

Koppenberg, Saskia

Research Report

Putting Migrants and Refugees on the Development Agenda: A qualitative comparable cases research on the Global Forum on Migration and Development and the UNHCR-led discussion on Targeting in the framework of Convention Plus

ÖFSE-Forum, No. 47

Provided in Cooperation with:

Austrian Foundation for Development Research (ÖFSE), Vienna

Suggested Citation: Koppenberg, Saskia (2010) : Putting Migrants and Refugees on the Development Agenda: A qualitative comparable cases research on the Global Forum on Migration and Development and the UNHCR-led discussion on Targeting in the framework of Convention Plus, ÖFSE-Forum, No. 47, ISBN 978-3-9502964-7-1, Südwind-Verlag, Wien, <https://www.oefse.at/publikationen/oefse-forum/detail-oefse-forum/publication/show/Publication/Putting-Migrants-and-Refugees-on-the-Development-Agenda/>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/268129>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Saskia Koppenberg

Putting Migrants and Refugees on the Development Agenda

**A qualitative comparable cases
research on the Global Forum
on Migration and Development
and the UNHCR-led discussion
on Targeting Development
Assistance in the framework
of Convention Plus**

Saskia Koppenberg

PUTTING MIGRANTS AND REFUGEES ON THE DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

**A qualitative comparable cases research on the Global Forum on Migration
and Development and the UNHCR-led discussion on Targeting Development
Assistance in the framework of Convention Plus**

1. Auflage 2010

© Österreichische Forschungsstiftung für Internationale Entwicklung (ÖFSE)

A-1090 Wien, Sensengasse 3, Telefon: (+43 1) 317 40 10, Fax: (+43 1) 317 40 10-150

e-mail: office@oefse.at, internet: www.oefse.at

Für den Inhalt verantwortlich: Saskia Koppenberg

Cover: Grieder Graphik

Druck: Facultas Wien


Südwind-Verlag

ISBN: 978-3-9502964-7-1

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie;
detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

finanziert durch die

Österreichische
 **Entwicklungszusammenarbeit**

Vorwort

Das Globale Forum über Migration und Entwicklung (GFMD) wurde 2007 als ein informeller und freiwilliger Dialog zwischen UN-Mitgliedsstaaten gegründet. Ziel ist der Austausch von Ideen und Strategien zum Umgang mit internationaler Migration auf der Ebene politischer EntscheidungsträgerInnen. In ihrer qualitativ-vergleichenden Inhaltsanalyse zeigt die Autorin Saskia Koppenberg, dass sich die Diskussionspapiere des GFMD vor allem auf zirkuläre und temporäre Arbeitsmigration konzentrieren und von einem ökonomisch geprägten Entwicklungsdenken ausgehen. Es wird ein modernisierungstheoretischer Ansatz verfolgt, der in Migration vor allem einen Kapitaltransfer in die globalen Zentren sieht.

Die zweite Fallstudie, der Dialog über Targeting Development Assistance des UNHCR konzentriert sich im Gegensatz dazu auf erzwungene Migration – Flüchtlinge, intern Vertriebene und RückkehrerInnen. Dieser Dialog ist durch ein alternatives Entwicklungsdenken charakterisiert, welches laut der Autorin der Diplomarbeit die menschliche Entwicklung der MigrantInnen sowie ihren Beitrag zur Entwicklung des Ortes, an dem sie sich – temporär – befinden, in den Vordergrund stellt.

In der Arbeit von Saskia Koppenberg wird ein sehr aktuelles Thema behandelt, das von zunehmendem wissenschaftlichen und politischen Interesse ist: der Nexus von Migration und Entwicklung. Die Autorin zeigt deutlich, dass Flüchtlinge und MigrantInnen in den Diskursen über Migration und Entwicklung meist nicht berücksichtigt werden. Durch die Konzentration auf bestimmte Formen von Migration und Entwicklung werden relevante Themen ausgeklammert. Die Autorin stellt hier zu Recht die Frage, welche Migration angesprochen wird und welche Konzepte und Theorien von Entwicklung dem „Sprechen“ über Migration zugrunde liegen.

