Gil Araujo 2009, 2010).

Another category that has also expanded in several EU states following the rapid growth of skilled labour migration since the beginning of this decade has been that of accompanying family members, as can be clearly seen in the UK and to a lesser extent in Denmark. In the UK dependants formed a third of the total number of entries amongst work permit holders and their dependants in 2006, though had decreased in 2007 to just over a quarter (Home Office 2008). By contrast, accompanying family members are relatively insignificant among migrants on the lower end of the skill spectrum, indicating that processes of family reunification are socially highly selective (Kraler 2010a). Indeed, in a number of countries low-skilled migrants are increasingly admitted through temporary migration schemes rather than through permanent migration, and are often unentitled to family reunification altogether. The freedom of movement now enjoyed by Eastern Europeans frequently means that they engage in transient circulations, unlike non-EU nations such as migrant women from the former Soviet Union or Latin America (see Banfi & Boccagni and Bonizzoni this volume).

The table below highlights the wide variations in the composition of flows and the significance of family flows. The UK had the most balanced inflow with all categories being represented. It should also be noted that the category Other often includes family members. So, too, does the free movement category, which includes family members of Eastern Europeans who have had the right to work in Ireland, Sweden and the UK since 2004; this and was extended to other countries in Southern Europe from 2006. Even if they may have moved initially without dependants, many migrants have been subsequently joined by their families (Ackers & Stalford 2007; Ryan & Webster 2008). We know, however, very little about gender differences in family migration flows although this is beginning to be examined through quantitative analysis of official statistics (see González-Ferrer this volume, 2006, 2007), large-scale surveys (Algava & Bèque 2008) and small-scale qualitative studies (see the Civic Stratification, Gender and Family Migration Policies in Europe project). Interviews with those signing the integration contract (*Contrat d'accueil et d'intégration*) in France revealed that 55 per cent of women were joining a spouse compared to 30 per cent of men, and 22 per cent had entered alone compared to 43 per cent of men (Algava & Bèque 2008). The ability to speak French fluently was much higher for men (30 per cent) than women (22 per cent), amongst whom many (41 per cent) could speak

only little or no French. In terms of previous educational level, there were insignificant differences between women and men who had higher education degrees (20 per cent and 22 per cent, respectively) or the baccalaurate (15 per cent and 16 per cent). The biggest disparity emerged between those who could neither read nor write (8 per cent women and 3 per cent men). The survey also shed light on another topic about which we know little, that of entry into the labour market and employment. Seventy-four per cent of men had previously worked in their country of origin compared to 50 per cent of women for whom migration frequently represented a move into unemployment. In Spain (see González-Ferrer this volume), participation in the labour market varies according to whether one was a first mover reuniting with a family member or a reuniting spouse.

Table 1.1 *Composition of permanent type* of migratory inflows 2007 (in %)*

Country	Work	Accompanying family of workers	Family (reunification and formation)	Humanitarian	Other	Free movement
Austria	1	1	40	11	0	46
Belgium	6	0	35	7	0	50
Denmark	15	6	18	5	5	50
France	6	0	59	4	10	20
Finland	9	-	36	12	4	39
Germany	6	0	23	3	4	64
Italy	31	2	40	3	2	22
Netherlands	5	0	47	24	0	24
Norway	8	0	50	12	0	30
Portugal	29	0	62	0	0	9
Sweden	0	0	37	28	0	35
Switzerland	2	0	21	5	2	70
UK	29	14	18	9	6	24

* 'Permanent type migration' is a concept used by the OECD, referring to all legal inflows that may lead to permanent legal residence in a country.

Source: SOPEMI (2008)

First movers have higher labour activity rates than spouses (for both females and males) who enter as dependants. Whilst females dominate family flows, men also constitute a significant proportion, especially amongst migrations pioneered by women or those joining settled and second-generation migrant populations (see Ahmad 2008 and Charlsley

2005 for the UK). Men may encounter similar problems of dependency and isolation as migrant women who are cut off from their families in the country of origin. They may also face deskilling in the labour market (George 2005; Kofman, Rogoz & Lévy 2010; Strasser et al. 2009).

Another recent study on marriage patterns among immigrants in Germany (González-Ferrer 2006) found marked gender differences in relation to the practice of 'importing' spouses. While importing spouses is associated with low educational levels among male primary migrants, the same is not true with respect to women. Research on Denmark suggests that such differences can also be observed along ethnic lines. Thus, while Pakistani marriage migrants are more highly educated than their spouses in Denmark, the reverse is true for Turkish marriage migrants in whose case importing spouses seems to be a way to maintain 'traditional' norms (Çelikaksoy, Sykt Nielsen & Verner 2006).

1.2.2 *Rationales and development of family migration policies*⁶

During the recruitment period, many states explicitly attempted to limit family reunification to ensure the eventual return of migrants (Bilger 2010 on Germany; Kraler 2010a). After the end of recruitment, family reunification was often not an explicit policy but the unintended consequence of various restrictions, as well as being informal and despite official preference for return. At the same time, formal rules on family reunification were underdeveloped in most European countries and, where rules existed, family reunification was nevertheless frequently spontaneous and outside formal channels. The UK was among the few European states that did have an elaborate policy framework regulating family-related migration early on. Various measures were imposed in the 1960s and 1970s aimed specifically at restricting marriage migration to the UK, most notably through the notorious 'primary purpose' rule. Here, the main objective was to curb overall levels of migration, to which family-related migration, especially marriage migration, was seen to be contributing.

In contrast, policy developments in Continental Europe were until the 1990s rarely informed by explicit macro-level objectives. Rather, developments were driven by action on the ground – the elaboration of rules by migration authorities, and since the 1980s, by the courts that increasingly had to deal with cases involving family members. By the 1990s, the European Convention of Human Rights and the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg were more often invoked in family-related cases and proved important in elaborating rights to family reunification in national contexts and establishing a common baseline for family reunification across Europe, on which legislative developments at the European Union level could be built (Guiraudon & Lahav 2000; Lahav 1997; Thym 2008).

The content of the first far-reaching legislative proposals at the European level, however, derived its impetus very much from the 'liberal moment' around the Tampere Summit in 1999 and the institutional opportunity structure at the time that allowed European pro-immigrant NGOs and associations to influence the drafting of the first directive (Geddes 2000). Due to resistance by some member states, the final directive, however, was quite different from the original version.

Yet, the Europeanisation of family migration policies not only established common (albeit weak) standards, but also initiated horizontal processes of policy diffusion, with governments adopting policies elaborated elsewhere in their own countries, most evident in the case of integration contracts and pre-entry tests. In Eastern European countries without a prior history of migration policymaking, policies were generally developed based on Western European models and the EU *acquis*, with little or no public debate and often without there being concrete objectives behind policy proposals – except from bringing countries' legislation in line with what were regarded as 'European standards' (see Szczepanikova 2008 on the Czech Republic). In Western European countries, policymakers have similarly come to draw on models developed elsewhere, although usually in the framework of home-grown debates on family-related migration. Several key concerns have driven policy developments in individual countries or have been invoked as justification for policy changes. These include numbers and related attempts to restrict family-related migration, the abuse of family reunification provisions (marriages of convenience), debates on forced and arranged marriages and more far-reaching concerns about the negative implications of co-ethnic marriage migration from traditional sending countries.

More and more, marriages are being viewed as sham marriages entered into so as to bypass immigration regulations (Kabis 2001; *European Journal of Migration and Law* 2006). This is seen especially when cultural difference between spouses are considered too great or the age difference 'unusual', generally when a woman is significantly older than her husband (Kofman, Lukes, Meetoo & Aaron 2008; Strasser et al. 2009). In response to these suspicious attitudes, the length of probationary periods for spouses has been extended and greater scrutiny by administrative authorities imposed in a number of countries. The age of marriage for spouses and partners has also been increased, supposedly to protect girls from forced marriages as well as the desire to slow down the continual inflow into communities of new migrants deemed to be living apart or in parallel lives. In Germany, for example, concern with low levels of intermarriage of Turkish migrants led to increasing age of marriage to eighteen (Deutsche Welle 2008). Policymakers are often adamant that one of the main objectives of setting a higher age is to restrict marriage migration and reduce overall levels of migration. Thus, the Dutch Minister of Alien

Affairs and Integration expected that the increased marriage age in conjunction with raised income levels would lead to a reduction of family formation by no less than 45 per cent (Bonjour 2008: 25). A study commissioned by the UK Home Office on the likely effects of raising marriage age found that such a move would involve more risks than benefits and concluded that immigration policy is not an appropriate tool to address forced marriages (Hester, Chantler, Gangoli, Devgon, Sharma & Singleton 2008). Despite this recommendation, the UK Border Agency raised the age of marriage to 21 for both spouses in November 2008. Although the use of immigration policy as a tool to fight forced marriage remains questionable, upping marriage age has also been supported by some feminist NGOs. Integration criteria, such as knowledge of the country's language, have also been, or are about to be, attached to admission criteria in Austria, Germany, France, the Netherlands and the UK (see Van Walsum this volume; Bilger 2010; Bonjour 2008; Kofman, Rogoz & Lévy 2009), and are debated in other countries.

The widening gap between changing norms of family life and the much narrower and simplistic conception of the family as formulated in migration law has often been noted (see Kofman & Kraler 2006; Van Walsum this volume). But less clear is why this is so. To be true, law often lags behind developments in society, but in other areas, such as family law, the law has adapted to changing realities of family life much faster. One explanation may be that family norms in contemporary European societies have actually changed much less than the diversification of family patterns seems to suggest. Indeed, despite this diversification, reflected in the increase of patchwork families and a multitude of partnership arrangements (with or without children), many Europeans still seem to cling to traditional notions of the family. As Riaño (this volume) in her case study of binational marriages in Switzerland suggests, the unequal positioning of men and women in relations of dependency by family reunification provisions in Swiss aliens legislation may reflect, rather than contradict, Swiss 'gender culture'.

1.2.3 *Legal aspects and European involvement*

As we saw in the previous section, there has been an increasing European involvement in the conditions for family reunification. A growing body of legal literature on family migration policy has been produced following the EU Family Reunification Directive 86/2003/EC and the right to family reunification under free movement legislation (European Migration Network 2008; Groenendijk, Fernhout, Van Dam, Van Oers & Strik 2007; Peers, Barzilay, Groenendijk & Guild 2000; Van Walsum & Spijkerboer 2007; Walter 2009). Rights to family reunification under free movement legislation (consolidated in 2004 in Directive 2004/38/EC)

originally served as the yardstick in elaboration of the family reunification directive, defined a relatively high standard of rights and, in so doing, followed an unusually wide definition of the family. Despite this, and although the intention of EU-wide legislation expressed in the Tampere Declaration in 1999 saw family reunification as facilitating integration and economic and social cohesion, by the time of the directive in 2003 migrant families were seen as hindering integration and burdening the welfare state. A number of the initial proposals were watered down and laid down as minimum conditions in the directive.

Nevertheless, the past years have witnessed some progressive measures, especially concerning relationships akin to marriage such as cohabitation and same-sex partnerships. Member states may treat 'long-term stable relationships' or 'registered partnerships' (under national regulations) as equivalent to marriage. This is already occurring in a number of states. Access to the labour market after twelve months for secondary migrants and an entitlement to an autonomous title independent of the sponsor after no more than five years of residence were also included in such provisions. In most countries this condition is met before the maximum period stipulated in the directive.

By October 2008, two opposing conceptions of family reunification had emerged. On the one hand, there was that of the commission whose proposal would improve the Family Reunification Directive, for example, by applying the same age limits for spouses and partners of third-country nationals as for citizens, and only imposing compulsory integration and language measures to facilitate, rather than discourage, reunification (European Commission 2008a; Huddleston 2008). Generally, the impetus of the proposal was to bring the rights under the directive closer to the rights of family members of EU citizens, regulated in a separate directive.⁷ On the other hand, the European Pact on Immigration and Asylum agreed under the French presidency would lower standards in many states to those operating in France and, in particular, introduce the new criteria of a state's capacity to receive family migrants (Council of the European Union 2008). Meanwhile, the original model for the Family Reunification Directive – rights of family members under freedom of movement legislation – has not been fully put into practice.

Thus, in a second report published in late 2008, the European Commission found the implementation of the right to family reunification under free movement legislation seriously lacking and 'disappointing' (European Commission 2008b). In principle, both in terms of the scope and the strength of the rights the 2004 directive accords to family members,⁸ it goes considerably beyond the scope of the Family Reunification Directive. This has had the perverse effect that EU member state nationals who do not enjoy freedom of movement rights have lesser rights than other EU citizens in a number of EU member states, a practice that has

been dubbed 'reverse discrimination'. Thus, in Austria, conditions for reunification are more restrictive for family members of Austrian nationals compared to those of other EU nationals regarding the sponsor's financial means and family members' obligation to fulfil integration requirements. Similarly, since 2007, third-country national spouses of German nationals are now admitted under the same (restrictive) conditions as spouses of third-country nationals. Among other requirements, they also must therefore prove a minimum level of German language proficiency before entry, whereas family members of other EU nationals in Germany are exempted from this requirement (European Migration Network 2008: 19). As a result of the unequal treatment of family members of nationals vis-à-vis family members of other EU nationals, an increasing number of binational families have opted for temporary relocations to other EU member states to 'gain' mobility rights and thus faster access to family reunification and other rights associated with freedom of movement.

At the time of the directive, Jastram (2003) made the following comment:

Globalization has expanded the realm in which families live and work, and created a new geography of family life. Few migrants, even those who have made the choice to travel and to do so alone, intend a permanent, or even long-term, separation from their loved ones. Immigration policymakers will increasingly be called upon to recognize the rights and realities of families living across borders.

Yet, instead we have seen a growing tension between globalising economic and social processes and the political restrictions imposed by states on family migrants. Furthermore, as states have tightened the conditions of family migration for their own citizens, more EU citizens, as we have noted above, have availed themselves of the preferential treatment afforded to EU nationals using their EU mobility rights in order to live with a non-EU member as a family unit (for Dutch examples, see Hollomey 2008). For EU citizens the definition of family members is more extensive; unlike non-EU nationals, they do not have to comply with criteria of minimum age and language competence.

Contrary to the general harmonising impetus of EU legislation, one of the most striking results of policymaking on family-related migration at the European level is an increasing fragmentation and differentiation of the right to family reunification, thus creating and reinforcing civic stratification – the differential positioning of individuals within a hierarchical system of rights (Morris 2002; Kofman & Kraler 2006). In part, this is a consequence of the differentiation of rights according to the nationality and legal status of the sponsor (i.e. whether the sponsor is a na-

tional, a national of another EU member state, a national who enjoys freedom of movement rights, a third-country national, a refugee or a third-country national who is a long-term resident).⁹ It is also the result of relatively weak standards with respect to these individual categories within current legal instruments under EU legislation. Thus, as far as third-country nationals are concerned, a major reason for the poor record of the directive in bringing about comparable minimum standards with respect to the right to family reunification can be found in the 27 derogation clauses of the directive (Huddleston 2008). Rather than a harmonisation of the definition of the right to family reunification in the spirit of the directive, we see a common movement to the bottom based on a harmonisation around the various derogation clauses, for instance, with respect to the minimum age for spouses and integration conditions. Family migration policy – like migration policy, in general – thus oscillates between a logic of inclusion and a logic of exclusion: the expansion of the right to family reunification has been accompanied by increasing barriers to legal statuses that are associated with these rights, and increasing policing of the boundaries between migrants as well as family members eligible for family reunification and those who are not (see also Wimmer 2002: 267–269).

For some family members, such as unaccompanied minors,¹⁰ the very meaning of family reunification is replete with contradictions (see Empez Vidal this volume). In order to be covered by child protection laws, the unaccompanied minor (usually male) must show that he or she has been neglected by the family. Returning a child to the family, as happens in the case of Moroccan boys in Spain, is pursued by officials on the grounds that children are better off living with their families. For the families of these youngsters, however, return usually represents failure – the inability of the child to live and work in a wealthier country. Paradoxically, family reunification as an instrument of child protection policy and purportedly a tool in ‘the best interest of the child’ may actually exacerbate situations of ‘neglect’ in a transnational context.

1.2.4 *Mixed and binational marriages*

Transnationalism and globalisation are themes in the broad range of studies investigating various aspects of binational marriages, involving citizens and non-citizens from different cultural or ethnic backgrounds (Allievi & Tognetti-Bordogna 1996; Beck-Gernsheim 2004, 2007; Beer 1996; Kabis 2001; Passerini 2004; Philippe, Varro & Neyrand 1998; Reunkaw 2003; Riaño and Suksomboon this volume; Schlehe 2001). While the terms ‘mixed’ or ‘bicultural’ are also used with respect to this particular form of cross-border marriage, the term ‘binational marriages’, in our view, best captures the interlinkage of issues related to the different

cultural backgrounds of the spouses with issues related to citizenship and residence. The latter also explains much of the political salience of this form of couple relationship.

Although the majority of migrants in such relationships are female, reflecting dominant norms of partner choice and 'global marriage-scapes' (Lauser 2008), an increasing number of males are involved.¹¹ As Annett Fleischer's case study of male Cameroonian migrants in this volume shows, males may be dominant in specific migration streams. At the same time, Fleischer's chapter also shows that the conceptualisation of these Cameroonian men as marriage migrants may be misplaced. Unlike the Thai women studied by Suksumboon, marriage is in most cases not part of the original migratory projects of these men. Although they, too, hold sexualised fantasies about 'the West' very similar to those of Thai female marriage migrants, marriage for them seems to be largely a strategy that emerges in the receiving context, reflecting different opportunity structures and processes at work for men and women.

Binational marriages raise a number of issues such as the definition of the family unit, the organisation of gender relations, the communication of family members across borders and the creation of spaces of intercultural social contact and social institutions (Lauth Bacas 2002). These marriages may be based on very unequal relationships founded on gender inequality and reinforced by immigration and social policy, as Riaño (this volume) shows for Switzerland, and of an exoticisation of the Other (Suksumboon this volume). In some cases, inequality in status and power between spouses may amount to outright coercion and involve both physical and psychological violence. There is consequently a large body of literature, partly from an advocacy background, which discusses binational marriages under a trafficking perspective and portrays women in these relationships as 'mail-order brides' and victims of global marriage and sex markets. However, as Palriwala and Uberoi (2008) remind us, one should be careful not to reduce female marriage migrants to mere victims and to disregard women's agency. And as Nicole Constable (2003) has argued in her study of 'mail-order brides', women are neither mere victims nor solely in search of better living in a wealthier country. Indeed, in the view of the women and men she interviewed, the discourse of 'mail-order brides' not only fails to capture the reality of these relationships, but is experienced as deeply offensive (see also Suksumboon this volume).

Mixed marriages are not only subject to suspicion from both majority and minority communities,¹² but they are also seen as 'suspect' by the state – the ultimate legitimator of marriage as a legal institution (European Journal of Migration and Law 2006; Kabis 2001). Not only does the state meticulously control access to any residence rights that may be gained through marriage by probing whether a relationship is genuine, based on certain conceptions of how relationships should be conducted, but various

countries also increasingly attempt to control and restrict access to marriage itself (see section 1.2.2 on rationales and development of policies).

Mixed marriages between a dominant and a racialised group may engender strong opposition (Mounier 2000). The dominant group may be unhappy about marriage with the subordinate one (Deutsche Welle 2008), whilst the minority may seek to maintain its identity and limit border crossings. Women, in particular, are often seen to represent the continuity of the culture and its traditions, especially in the context of changes wrought by migration (Yuval-Davis & Anthias 1989). There are also gender differences in attitudes and regulations about marrying outside the community. For example, amongst Muslims it is permissible for men to marry non-Muslim women, but not the other way round.

1.2.5 *Transnational marriages*

Long-distance transnational marriages between co-ethnic spouses are by no means a new phenomenon (Hoerder 2002). Indeed, transnational marriages have been a major theme in the reproduction of classic trade diasporas such as Indian communities, as well as in the maintenance of transnational ties between Indian communities in East Africa, the UK and India (Bastos 2005). However, these, too, have become more important as a result of greater global mobility and changing patterns of migration. As a result of the transition of migration of Western European countries from labour recruitment to settlement migration and the emergence of second and third generations, transnational marriage migration has overtaken classic family reunification. Although mixed marriages have increased too (see section 1.2.4), co-ethnic marriages remain the dominant mode of marriages among migrant communities and of transnational marriages. Transnational marriages are at the centre of current debates on family-related migration. Not only do they contribute to the reproduction of ethnic communities, involving significant chain migration, but they also raise several issues regarding integration and multiculturalism.

Associated, as they are, with 'traditional practices' such as forced and arranged marriages, transnational marriages have become a contested issue and subject to increased state regulation. In addition, the persistence of co-ethnic marriage preferences among the second generation raises issues regarding intermarriage and integration. In particular, it calls into question the often tacit expectation that second and third generations would show a greater tendency to assimilate and intermarry. Yet the incidence of co-ethnic marriages or, conversely, the incidence of mixed marriage varies enormously between different groups and, within these groups, by gender and generation. Thus, a recent survey of intermarriage patterns among major migrant communities in selected Western European countries (Lucassen & Laarman 2009) found that women marry

partners from outside their group less often than their male counterparts. While a higher proportion of second-generation members tends to intermarry more than the first generation, there are large differences. In the case of guest workers from Southern Europe and the West Indies, intermarriage rates of the second generation are double that of the first generation, with women lower than men. Intermarriage rates range between 15 per cent (Southern European female migrants) and 26 per cent (West Indians) among the first generation and 38 per cent (Southern European female migrants) and 60 per cent (West Indian males) among the second generation, respectively. By contrast, intermarriage rates among Moroccans and Turks are far lower (5 and 11 per cent for first-generation females and males, respectively, and 8 and 16 per cent for second-generation females and males) (Lucassen & Laarman 2009: Table 3). Religion, family systems, discrimination, colonial and other ties are important factors explaining such patterns. In contrast to the US experience, 'race' seems to be a much less significant factor in Europe.