Mit dieser Diplomarbeit werden die beiden Fallstudien GFMD und UNHCR sehr gut in die verschiedenen Migrations- und Entwicklungsansätze eingebettet. Die abschließende Reflexion der beiden Fallstudien ermöglicht eine empirisch und analytisch fundierte Kritik an der Entwicklungspolitik und deren Strategien.

Michael Obrovsky

Leiter des Bereichs Wissenschaft & Forschung / ÖFSE



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

„Putting Migrants and Refugees on the Development Agenda:

A qualitative comparable cases research on the Global Forum on Migration and Development and the UNHCR-led discussion on Targeting Development Assistance in the framework of Convention Plus“

Verfasserin

Saskia Koppenberg

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magistra (Mag.)

Wien, 2010

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt: A 057 390

Studienrichtung lt. Zulassungsbescheid: Internationale Entwicklung

Betreuerin: Univ.-Prof. Dr. Petra Dannecker

Contents

<i>Illustrations</i>	5
Figures.....	5
Tables.....	5
<i>Abbreviations</i>	6
<i>Preface</i>	7
CHAPTER I: Introduction	1
1 Migration and development.....	2
2 The cases under review.....	3
3 The purpose of the thesis and research questions.....	4
4 The research method.....	5
5 The structure of the thesis.....	6
CHAPTER II: Method	9
1 The general research perspective: Qualitative research.....	10
2 The research method: Qualitative structuring as regards content analysis combined with a comparable cases strategy.....	12
2.1 Contextualization of the research and case selection.....	14
2.2 Material sampling.....	14
2.3 Genesis and formal characteristics of the material.....	15
2.4 The direction of analysis.....	18
2.5 Definition of the analytical technique.....	18
2.6 Determination and implementation of the model of analysis.....	19
2.6.1 Formulation of theoretical derived categories	20
2.6.2 Composition of a coding agenda.....	20
2.6.3 Data analysis.....	20
2.6.4 Paraphrasing, generalization and summarizing.....	21

2.7 Determination and implementation of the comparable cases method.....	21
2.8 Presentation and interpretation of the research results.....	22

CHAPTER III: Migration and Development - Some conceptual and theoretical

considerations.....	23
----------------------------	-----------

1 Migration.....	24
1.1 The conceptualization of migration.....	24
1.2 Voluntary or forced migration? How to distinguish between them?.....	26
2 What is development?.....	28
2.1 Thoughts on the concept of development.....	29
2.2 Definitions of and approaches to development.....	30
2.2.1 Development as a long-term process of structural socio-economic transformation... ..	30
2.2.2 Development as short- to medium-term policy- and practice-related evaluative outcome of desirable targets.....	31
2.2.3 Development as a dominant Western discourse.....	34
3 The academic debate on migration and development.....	35
3.1 Phase 1: 1950s and 1960s - the positive view of the effects of migration on development	36
3.2 Phase 2: 1970s and 1980s – the negative view of the effects of migration on development	38
3.3 Phase 3: Since the end of 1980s - turn-around to a positive and also more differentiated view of the effects of migration on development.....	40

CHAPTER IV: Results.....	45
---------------------------------	-----------

1 The Global Forum on Migration and Development.....	47
1.1 Question on the phenomenon of migration itself - Which migration?.....	47
1.2 Question on the migration-development nexus – How do migrants contribute to development?.....	51
1.2.1 How are migrants expected to contribute to development?.....	52
1.2.2 Gender.....	62
1.2.3 Human rights.....	64
1.3 Question on the phenomenon of development itself - What development?.....	66

2 The UNHCR-led Convention Plus discussion on Targeting Development Assistance – a comparative perspective.....	69
2.1 Question on the phenomenon of migration itself - Which migration?.....	70
2.2 Question on the migration-development nexus – How do forced migrants contribute to development?.....	72
2.2.1 Who benefits?.....	73
2.2.2 How are forced migrants expected to contribute to development?.....	74
2.3 Question on the phenomenon of development itself - What development?.....	80
3 Reflection on the findings.....	82
3.1 Reflection on the dominant migration concept - Which migration?.....	82
3.2 Reflections on the migration-development nexus – For whose benefit?.....	84
3.3 Reflections on the dominant development concept - What development?.....	85