As in the case of binational marriages, global processes are reflected in transnational marriage practices by linking individuals' aspirations for marriage and mobility. These opportunities for marriage and mobility are highly gendered and are, in the context of international migration, mediated by different forms of state regulation (Palriwala & Uberoi 2008a). In the face of massive global asymmetries of opportunities and resources, transnational marriage presents opportunities to bridge these asymmetries at the level of individuals and families. In the context of migration, supposedly traditional practices such as arranged marriages and bride price and dowry payments may gain in importance rather than be discontinued (Palriwala & Uberoi 2008a: 48; Timmerman 2008). While marriage migration thus presents concrete opportunities for social mobility and access to resources for individuals and their families in the sending contexts, 'importing' a spouse also presents opportunities for migrants and their families in the receiving contexts, although these are not free from contradictions and tensions. Thus, parents who marry off their children to spouses from the country of origin regard co-ethnics in the receiving context as too westernised and morally suspicious, a perception frequently shared by their children, even if they do not necessarily cite the same reasons for preferring partners from abroad (Straßburger 2003, 2004; Timmerman 2008).

Marrying co-ethnic partners may also be a conscious attempt to reproduce ethnic social capital and reinforce ethnic networks in a context of highly stratified and segregated social networks in the receiving context (Straßburger 2003). Another important factor in transnational marriages is power asymmetries between 'natives' and those marrying in, as well as the resulting relations of dependency between spouses, asymmetries that are mediated and partly reinforced by state regulations on immigration.

Although such asymmetries are not specific to transnational marriages and are a similarly defining trait of binational relationships, they may carry different meanings, for example, if a woman raised in an immigration context uses marriage to a spouse from the country of origin to increase her scope of agency and reduce the influence of in-laws (Straßburger 2004). Transnational marriages may also involve relocation of a spouse raised in the receiving context to the country of origin. Although transnational marriages have received increasing attention over the past few years, little systematic analysis has been done on reverse marriage migration to the country of origin outside the context of advocacy and social work.

1.2.6 *Transnational families*

Transnational families have also received increasing attention recently (Bryceson & Vuorela 2002). The literature often addresses two types of relationships within the family. The first concerns children left behind, their care and transnational motherhood (Hodagneu-Sotelo & Avila 1997; Parreñas 2005; Verneck 2008).¹³ The debate has emphasised the problems children face with one or both parents being absent, their relationships with other kin or carers and whether resources generated from migration may make up for the absence of direct parental support. According to Parreñas (2005), fathers rarely pick up caring responsibilities; much more common is the phenomenon of 'other-mothering', where grandmothers, older daughters or other female kin take over the care. On the other hand, based on a detailed study in the Philippines, Asis (2006) suggests that in about half the cases where mothers have migrated, children identified men as the primary caregivers, a finding at odds with that of Parreñas.

While much of the literature focuses on non-EU migrants, some issues may also apply to the children of skilled migrants moving within the EU (Ackers & Stalford 2007). Less common but nevertheless significant, especially in countries with family reunification, are the difficulties children encounter in adapting to the country of destination (see Bonizzoni and Catarino & Oso this volume). The age and educational level at which the children move are likely to influence the difficulties they face in adapting to a new family life.

The second topic concerns the relationship between migrant children and parents left behind, especially the material and emotional care they may need as they grow older (see Evergeti & Ryan this volume; Baldassar 2008). For Baldassar and Baldock (2007), giving and receiving care means the capacity to care, a sense of obligation that differs between cultures and the negotiations to provide care between members of the family. The interplay between family dynamics and networks is set within a broader context of public policy and welfare regimes. The different modalities in which care is fulfilled will depend on the expectations of family members

and the availability of care resources in different settings, such as the household, the commercial sector, the community and voluntary sectors and the state (Kofman 2009).

Whilst there is a substantial literature on domestic labour (Lutz 2008) and the global chains of care (Yeates 2004) focusing on migrant women from poorer countries who supply care at home in wealthy countries (Hochschild 2000; Parreñas 2001), less attention has been paid to the care provided transnationally by families to their older parents left behind. The migration of children, for example from Ireland or Southern European countries (see Evergeti & Ryan this volume; Zontini 2007), had once often occurred, some time ago when these countries were poor. In the meantime, such countries have grown wealthy and experienced a deficit of care provision requiring their own recourse to migrant labour. In such situations, children may still provide intermittent care, emotional support and financial assistance. For intra-European migrants, in particular, frequent visits (Mason 2004) in addition to regular internet and telephone communication, help reduce the effect of distance. It is also easier for them to reconstitute the family in the country of destination than for third-country nationals for whom immigration regulations limit the entry of older parents and grandparents as well as their own mobility towards their country of origin.

In countries such as Australia and Canada (see Creese, Dyck & McLaren this volume), it is easier for certain groups to bring in grandparents who in turn perform the child-care so that both parents can work. Thus, the role of grandparents may be reframed by the migration process. In specific situations grandparents will stay in the home country and take care of the children left behind (Castagnone, Eve, Petrillo & Piperno 2007). In other cases, grandparents will engage in temporary and sometimes permanent migration in order to take care of their grandchildren (Escrivà 2005; Nedelcu 2008).

It is often assumed that migrant families are special in this respect, and that native families in the course of modernisation have lost their solidarity potential beyond the nuclear household. However, the burgeoning research literature on contemporary family and kinship relations in Western societies provides a different picture. It shows that the family is still a key system of social support among all living generations, and thus a strong pillar of the welfare mix of these societies (Kohli 1999; Arber & Attias-Donfut 2000; Albertini, Kohli & Vogel 2007). Summing up this literature yields the following schematic results (Kohli 2004).

- Adult children and their elderly parents live close to each other (although mostly not in the same household), feel close to each other emotionally, have frequent contact with each other and mutually support each other through several types of help.
- Financial transfers and social support are still frequent and substantial,

occurring mostly in the generational lineage, with their net flow being mostly downward, from parents to children.

- Financial transfers *inter vivos* are complemented by bequests. *Inter vivos* transfers go to children in need ('altruism'), while bequests are distributed equally among all children. There is no longer evidence of a gender bias favouring sons.
- Differences among countries are substantial and tend to be clustered in relation to welfare regimes.

Transnational families are different due to greater geographical distance between the generations, but this may be compensated by even larger flows of support as well as by regular pendular mobility (Krumme 2004). Remittances from migrants to their country of origin are, to a large extent, family transfers. Their intergenerational direction depends on which generation is left in the country of origin. As migrant families have been less able than their non-migrant counterparts to build up wealth, bequests among them are less frequent.

Intergenerational relationships also change amongst migrant families living nearby within the same country. In recent years, several comprehensive studies have begun to systematically compare migrant and non-migrant families along these lines (e.g. Attias-Donfut 2006 for France; Baykara-Krumme 2008 for Germany). Based on a quantitative analysis of major migrant groups compared with the non-migrant Dutch, Schans and De Valk (this volume) argue that whilst attitudes towards filial obligations differ amongst migrant groups (Moroccans, Turkish, Surinamese and Antilleans) and between themselves and the Dutch, actual support received by each group is not as differentiated. Dutch parents do indeed receive a higher degree of emotional support and advice than many other groups, and there is therefore no direct correspondence of attitudes with actual support. In Germany, elderly migrants have a somewhat higher rate of co-residence with their adult children; these and other differences can mostly be explained by structural factors, but there are also some elements of cultural tradition involved (Baykara-Krumme 2007). Both attitudes and actual care and support for the older generation depend on position within the family. For example, in some cultures, as in India (see Varrel this volume), it is the older male child who is expected to provide support. The kind of support also varies according to gender. Women are more likely to provide physical and bodily care whilst men are more inclined to supply financial advice or do handy work around the home (Baldassar & Baldock 2000). Within family businesses in France and Spain daughters seem to show greater indebtedness and create non-commercial relations (see Catarino & Oso this volume).

Today de-familialisation¹⁴ (Esping-Andersen 1999) means that there is a variety of ways in which care is organised through the state and the

market. However, the often held assumption that the welfare state has crowded out family support has been refuted. The literature finds instead that the welfare state has provided the family with new resources for assisting its weaker members; in other words, it has 'crowded in' family support (Kohli 1999; Künemund & Rein 1999). The different mix of possibilities (family, state, market, voluntary, community) and recourse to migrant labour vary according to particular welfare regimes (Albertini et al. 2007; Kofman 2009). However, we need to achieve a fuller understanding of the effect of welfare arrangements on intergenerational support behaviour in immigrant families.

1.3 Migrant families and the sociology of the family

As shown in the preceding section, it is important to situate the migrant family within the broader field of the sociology of the family. Interest in the family, both theoretically and in smaller-scale qualitative studies (Smart 2005), is flourishing, with the focus of study widening again to account for the impact of families on the social, economic and political order and its change. Since the 1960s – the high point of modern 'familism' in terms of nuptiality and fertility based on the male-as-breadwinner model – we have witnessed a massive pluralisation of the legal and demographic forms of living together. As such, speaking of 'the family' in academic discourse is now routinely replaced by the plural 'families' – with 'migrant families' sometimes treated as one such form (if not several) of them. There is also a renewed interest in linking the macro-social dimensions of families to those of intimate relations. One of the most heated debates in this field is individualisation (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim 2002; Giddens 1991), which argues that individuals are increasingly able to choose with whom they associate, and reflect on the nature of their social bonds. It is claimed that individuals are set free from the constraints of class and gender rigidities and of traditional family and community control, as the hold of these social bonds is weakened. External moral codes no longer regulate familial and social behaviour to the same extent as before. Individuals' social lives have been disembedded from local contexts and are stretched 'across indefinite spans of time and place' (Giddens 1990: 20).

This thesis has been critiqued for its simple dichotomy between tradition and modernity. Some question the usefulness of the notion of detraditionalisation and suggest that traditional practices and reflexivity coexist (Adam 1996). We also need to reconsider what constitutes a traditional form or practice and how older forms may be reinvented and modified in response to new conditions. Families must be seen as parts of wider kinship networks (Heady & Kohli 2010). Families beyond the nuclear

household are important and useful to make up for the inadequacies in the provision of formal care (see Creese et al. this volume). Though family forms and living arrangements are becoming more diverse, there is no evidence that the traditional roles of nurture and care have been abandoned (Anttonen, Baldock & Sipilä 2003; Williams 2004). These roles are simply carried out within different and, sometimes, non-consanguineous and changing sets of relatives. What this means is that the shape of commitments is changing but there is no loss of commitments. People are still embedded in their relationships with others.

The individualisation thesis shares with other approaches the assumption that changes in labour force participation trigger family change. Hence, as women increasingly enter the labour market and become independent earners, they cease to be dependent on men. Yet many women do not enter the labour market on the same terms as men nor with the same conditions of employment. Moreover, unlike men, they still bear the main responsibility for care of close and more distant family members throughout their life course. They thus face the dilemma of reconciliation between formal work and family care – not only as young mothers but also as middle-aged adults in a potential ‘sandwich’ situation (Künemund 2006).

The claims of individualisation run up against the evidence of continuing – and possibly increasing – homogamy with regard to education and class, while other formerly powerful dimensions of ‘assortative mating’ such as ethnicity and religion seem to lose their hold. But here there may be countervailing trends among migrant families, with second- and third-generation migrants showing greater homogamy.

A number of scholars seeking to rebut the picture of individual and detached social relations within and beyond the family have found Bourdieu’s conceptualisation of social reproduction and the family to be valuable and insightful (Charles, Aull Davies & Harris 2008; McNay 1999). His definition of the family is based on ‘economic, physical and above all symbolic power relations’ and linked to the economic, social and cultural capitals possessed by its members (see Creese et al. this volume). The family has a permanence that is reproduced through everyday activities of support, exchange of gifts and visits – which are disproportionately carried out by women – and, above all, by the intergenerational transmission of capital.

However, Bourdieu’s conceptualisation, like much writing on the sociology of the family, mainly focuses on the nation-state and its citizens as the main scale of social life and unit of observation. In doing so, it ignores the effects of people’s transnational mobility, the transnationalisation of family forms and arrangements and the ways that family structures are socially reproduced across nation-states in response to immigration restrictions. It can therefore be said that the sociology of the family often

suffers from a kind of 'methodological nationalism' (Wimmer & Glick Schiller 2002). Classic textbooks of sociology of the family make almost no reference to migrant families. *The Blackwell companion to the sociology of families* (Scott, Treas & Richards 2003) is a notable exception: two chapters are dedicated to migrant families, though still as if they were a specific and isolated issue rather than part of a wider picture regarding family changes in contemporary societies.

Migrant families indeed challenge monolithic visions of the family and can be seen as paradigmatic of the diversification of family structures and arrangements that have occurred over the last three decades (Williams 2004). Moreover, they urge us to include diversity when taking into account new family forms and arrangements. Apart from the studies cited above, there is still a lack of empirical research that compares immigrant and non-immigrant family forms.

A number of questions can be asked about migration and individualisation. To what extent does the migration process lead to specific forms of individualisation of the migrant members of the family? How does it lead to a redefinition of family members' commitments? To what extent does renegotiation of intergenerational relationships occur within broader patterns of social change (Cole & Durham 2007)? Migration represents individuals' belonging and positioning within family and gender structures and relations but, at the same time, the migratory process can lead to a reformulation of gender and generational roles within both the productive and reproductive spheres.

A shortcoming of migration research is that it has mainly focused on the role of women within the family, thus neglecting the investigation of relations between family members (Charsley 2005; George 2005; Passerini 2004; Ryan & Webster 2008). For instance, the evolution of norms regarding fatherhood, motherhood and parenting during the migration process should be questioned. How does migration affect the perception of what is a good father or mother? How does it affect the balance between breadwinning and care sharing or between productive and reproductive tasks? Little research has been undertaken on fatherhood¹⁵ in the context of family migration and on how migration impacts both masculinities and femininities within the family.

1.4 The contributions in this volume

The individual case studies in this volume respond to the need for methodological pluralism and address different aspects of family-related dimensions of international migration and processes of incorporation through a variety of methods, approaches, from different disciplinary perspectives and at different levels of analysis. These combine insider

perspectives of individuals and families involved in family migration with outsider perspectives of the state and social workers as well as broader societal discourses. The contributions also span different geographical areas. While most chapters focus on European receiving countries, also dealt with are migrants in Canada and highly skilled migrants returning to India. To the extent that they address transnational dimensions of family migration, many contributions also extend to major regions of origin, both within and outside Europe.

Chapters have been organised around four major themes: 1) the family as a moral and social order and contested norms; 2) gender, generation and work in the migrant family; 3) marriage migration and gender relations; and 4) transnational family lives and practices.

In the first section, the chapters investigate the family as a moral and social order, as a site of contestation and an arena where different conceptions of the family and its moral and social underpinnings are negotiated. They do so from different perspectives.

The first two chapters by Sarah van Walsum and Ralph Grillo, respectively, investigate moral discourses around migrant families and assumptions and observations about the migrant family as expressed in policy debates and policies on migrant families. In particular, they address the increasing problematisation of the migrant and minority ethnic family seen as the site of practices that distinguish it from the supposedly individualistic and egalitarian Western model in which marriage has lost its centrality. Van Walsum (chapter 2) places concerns over the migrant family and family migration within the broader context of changes in Dutch immigration, integration and social policies, as well as the past few decades' emergence of a new moral order of individual responsibility, labour force participation, sexual emancipation and gender equality. Van Walsum argues that the migrant family has been increasingly seen as the antithesis of liberalism and secularism, which have come to characterise Dutch identity. Because specific migrant groups are seen to threaten this social order, they had to be restricted in their entry. She also highlights how technologies of control have shifted from a colonial preoccupation with sexuality (or the creation of children as a result of that act) as well as issues of racial purity and mixity to delinquent children lowering the market values of global cities.

In the UK, as Grillo highlights (chapter 3), families are also the place where who may do what, when and how is decided. As Grillo argues, migration, as one source of change, puts a great strain on the familial moral order, forcing people on all sides to interpret or reinterpret beliefs and practices. Families have thus become an iconic cultural, social and ideological 'site' of contestation around cultural difference, cultural and social change and policies intended to address them. They serve as a powerful kaleidoscope through which to examine the realities of contem-

porary multicultural societies. Grillo shows how in debates about marriage practices, boundaries are drawn and a *modus vivendi* is reached. He argues that rather than the imposition of a hegemonic authority in a top-down manner, these debates involve a complex negotiation of different interests and stakes, reflecting the complex *rapport de force* in contemporary Britain.

Contributions by Djamila Schans and Helga de Valk (chapter 4) and Núria Empez Vidal (chapter 5) reflect on the family as a social and moral order from the micro-perspective of individuals 'on the ground'. Both chapters focus on children, investigating the interplay and contradictions between societal and individual family norms, attitudes and practices. Schans and De Valk (chapter 4) probe into whether intergenerational relationships of migrants are fundamentally different from native families through a study of attitudes and practices of children towards their parents. They find that attitudes do indeed differ (although less so in the second generation), with migrants of both the first and second generations showing a high level of sense of commitment, suggesting that familial obligations are indeed among the core values of the migrant groups surveyed. However, they also show that actual support received by parents does not correlate to sense of obligation on the part of children or expectations on the part of parents. While the overall level of expectations and support received are higher among migrants, Schans and De Valk show that differences are less pronounced in terms of actual support received. In the type of support provided by children to parents, though, they also find important differences. However, they stress that the quality of the relationship with the child seems to be a much more important factor than origin in explaining support behaviour.

Expectations – or more precisely, contradictory expectations held by different actors or created by different normative orders – are also at the centre of Empez Vidal's case study of Moroccan unaccompanied minors (chapter 5). As Empez Vidal argues, the migration of unaccompanied minors from Morocco to Spain needs to be placed in the broader context of South-North relations, differences in wealth, related migration expectations that unaccompanied minors and their families have in terms of improving access to resources and achieving upward social mobility. This is also as a livelihood strategy and a specific opportunity structure that renders the migration of an unaccompanied minor a promising avenue to migration. In her analysis of what she calls the 'humanitarian window of opportunity', Empez Vidal reveals contradictions that result from the interaction between immigration law, the legal and child protection systems, the individual migration projects of unaccompanied minors and the expectations of their families left behind. Thus, while addressing neglect is the main objective and indeed the *raison d'être* of child protection services, the fact that proving neglect is a precondition for accessing child protection facilities and thereby, potentially, a legal status, generates real

neglect among the children studied by Empez Vidal. Similarly, reunifying children with their families at home, which is widely seen as the optimal way to address the situation of unaccompanied minors by child protection, often risks producing neglect at home – and thus beyond the reach of Spanish child protection services. Many of the tenets of the current situation – the desire of many young Moroccans to make their way to Spain, restrictive immigration policies, and humanitarian laws intent on protecting the most vulnerable – will prevail for the foreseeable future. Against this background, Empez Vidal concludes that there is little prospect that the fundamental contradictions characterising the current situation will change anytime soon.

The chapters in the second section, entitled ‘Gender, generation and work in the migrant family’, turn to the economic dimensions of family-related migration and investigate the role of familial arrangements in relation to employment of its members, family labour and the incorporation of family members in the labour market, more generally from different perspectives. The opening contribution (chapter 6) by Gillian Creese, Isabel Dyck and Arlene Tiger McLaren questions the pervasive dichotomy between the family as belonging to the non-productive, supposedly traditional sphere, and employment belonging to the productive, supposedly modern sphere. Using Bourdieu’s theory of different forms of capital, the authors investigate how female family members’ social and emotional capital is transformed in different ways and becomes integral to how the ‘human capital’ of immigration policy discourse can be enabled. Based on an in-depth longitudinal study of 25 immigrant households in Vancouver, they show how social capital of female family members enables processes of reskilling and labour market inclusion of husbands and how the domestic sphere is closely interwoven with the labour market activities of male family members. They thus conclude that far from being ‘unproductive’ and ‘problematic’, family migration appears as an interdependent family strategy focused on productive activities in which households develop family-based practices and goals.

The second chapter in this section, Christine Catarino and Laura Oso’s study of immigrant family businesses in Spain and France (chapter 7) similarly investigates the interlinkages between the family and employment activities through its focus on a case where the family unit coincides with the work unit. As they argue, the special characteristics of family businesses raise issues about the nature of the relationships between family members. Focusing on the nature of exchanges, labour commitment and bonds between family members of different generations involved in the family business, Catarino and Oso show that the nature of the commitment varies greatly between the subjects of their study, depending on age, position in the family, gender, nature and stage of the parents’ migration projects and how it is perceived by children, to name

but the most important determinants of labour commitment. While some children involved in their parents' business see their labour commitment as a moral obligation and a way to pay back some of the emotional and educational investments, among others, that their parents have invested in them, others see their work purely as a market exchange, while still others see it as a combination of the two. However, the chapter also emphasises the differences in the perception of intergenerational arrangements between different members of the family – parents, children and between siblings – suggesting that we need to consider the diversity of migrant experiences to fully comprehend family-related migration.

The concluding contribution in this section, Amparo González-Ferrer's study of family reunification processes and labour market inclusion in Spain (chapter 8) takes a different angle on the relationship between family migration, migrant families and the labour market. Based on an analysis of Spanish Labour Force Survey (LFS) data and official administrative statistics on family reunification, González-Ferrer finds that family-related migration has been substantial in Spain, contrary to what is suggested by official statistics published by the government. In addition, the LFS data show that the vast majority of married persons in Spain have successfully reunified with their spouses and have done so very fast, suggesting that migration had been a family strategy pursued from the outset, but also indicating soft enforcement of immigration regulations and resulting in reunification processes on the fringes of the law. As the LFS data show, the vast majority of family members enter the labour market, although displaying considerable gender differences, with women less likely to enter employment. As González-Ferrer notes, family migration status (i.e. whether a person is a first mover, or conversely, is joining another family member in Spain) is a key determinant of labour force participation. Reunified spouses are the category displaying the lowest labour force participation rates, with women showing considerably lower rates, which are, however, roughly equal to those of native Spanish women. Conversely, first movers who have reunified with their spouses have the highest labour force participation rates. One of the categories least likely to enter the labour market are foreign women who joined their husbands several years later, suggesting that fast family reunification is beneficial for labour market inclusion. González-Ferrer concludes that given the extent of differences in how families organise the family reunification process, which are associated with differential labour market outcomes, especially for women, policymakers need to take the potential consequences of visa and work permit restrictions into account when designing policies.

The chapters in the third section combine different perspectives on marriage migration and gender relations. While Panitee Suksumboon (chapter 9) and Annett Fleischer (chapter 10) adopt the point of view of

migrants involved in marriage migration, Yvonne Riaño (chapter 11) investigates the gendered conceptions of marriage as embodied in Swiss immigration legislation, interpreting them as an expression of Swiss gender norms. All three chapters highlight the role of the state in shaping marriage migration and gender relations within marriages.

In her study, Suksumboon shows Thai women's strategies to pursue marriage to foreign – in this case, Dutch – men. Suksumboon stresses that while it is true that marriages between Thai women and Dutch men take place in a context of global asymmetries of wealth, power, resources and status, the relationship cannot be reduced to economic motives and the desire to achieve social mobility through marriage migration. As she shows, idealised conceptions of marital relationships and positive, often exoticised imaginations of Thai women by Dutch men, and idealised images of *farang* ('foreign') men by Thai women play an important part in marriage motivations. In addition, constraints on the local marriage market, particularly for divorced women and women no longer considered attractive spouses in Thailand because of their age, also play a role. As Suksumboon shows, however, motivations and reasons for marriage migration are not uniform for Thai marriage migrants, depending on class, age, and origin within Thailand. Her study stresses the agency of the women involved, but also highlights the power of the state in the immigration context to constrain the scope for agency, often putting women in a difficult position during their first years of residence.

Like Suksumboon, Fleischer (chapter 10) studies marriage migration from the perspective of individual migrants. In her case, however, the focus is on foreign men – Cameroonians in Germany – marrying native German women. Her account of marriage and migration strategies of Cameroonian men is complementary, at times parallel to, but in many respects also a stark contrast to Suksumboon's account of Thai female marriage migrants. In both cases, exoticised imaginations of the Other play a key role in forging relationship between the two concerned partners. In contrast to Suksumboon's case, however, where the initial encounter between the future spouses takes place in Thailand, helped by long-standing traditions of match-making in the context of Thailand's tourist industry and the existence of specialised dating agencies and online dating fora, the encounter in the case of Cameroonian men takes place in the country of immigration and is often a response to the need to regularise an insecure legal status. The latter also generates institutionalised suspicion from authorities involved. In this context, spouses are required to conform to closely policed notions of a 'good marriage' and a marriage based on affection and love, which the spouses must constantly prove. At the same time, the importance of marriage for some migrants contrasts starkly with the decline of marriage as the sole legitimate form of couple relationship in mainstream German society.

Similar contradictions between immigration law, changing societal attitudes and practices towards marriage and gender equality are highlighted by Riaño (chapter 11). Her study of the position of spouses under Swiss immigration law focuses on the contradictions between the promotion of gender equality by mainstream society, on the one hand, and the creation of unequal, 'traditional' relationships through restrictive residence regulations, on the other. Riaño observes that binational marriages appear as a particular case of asymmetric power relations within the family: whereas a Swiss husband enjoys full citizenship rights, those of the foreign spouse are limited. Swiss immigration regulations do not foresee an economic role for foreign spouses because they are expected to 'remain with their husbands'. Women also experience considerable pressure from Swiss society to conform to a child-rearing role. Traditional gender roles are thus, directly or indirectly, set: the Swiss man as breadwinner and the foreign woman as homemaker, thus perpetuating patriarchal gender roles and values. Riaño concludes that unequal gender relations within migrant families cannot simply be interpreted as resulting from supposedly 'backward' ethnic values, as it is often contended in integration debates, but as an outcome of the patriarchal values that underpin immigration regulations in particular, and Swiss gender norms in general.

The chapters in the fourth section highlight the importance of family ties and obligations in shaping migratory decisions and circulation in a transnational context. Their focus is on care arrangements and the role of care responsibilities in influencing migrants' decision-making and practices.

Ludovica Banfi and Paolo Boccagni's empirical studies of three women-led migratory streams into Italy – Ecuadorians, Polish and Ukrainian women – (chapter 12) draw out the differences and commonalities between the groups in terms of age, life cycle and legal opportunities available in different migration regimes. An element common to all three cases studied by Banfi and Boccagni is that women's responsibility in economic and moral terms towards their families at home is a key driver of their migration. However, concrete arrangements and family practices associated with migration differ greatly between the groups, in particular as far as children are concerned as well as with regard to partners, where there is a broad continuum of practices ranging from eventual family reunification either in Italy or in the country of origin to family disruption. As the authors find, a key aspect influencing the evolution of family practices at a distance and the ensuing differences between the three groups is the interaction between individual's migratory projects and structural factors, notably the legal framework for migration, labour demand and geographical proximity and related costs, all of which impact the ability to circulate transnationally or, conversely, to choose between being 'here' and 'there'.

Banfi and Boccagni, however, also highlight how the term 'transnational' is perhaps more appropriate for intergenerational relations, which are more intense and involve active provision of care, than when applied to couple relationships, where transnational practices seem to be of an altogether vaguer nature and are much more diverse compared to relations with children.

Paola Bonizzoni (chapter 13) looks in more depth at some of these structural factors that impact family practices in a migration context, based on a case study of Latin American women in Milan. She highlights the diversity of the women's immigration status and the way their immigration status facilitates or obstructs the ability to reconstitute the family in a transnational context. As Bonizzoni shows, many families are trapped in a transnational existence, having neither the resources nor the legal rights to reunify with their families. If they manage to reunify, they often do so only after long periods of separation. In addition, their weak labour market position frequently means that striking a balance between working and family time presents a major challenge for them. In addition, it creates or exacerbates tensions within the family. Using the concepts of 'civic stratification' and 'stratified reproduction', Bonizzoni shows the effect of combining restrictive immigration policies with feminised forms of low-wage labour: the constraint on families' ability to reconstitute themselves and the simultaneous shaping of lives, practices and conflicts within the families.

The major part of the literature on transnational family lives and practices focuses on low-skilled migrants, often based on the tacit assumption that skilled and highly skilled migrants are much less likely to engage in or be affected by transnational family practices, and that their migration is primarily driven by individual economic motivations, on the one hand, and the demand for skilled labour, on the other. While migration studies have increasingly uncovered social and family ties as an important factor shaping migrants' decision-making in general, highly skilled migration is still largely analysed within a framework of methodological individualism. In this vein, frequently used conceptions of highly skilled migration such as the 'circulation of talent' or 'migration of skills' conceive highly skilled migrants as individuals for whom social and family ties seem to be irrelevant in making decisions about their migration. Auréli Varrel's case study of highly skilled Indian migrants returning from the US to India (chapter 14) questions these assumptions and shows how a sense of commitment and moral obligation towards other family members who stay behind, notably parents, as well as the desire to transmit Indian cultural identities to children, is an important aspect of migratory decisions of the respondents in her study. However, the return process is not decoupled from economic decisions and is strategically employed by some to advance careers. However, as Varrel shows, return does have differen-

tial implications for men and women. It often results in a complex re-composition of generational and gender roles in the family, as well as the spatial reorganisation of the family members – the relocation of members of the nuclear family and extended family across the Indian subcontinent, the reshaping of migrants' nuclear families into Indian extended families and the exclusion of skilled women from the workforce. Far from being a smooth process, the 'circulation of skills' thus raises many of the same intergenerational and gender issues as the migration of any other migrants.

In the concluding chapter to this section, Venetia Evergeti and Louise Ryan (chapter 15) critically reflect on the burgeoning literature on transnational families and transnational care arrangements, highlighting the need to acknowledge the diversity of migrants' experiences and use appropriate methods and theorisations that reflect this diversity. As they observe, the focus of much of the literature on transnational families on disadvantaged female migrants has led to an underestimation of the diversity and fluidity of migratory experiences, strategies and caring practices developed in a transnational context. They call for a more nuanced understanding of how migrants organise and deal with family responsibilities 'here' and 'there', and how family practices and responsibilities mediated by age, class, skill level, stage in the life cycle and migration status. To achieve such a nuanced understanding, they highlight the importance of utilising ethnographic and qualitative methods that capture both the local and global context of the everyday reality of transnational families.

1.5 Conclusion

As described in this introductory chapter, family migration is growing in significance in academic writing and policymaking both at national and European levels. Yet despite the importance of the family in the process and course of migration, family migrations in their different forms remain weakly theorised and marginal in migration studies. Considerable benefit would be derived from bringing closer together the insights of family sociology and migration studies. It would help our understanding of contemporary families, many of which have been shaped by migratory movements. Families are diverse, complex and fluid; they are the nexus in which economic, social and political processes come together as do processes of production and reproduction. We need not just study the family as a unit, but also to examine its different members and the relationships between genders and generations, as well as the ways in which they are altered in the course of migration.

A theme running through this chapter has been the impact of the state

and its regulatory framework in shaping and constraining families in migration. The family, its members and key moments of change and reproduction, such as marriage, have become a major object of national and European policymaking. National regulations have constricted the ability of certain families to live transnationally yet, at the same time, the quest for greater mobility, intended primarily for European citizens, has been used strategically by non-European family members of such citizens. So although EU law may in fact be more conservative in its conception of the family than in some member states, its vision of the relationship between the citizen and the state differs.

To gain a fuller understanding of the structure of families and changes engendered in the course of migration, we need to use a variety of methodologies, as the chapters in this volume have done. Analysis of official statistics and large-scale surveys can illuminate current trends and establish correlations and (in some instances) causal relations. Quantitative analysis also can help illuminate family norms, conceptions of the family and family life and attitudes towards intergenerational obligations. Qualitative analysis (biographical interviews and focus groups) enables us to probe in greater depth the interaction between different processes, migrant strategies and changing identities. Analyses of legislation, policy documents, legal texts, case law and administrative records allow us to comprehend the ways families are shaped by, and respond to, immigration regulations. Comparative analyses between nationalities and nation-states, both within the EU and beyond, are also required for elucidating the relationship between family forms and immigration policies. Thus, multi-sited ethnographic methods (Marcus 1995), transnational survey designs and multi-national case study approaches focusing on different ends of the migration process are particularly appropriate to study processes of family migration and family practices in a transnational context. Transnational research designs can also fruitfully be employed for studying the impact of receiving countries' policies on changes in family arrangements and relationships. However, as important as utilising different methodologies and studying family-related migration from different disciplinary perspectives may be, it is crucial to let these different insights speak to each other, as we have attempted to do here.

With this volume, we hope to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of family dimensions of international migration, while also showing the centrality of family dimensions to all international migration. Similarly, we hope this publication encourages future research that overcomes boundaries, disciplinary and otherwise, and understands family dimensions of international migration in all its diversity and complexity.

Notes

- 1 Examples of family migration projects include the Familles et Couples Binationaux en Europe (Fabienne 2000-2001); Gender Relationships in Europe at the Turn of the Millennium: Women as Subjects in Migration and Marriage (GRINE 2001-2004, http://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/projects/055_en.html); Civic Stratification, Gender and Family Migration Policies in Europe (2006-2008; <http://research.icmpd.org/1445.html>); HEIRAT Female Marriage Migrants: Awareness Raising and Violence Prevention (2002-2004, http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/daphnetoolkit/html/organisations/dpt_org_de_307_en.html).
- 2 Examples of family migration conferences include Transnationalism, Family Ties, and Migration in Europe, (13-14 December 2007, Paris); and Families, Construction of Foreignness and Migration in 20th Century Western Europe (15-16 May 2008, Leuven). Five panels at the Seventh European Social Science History Conference (26 February – 1 March 2008, Lisbon) focused on family migration, while a sixth explored the role of family migration in history and several others featured papers addressing family-related migration.
- 3 We use the term 'binational marriage' rather than alternatives such as 'bicultural marriage' to highlight that public debates around these marriages are not just about cultural difference and 'mixture', but are very much linked to citizenship and residence rights. In our usage, the term, however, designates marriages involving spouses of different cultural or ethnic background and of different citizenship. See also our discussions of binational and transnational co-ethnic marriages in chapter sections 1.2.4 and 1.2.5, respectively.
- 4 See also the research programme Children's Mobility and Immobility in Transnational Family Migration at the Peace Research Institute (PRIO) in Oslo (<http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Project/?oid=96563>).
- 5 Although Faist's study draws extensively on Boyd's work and highlights the role of networks – both for dynamics of international migration and the emergence of transnational social spaces – it is interesting to note how little attention he pays to family-related migration.
- 6 This section draws on results from the project Civic Stratification, Gender, and Family Migration Policies in Europe (Kraler 2010a).
- 7 Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the European Council of 29 April 2004 on the right of citizens of the union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the member states.
- 8 Rights enjoyed by beneficiaries of the directive may only be suspended on serious grounds of public policy or in cases of grave violation of the law.
- 9 Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents.
- 10 There is a growing interest in unaccompanied minors in Europe. See, for example, the conference Migration of Unaccompanied Minors in Europe: Contexts of Origin, Migration Routes and Reception Systems (10-11 October 2007, Poitiers) (Hernandez 2008); UNICEF http://www.unicef-irc.org/research/resource_pages/migration/index.html; and a recent project undertaken by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA 2010) investigating the social situation of unaccompanied asylum seekers in selected EU Member States.
- 11 It seems, however, that there are marked gender differences in terms of patterns of migration and matchmaking. Thus, tourism and internet dating seem to be much more important for female marriage migrants, while professional

- matchmaking agencies almost exclusively offer foreign women to male clients. In addition, marriage after entry seems to be more important for male migrants (see also Fleischer this volume).
- 12 These suspicions, in turn, often mirror an institutionalised suspicion emanating from the state. Mixed couples are thus frequently suspected of living in a marriage of convenience not only in the eyes of state authorities, but also their very own friends and relatives (Strasser et al. 2009).
 - 13 For major themes addressed in current research on this topic, see also information about the conference held on 20-21 November 2008 at the Peace Research Institute (PRIO) in Oslo on transnational parenting and children left behind (<http://www.prio.no/Research-and-Publications/Migration/Transnational-parenthood-and-children-left-behind>).
 - 14 De-familisation refers to 'the degree to which households' welfare and caring responsibilities are relaxed – either via welfare state provision or via market provision' (Esping-Andersen 1999), though does not consider the use of migrant labour.
 - 15 One of the rare studies on fathering in a migration context is a project funded by the UK Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and coordinated by Julia Brannen at the Institute of Education, University of London: Fathers across Three Family Generations in Polish, Irish and UK Origin White Families (May 2009 – October 2011) is ([see http://www.ioe.ac.uk/study/departments/tcru/16157.html](http://www.ioe.ac.uk/study/departments/tcru/16157.html)).

References

- Abadan-Unat, N. (2005), *Migration ohne Ende: Vom Gastarbeiter zum Eurotürken*. Berlin: Edition Parabolis.
- Abraham, M. (2008), 'Domestic violence and the Indian diaspora in the United States', in R. Palriwala & P. Uberoi (eds.), *Marriage, migration and gender*, 303-325. London: Sage.
- Ackers, L. (2007), 'Context, culture and values in migration research on children and mobility within the European Union', in L. Hantrais & S. Mangen (eds.), *Cross-national research: Methodology and practice*, 171-181. London: Routledge.
- Ackers, L. (1998), *Shifting spaces: Women, citizenship and migration within the European Union*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Ackers, L. & H. Stalford (2007), 'Managing multiple life-courses: The influence of children on migration processes in the European Union', in K. Clarke, T. Maltby & P. Kennett (eds.), *Social policy review 19: Analysis and debate in social policy*, 321-342. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Ackers, L. & H. Stalford (2004), *A community for children? Children, citizenship and internal migration in the EU*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Adam, B. (1996), 'Detraditionalization and the certainty of uncertain futures', in P. Helas, S. Lash & P. Morris (eds.), *Detraditionalization*, 134-148. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ahmad, A.N. (2008), 'Gender and generation in Pakistani migration: A critical study of masculinity', in L. Ryan & W. Webster (eds.), *Gendering migration: Masculinity, femininity and ethnicity in post-war Britain*, 155-170. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Albertini, M., M. Kohli & C. Vogel. (2007), 'Intergenerational transfers of time and money in European families: Common patterns: Different regimes?', *Journal of European Social Policy* 17: 319-334.

- Algava, E. & M. Bèque (2008), 'Nouveaux détenteurs et détentrices d'un d'un titre de séjour: des trajectoires familiales et professionnelles contrastées', *Femmes et hommes: Regards sur la parité*, 37-50. Paris: Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques. www.insee.fr/fr/publications-et-services/sommaire.asp?id=175®_id=0.
- Allievi, S. & M. Tognetti-Bordogna (1996), *Legami familiari e immigrazione: I matrimoni misti*. Turin: L'Harmattan Italia.
- Anttonen, A., J. Baldock & J. Sipilä (eds.) (2003), *The young, the old and the state: Social care systems in five industrial nations*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Arber, S. & C. Attias-Donfut (eds.) (2000), *The myth of generational conflict: The family and state in ageing societies*. London: Routledge.
- Asis, M. (2006), 'Living with migration: Experiences of left-behind children in the Philippines', *Asian Population Studies* 2 (1): 45-67.
- Attias-Donfut, C. (2006), *L'enracinement: Enquête sur le vieillissement des immigrés en France*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Attias-Donfut, C. (ed.) (1995), *Les solidarités entre générations: Vieillesse, familles, état*. Paris: Nathan.
- Baldassar, L. & C. Baldock (2000), 'Linking migration and family studies: Transnational migrants and the care of aging parents', in B. Agozino (ed.), *Theoretical and methodological issues in migration research*, 61-89. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Baldisserrri, M. (2005), 'Relazioni familiari nell'immigrazione delle peruviane a Firenze', in T. Caponio & A. Colombo (eds.), *Stranieri in Italia: Migrazioni globali, integrazioni locali*, 61-89. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Bailey A. & P. Boyle (2004), 'Untying and retying family migration in the New Europe', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30 (2): 229-241.
- Basch, L., N. Glick Schiller & C. Szanton Blanc (1994), *Nations unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments, and deterritorialized nation states*. New York: Gordon and Breach.
- Bastos, S.P. (2005), 'Indian transnationalisms in colonial and postcolonial Mozambique', in V. Bilger & A. Kraler (eds.), 'African migrations: Historical perspectives and contemporary dynamics', Stichproben: Vienna Journal of African Studies special issue 8: 277-306.
- Baykara-Krumme, H. (2008), *Immigrant families in Germany: Intergenerational solidarity in later life*. Berlin: Weißensee.
- Beck, U. & E. Beck-Gernsheim (2002), *Individualization*. London: Sage.
- Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2007), 'Transnational lives, transnational marriages: A review of the evidence from migrant communities in Europe', *Global Networks* 7 (3): 271-288.
- Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2004), *Wir und die Anderen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Beer, B. (1996), *Deutsch-Philippinische Ehen: Interethnische Heiraten und Migration von Frauen*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- Berger, J. & J. Mohr (1975), *A seventh man*. New York: Viking Press.
- Berthoud, R. (2000), 'Family formation in multicultural Britain: Three patterns of diversity', working paper. Institute for Social and Economic Research: University of Essex.
- Bilger, V. (2010), 'Family migration policies in Germany', NODE Policy Report. Vienna: BMWF/ICMPD.
- Bhabba, J. & S. Shutter (1994), *Women's movement: Women under immigration, nationality and refugee law*. Oakhill/Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Bohning, W. (1984), *Studies of international migration*. London: Macmillan.
- Bonjour, S. (2008), 'Family migration policies in the Netherlands', NODE Policy

- Report. Vienna: BMWF/ICMPD. http://research.icmpd.org/fileadmin/Research-Website/Project_material/NODE/Family_Migration_Pol_NL_final_or.pdf.
- Bonizzoni, P. & A. Cibeà (2009), 'Family migration policies in Italy', NODE Policy Report. Vienna: BMWF/ICMPD. http://research.icmpd.org/fileadmin/Research-Website/Project_material/NODE/IT_Policy_Report.pdf.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996) 'On the family as a realised category', *Theory, Culture and Society* 12 (3): 19-26.
- Boyd, M. (1989), 'Family and personal networks in international migration: Recent developments and new agendas', *International Migration Review* 23(3): 638-70.
- Castagnone E., M. Eve, R. Petrillo. & F. Piperno (2007), 'Madri migranti: Le migrazioni di cura dall' Ucraina e dalla Romania in Italia: Percorsi e impatto sui paesi di origine', CESPI Working Paper 34. http://www.cespi.it/working_Papers.html.
- Çelikaksoy, A. (2008), 'Marriage migration: The case of non-western immigrants in Denmark', paper presented at the Seventh European Social Science History Conference (ESSHC), Lisbon, 26 February – 1 March 2008.
- Çelikaksoy, A., H. Sykt Nielsen & M. Verner (2006), 'Marriage migration: Just another case of positive assortive matching?', *Review of Economics of the Household* 4 (3): 253-275.
- Charbit, Y. & C. Bertrand (1985), *Enfants, familles, migrations*, INED Cahier no.110. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Charles, N., C. Aull Davies & C. Harris (2008), *Families in transition: Social change, family formation and kin relationships*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Charsley, K. (2005), 'Unhappy husbands: Masculinity and migration in transnational Pakistani marriages', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11: 85-105.
- Cole, J. & D. Durham (eds.) (2007), *Generations and globalization: Youth, age, and family in the new world economy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Constable, N. (2003), *Romance on a global stage: Pen pals, virtual ethnography and 'mail-order' marriages*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Council of the European Union (2008), 'European pact on immigration and asylum', Brussels, 13440/08, ASIM 72, Brussels, 24 September 2008 (07.10) (OR. fr). http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/news/intro/doc/doc_13440_08_en.pdf.
- De Hart, B. (2006), 'The morality of Maria Toet: Gender, citizenship and the construction of the nation-state', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 32 (1): 49-68.
- De Hart, B. & R. van Oers (2006), 'European trends in nationality law', in R. Bauböck, E. Ersbøll, K. Groenendijk & H. Waldrach (eds.), *Acquisition and loss of nationality. Policies and trends in 15 European states. Volume 1: Comparative Analyses*, 317-357. IMISCOE Research Series. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Eisfeld, J. (2005), *Die Scheinehe in Deutschland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Beiträge zur Rechtsgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts 45. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Escrivà, A. (2005), 'Aged global care chains: A Southern-European contribution to the field', paper presented at the Migration and Domestic Work in Global Perspective Conference, Wassenaar, 26-29 May 2005.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1999), *The social foundations of post-industrial economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- European Commission (2008a), 'Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the application of directive 2003/86/EC on the right to family reunification', COM(2008) 610 Final, 8 October 2008.
- European Commission (2008b), 'Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the application of directive 2004/38/EC on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within

- the territory of the member states', COM(2008) 840/3 Final.
- European Journal of Migration and Law* 8 (2006), special issue 'Marriages of conveniences'.
- European Migration Network (2008), *Family reunification*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Faist, T. (2000), *The volume and dynamics of international migration and transnational social spaces*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fernandez de la Hoz, P. (2002), *Migrant families and integration in the EU members states*. Vienna: Österreichisches Institut für Familienforschung.
- Fong, D. (2008), 'Low rate of German-Turkish marriages impedes integration', *Deutsche Welle* 24 February 2008. <http://www.dwworld.de/dw/article/0,2144,313-4265,00.html>.
- Fonseca, M. & M. Ormond (2008), 'Defining family and bringing it together: The ins and outs of family reunification in Portugal', in R. Grillo (ed.), *The family in question: Immigrant and ethnic minorities in multicultural Europe*, 89-112. IMISCOE Research Series. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- FRA (Fundamental Rights Agency) (2010), *Separated, asylum-seeking children in European Union member states*. Vienna: European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. http://fra.europa.eu/fraWebsite/attachments/SEPAC-SUMMARY-REPORT-conference-edition_en.pdf.
- Geddes, A. (2000), *Immigration and European integration: Towards fortress Europe?* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- George, S.M. (2005), *When women come first: Gender and class in transnational migration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Giddens, A. (1991), *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (1990), *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gil Araujo, S. (2010), 'Family migration policies in Spain', NODE Policy Report. Vienna: BMWF/ICMPD. <http://research.icmpd.org/1445.html>.
- Gil Araujo, S. (2009), 'Civic stratification, gender, and family migration policies: An exploratory investigation of migrants involved in family migration in Spain', NODE Interview Analysis. Vienna: BMWF/ICMPD. <http://research.icmpd.org/1445.html>.
- González-Ferrer, A. (2007), 'The process of family reunification among original guest-workers in Germany', *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung* 19 (1): 10-33.
- González-Ferrer, A. (2006), 'Who do immigrants marry? Partner choice among single immigrants in Germany', *European Sociological Review* 22 (2): 171-185.
- Grillo, R. (ed.) (2008), *The family in question: Immigrant and ethnic minorities in multicultural Europe*. IMISCOE Research Series. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Groenendijk, K. (2006), 'Family reunification as a right under community law', *European Journal of Migration and Law* 8: 215-230.
- Groenendijk, K., R. Fernhout, D. van Dam, R. van Oers & T. Strik (2007), *The family reunification directive in EU member states: The first year of implementation*. Centre for Migration Law, Nijmegen. Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers.
- Guiraudon, V. & L. Gallya (2000), 'A reappraisal of the state: Sovereignty debate. The case of migration control', *Comparative Political Studies* 33 (2): 163-195.
- Guth, J. (2007), 'Triggering skilled migration: Factors influencing the mobility of early career scientists to Germany', Focus Migration Policy Brief 6.
- Heady, P. & M. Kohli (eds.) (2010), *Family, kinship and state in contemporary Europe*, vol. 3: *Perspectives on theory and policy*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

- Herman, E. (2006), 'Migration as family business: the role of personal networks in the mobility phase of migration', *International Migration* 44 (4): 191-230.
- Hester, M., K. Chantler, G. Gangoli, J. Devgon, S. Sharma & A. Singleton (2008), *Forced marriages: The risk factors and the effect of raising the minimum age for a sponsor and of leave to enter the UK as a spouse or fiancé(e)*. University of Bristol. http://www.endviolenceagainstwomen.org.uk/pages/honour_crimes_forced_marriage.html.
- Hodagneu-Sotelo, P. & E. Avila (1997), 'I'm here, but I'm there': The meaning of Latina transnational motherhood', *Gender and Society* 11 (5): 548-571.
- Hoerder, D. (2002), *Cultures in contact: World migration in the second millennium*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hollomey, C. (2008), 'Civic Stratification, gender, and family migration policies: An investigation of experiences of persons involved in family related migration in the Netherlands', NODE Interview Analysis, unpublished project report. Vienna: BMWF/ICMPD.
- Home Office (2008), *Control of immigration: Statistics United Kingdom 2007*, Home Office Statistical Bulletin 10/08.
- Huddleston, T. (2008), 'What future for families in Europe: The high road back to Tampere or the low road from Vichy', MIPEX Policy Impact Assessment Series. Brussels: Migration Policy Group.
- International Migration Review* (1984), special issue 'Women in migration'.
- Jastram, K. (2003), 'Family unity: The new geography of family life', *Migration Information Source*. <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=118>.
- Kabis, V. (ed.) (2001), *Bi-nationale Familien und Lebensgemeinschaften in Europa (FABIENNE)*. Abschlussbericht. Frankfurt am Main: Verband bi-nationaler Familien und Partnerschaften, iaf e.V.
- King, R., M. Thomson, A. Fielding & T. Warnes (2004), *Gender, age and generation: State of the art cluster 8 report*. University of Sussex: Sussex Centre for Migration Research. IMISCOE Working Paper no. 5. <http://library.imiscoe.org/en/record/208528>.
- Kofman, E. (2009), 'Gendered migrations and the globalisation of social reproduction and care: New dialogues and directions', in M. Schrover and E. Yeo (eds.), *Gender and Migration in global, historical and theoretical perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Kofman, E. (2004), 'Family-related migration: A critical review of European studies', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30 (2): 243-262.
- Kofman, E. & A. Kraller (2006), 'Civic stratification, gender and family migration policies in Europe'. ICMPD Working Paper no. 1. http://research.icmpd.org/fileadmin/Research-Website/Publications/working_papers/AK_Family_Migration_WP_01.pdf
- Kofman, E., M. Rogoz & F. Lévy (2010), 'Family migration policies in France', NODE Policy Report. Vienna: BMWF/ICMPD. <http://research.icmpd.org/1291.html>.
- Kofman, E., S. Lukes, V. Meeto & P. Aaron (2008), 'Family migration to the United Kingdom: Trends, statistics and politics', NODE Policy Report. Vienna: BMWF/ICMPD. <http://research.icmpd.org/1291.html>.
- Kofman, E., A. Phizacklea, P. Raghuram & R. Sales (2000), *Gender and international migration in Europe: Employment, welfare, politics*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Kohli, M. (2004), 'Intergenerational transfers and inheritance: A comparative view', in M. Silverstein (ed.), 'Intergenerational relations across time and place', *Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics* 24: 266-289. New York: Springer.

- Kohli, M. (1999), 'Private and public transfers between generations: Linking the family and the state', *European Societies* 1: 81-104.
- Kraler, A. (2010a), 'Civic stratification, gender, and family migration policies in Europe', final report. Vienna: BMWF/ICMPD, http://research.icmpd.org/fileadmin/Research-Website/Project_material/NODE/FINAL_Report_Family_Migration_Policies_Online_FINAL.pdf.
- Kraler, A. (2010b), 'Ein unkämpftes Terrain. Familienmigration und Familienmigrationspolitik', in H. Langthaler (ed.), *Integration in Österreich: Sozialwissenschaftliche Befunde*, 64-103. Innsbruck: Studienverlag.
- Krumme, H. (2004), 'Fortwährende Remigration: Das transnationale Pendeln türkischer Arbeitsmigrantinnen und Arbeitsmigranten im Ruhestand', *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 33: 362-373.
- Künemund, H. (2006), 'Changing welfare states and the sandwich generation: Increasing burdens for the next generation?' *International Journal of Ageing and Later Life* 1: 11-30.
- Künemund, H. & M. Rein (1999), 'There is more to receiving than needing: Theoretical arguments and empirical explorations of crowding in and crowding out', *Ageing and Society* 19: 93-121.
- Lahav, G. (1997), 'International versus national constraints in family-reunification migration policy', *Global Governance* 3: 349-372.
- Lauser, A. (2008), 'Philippine women on the move: Marriage across borders', *International Migration* 46 (4): 85-108.
- Lauth Bacas, J. (2002), 'Cross-border marriages and the formation of transnational families: A case study of Greek-German couples in Athens', Transnational Communities Programme Working Papers Series WPTC-02-10. Oxford: University of Oxford.
- Lopes P., C. Pereulou & C. Balsa (eds.) (1994), Actes de la conférence Européenne: Famille et mobilité humaine dans l'espace de l'Union Européenne', 17-20 March 1994. Lisbon, Commission of the European Communities D.G.V., University of Lisbon.
- Lucassen, L. & C. Laarman (2009), 'Immigration, intermarriage and the changing face of Europe in the post war period', *History of the Family* 14 (1): 52-68.
- Lutz, H. (2008), *Migration and domestic work: A European perspective on a global theme*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Mahler, S. & P. Pessar (2001), 'Gendered geographies of power: Analyzing gender across transnational spaces', *Identities* 7 (4): 441-459.
- Marcus, G.E. (1995), 'Ethnography in the world system: The emergence of multi-sited ethnography', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 95-117.
- Mason, J. (2004), 'Managing kinship over long distances: The significance of "the visit"', *Social Policy and Society* 3 (4): 421-429.
- McNay, L. (1999), 'Gender, habitus and the field: Pierre Bourdieu and the limits of reflexivity', *Theory, Culture and Society* 16 (1): 95-117.
- Meurs, D. & A. Pailhé (2008), 'Descendantes d'immigrés en France: Une doublevulnérabilité sur le marché du travail?' *Travail, Genre et Sociétés* 2 (20).
- Migrations Société* (2008), special issue 20 (119) 'Entre consentement et imposition: Réalités politiques et sociales des mariages dits forcés'.
- Miranda, A. (2002) 'Les Chinois dans la région de Naples: Altérités et identités dans une économie locale en mutation', in M. Peraldi (ed.), *La fin des norias? Réseaux migrants dans les économies marchandes en Méditerranée*, 431-452. Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose.

- Mirdal, G.M. (1984), 'Stress and distress in migration: Problems and resources of Turkish women in Denmark', *International Migration Review* special issue 'Women in migration' 18 (4): 984-1003.
- Morokvasic, M. (1984), 'Birds of passage are also women', *International Migration Review* special issue 'Women in migration' 18 (4): 886-907.
- Morris, L. (2002), *Managing migration: Civic stratification and migrants' rights*. London: Routledge.
- Mounier, M. (2000), 'Le couple franco-algérien', *Migrations Société* 12 (68): 7-18.
- Münscher, A. (1984), 'The workday routines of Turkish women in Federal Republic of Germany: Results of a pilot study', *International Migration Review* 18 (4): 1230-1246.
- Nedelcu, M. (2008), 'Je passe ma retraite au Canada: Quand les parents des migrants roumains à Toronto suivent leurs enfants dans la migration', in C. Audebert & E. Ma Mung (eds.), *Les migrations internationales: Enjeux contemporains et questions nouvelles*, 219-234. Bilbao: Université Deusto/HumanitarianNet.
- Neyer, G. (1986), 'Jugoslawische und türkische Frauen in Österreich: Migration als Emanzipationschance?', in H. Wimmer (ed.), *Ausländische Arbeitskräfte in Österreich*, 433-457. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.
- Palriwala, R. & P. Uberoi (2008a), 'Exploring the links: Gender issues in marriage and migration', in R. Palriwala & P. Uberoi (eds.), *Marriage, migration and gender*, 23-60. London: Sage.
- Palriwala, R. & P. Uberoi (eds.) (2008b), *Marriage, migration and gender*. London: Sage.
- Parreñas, R.S. (2005), *Children of global migration: Transnational families and gendered woes*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Parreñas, R.S. (2001), *Servants of globalization: Women, migration and domestic work*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Passerini, L. (2004), 'Gender relationships in Europe at the turn of the millennium: Women as subjects in migration and marriage (GRINE)', final report. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Peers, S., R. Barzilay, K. Groenendijk & E. Guild (2000), *The legal status of persons admitted for family reunion: A comparative study of law and practice in some European states*. Centre for Migration Law: Nijmegen.
- Pflegerl, J. & S. Trnka (eds.) (2005), *Migration and the family in the European Union*. Vienna: Austrian Institute for Family Studies.
- Philippe, C., G. Varro & G. Neyrand (eds.) (1998), *Liberté, égalité, mixités conjugales*. Paris: Anthropos.
- Pratt, G. (2008), 'Assessing Canada's live-in caregiving programme', paper presented at the workshop 'Mobility, Integration and Development in a Globalised World' at the 13th International Metropolis Conference, Bonn, 27-31 October 2008. http://www.metropolis2008.org/pdf/20081031/plenum/20081031_gender-dimensions-of_pratt-geraldine.pdf.
- Preller, C. (2008), *So fern und doch so nah: Traditionsbedingte Gewalt an Frauen*. Vienna: Bundesministerium für Frauen und Öffentlichen Dienst. <http://www.frauen.bka.gv.at/studien/tgf2008/index.html>.
- Raghuram, P. (2004), 'The difference that skills make: Gender, family migration strategies and regulated labour markets', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30 (2): 303-323.
- Reinecke, C. (2008), 'Policing foreign men and women: Gendered patterns of expulsion and migration control in Germany, 1880-1914', in M. Schrover, J. van der Leun, L. Lucassen & C. Quispel (eds.), *Illegal migration in a global and historical perspective*, 57-81. IMISCOE Research Series. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

- Rude-Antoine, E. (2005), *Forced marriages in Council of Europe member states: A comparative study of legislation and political initiatives*. Strassbourg: Council of Europe.
- Ruenkaew, P. (2003), *Heirat nach Deutschland: Motive und Hintergründe thailändisch-deutscher Eheschließungen*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.
- Ryan, L. & W. Webster (eds.) (2008), *Gendering migration: Masculinity, femininity and ethnicity in post-war Britain*. Studies in migration and diaspora. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Sai, S. (2008), 'Reconfigurazioni familiari e identità di genere tra i migranti sikh', in G. Sciortino & A. Colombo (eds.), *Stranieri in Italia: Trent'anni dopo*, 117-145. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Salih, R. (2003), *Gender in transnationalism: Home, longing and belonging among Moroccan migrant women*. London: Routledge.
- Saraceno, C. & M. Naldini (2001), *Sociologia della famiglia*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Sauer, B. & S. Strasser (eds.) (2008), *Zwangsfreiheiten: Multikulturalität und Feminismus*. Historische Sozialkunde/Internationale Entwicklung 27. Vienna: Promedia.
- Schlehe, J. (ed.) (2001), *Interkulturelle Geschlechterforschung: Identitäten, Imaginationen, Repräsentationen*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.
- Schmidt, G. (2007), 'Good citizens, good subjects and good lives: Transnational marriages and marriage migration policy in Denmark', paper presented at the IMISCOE Cluster B3 conference, 23-25 April 2007.
- Schrover, M. (2009), 'Vulnerability and the constructions of family and gender', *History of the Family* 14 (2): 191-202.
- Scott J., J. Treas & M. Richards (eds.) (2003), *The Blackwell companion to the sociology of families*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Segalen, M. (2000), *Sociologie de la famille*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Senavilla Hernandez, D. (ed.) (2008), La migration des mineurs non-accompagnés en Europe, Emigrinter, no. 2. http://www.mshs.univ-poitiers.fr/migrinter/emigrinter/200802/emigrinter2008_02_tout.pdf.
- Smart, C. (2007) *Personal life: New directions in sociological thinking*. Cambridge: Polity.
- SOPEMI (2008) *International migration outlook*. Paris: OECD.
- Statistik Austria (2008), *Statistik der Eheschließungen seit 1970 nach Staatsangehörigkeit*. http://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistiken/bevoelkerung/eheschliessungen/index.html.
- Straßburger, G. (2003), *Heiratsverhalten und Partnerwahl im Einwanderungskontext: Eheschließungen der zweiten Migrantengeneration türkischer Herkunft*. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag.
- Straßburger, G. (2004), 'Transnational ties of the second generation: Marriages of Turks in Germany', in T. Faist & E. Özveren (eds.) *Transnational social spaces: Agents, networks and institutions*, 211-230. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Strasser, E., A. Kraler, S. Bonjour & V. Bilger (2009), 'Doing family: Responses to the construction of the 'migrant family' across Europe', *History of the Family* 14 (2): 165-176.
- Studer, B. (2001), 'Citizenship as contingent national belonging. Married women and foreigners in 20th century Switzerland', *Gender & History* 13 (3): 622-654.
- Szczepanikova, A. (2008) 'Family migration policies in the Czech Republic', NODE Policy Report. Vienna: BMWF/ICMPD. http://research.icmpd.org/fileadmin/ResearchWebsite/Project_material/NODE/Family_Migration_Policies_CZ_final_01.pdf.
- Timmerman, C. (2008), 'Marriage in a "culture of migration": Emirdag marrying into Flanders', *European Review* 16 (4): 585-594.

- Thym, D. (2008), 'Respect for private and family life under article 8 ECHR in immigration cases: A human right to regularize illegal stay?' *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 57 (1): 87-112.
- Toner, H. (2007), 'Immigration law and family life: A happy marriage?' in R. Probert (ed.), *Family life and the law: Under one roof*, 197-222. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Van Walsum, S. & T. Spijkerboer (2007), *Women and immigration law*. Milton Park/New York: Routledge-Cavendish.
- Vatz Laaroussi, M. (2001), *Le familial au coeur de l'immigration: Les stratégies de citoyenneté des familles immigrantes au Québec et en France*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Verseck, K. (2008), 'Die Kinder der Erdbeerpflücker', in Rumänien wächst eine Generation von Migrationswaisen heran', *Le Monde Diplomatique* (German edition), no. 8682 September 2008. <http://www.monde-diplomatique.de/pm/2008/09/12.mondeText.artikel,00065.idx,11>.
- Walter, A. (2009), *Familienzusammenführung in Europa: Völkerrecht, Gemeinschaftsrecht, nationales Recht*. Baden: Nomos.
- Watson, J. (1977), *Between two cultures: Migrants and minorities in Britain*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Williams, F. (2004), *Rethinking families*. London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.
- Wimmer, A. (2002), *Nationalist exclusion and ethnic conflict: Shadows of modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wimmer, A. & N. Glick Schiller (2002), 'Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation-state building, migration and the social sciences', *Global Networks* 2 (4): 331-334.
- Yuval-Davis, N. & F. Anthias (eds.) (1989), *Woman-nation-State*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Zlotnik, H. (1995) 'Migration and the family: The female perspective', *Asia and Pacific Migration Journal* 4 (2-3): 253-271.