CHAPTER V: Summary, Discussion, Conclusion.....89

1 The research starting point	90
2 Review of the method.....	91
3 Summary of the findings and contextualization within the academic debate	92
3.1 Summary of the findings.....	93
3.1.1 The Global Forum on Migration and Development.....	93
3.1.2 The UNHCR-led TDA dialogue on forced migration and development.....	95
3.2 Contextualising the debates within the academic debate on migration and development.	96
3.2.1 The Global Forum on Migration and Development.....	96
3.2.2 The UNHCR-led TDA dialogue on forced migration and development.....	97
4 Discussion.....	97
4.1 Categorization in the dialogue on migration and development.....	97
4.2 Focussing migrants as the subject of the migration-development nexus.....	98
4.2.1 Migrants as agents for development.....	98
4.2.2 Migrants' self-development.....	99
4.2.3 Migrants' contribution to development.....	100
4.3 The overall development goals of the dialogue on migration and development.....	101
5 Implications of the findings on the global-level dialogue on migration and development	102
6 Suggestions for follow-up studies on the global-level dialogue on migration and development	105

7 Concluding remarks.....	107
References	108
Appendices	116
Abstract.....	116
Zusammenfassung.....	118
Curriculum Vitae.....	121
Lebenslauf.....	123

Illustrations

Figures

Figure 1: Model of research procedure.....	13
Figure 2: Model of the method of analysis.....	19

Tables

Table 1: Main phases of the academic debate on migration and development.....	35-36
Table 2: People of concern to UNHCR by region of destination at end of 2008.....	71
Table 3: People of concern to UNHCR by selected country of destination at end of 2008.....	71

Abbreviations

GFMD	Global Forum on Migration and Development
GNP	Gross National Product
HDI	Human Development Index
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IOM	International Organization for Migration
JRS	Jesuit Refugee Service
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NELM	New Economics of Labour Migration
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
ODA	Official Development Assistance
TDA	Targeting Development Assistance
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Preface

[O]ne cannot be responsible for others' well-being without being responsible for one's own, but neither can one be well on one's own without taking some responsibility for the well-being of others (Scott-Villiers 2004: 200).

CHAPTER I

Introduction

1 Migration and development

The linkage between migration and development is nothing new. There has been much political as well as academic discussion and research on the multi-dimensional relationship between migration and development that is the migration-development nexus. The views of the effects of migration on development have varied over time, from optimism in the 1950s and 1960s to scepticism in the 1970s and 1980s. Since then these radically opposing views have been replaced by a more comprehensive and pluralist understanding of the migrants' impact on development. In recent years there has been a renaissance of optimistic views, emphasising the positive effects of migration on the development of the migrants' countries of origin. Migrants have increasingly been qualified as agents of development and consequently the interest in managing the impact of migrants in order to optimize the development outcome dominates today's debates on migration and development. Key issues such as remittances, circular migration and diaspora became present characteristics of any research, discussion or examination of the migration-development nexus. However there are attempts to address these 'hegemonic readings of the migration–development nexus' (Raghuram 2009: 107).

The journal *Population, Space and Place* in 2009 published a special issue with the heading 'Rethinking the Migration-Development Nexus - Bringing marginalized visions and actors to the fore.'¹ The authors, such as Piper, Raghuram and Dannecker who contributed to this issue, hold that in the debate on the relationship of migration and development 'some forms of migration and particular forms of development come to be visible, while others become 'invisibilised'' (Raghuram 2009: 103). They examined a 'discursive construction of including and excluding certain issues, places and groups of migrants' (Piper 2009: 99), and argued that the migrants' own visions on development which do not necessarily correspond with the dominant visions of other development actors are not included in the dialogue about migration and development (Dannecker 2009: 119-120). Thus in their articles they made an attempt to unsettle these dominant perspectives of the discussions on migration and development and to bring in marginalized issues, actors and concepts.

This is where the thesis starts.

¹ Published online in Wiley InterScience. Available at <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/122210649/issue>. [Date accessed: April 2010].

2 The cases under review

Migration and development as a global issue rose high on the agenda of the international community, ending up in a global-level dialogue on migration and development. The most important and best known arena for the global-level dialogue has become the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) since its beginning in 2007. As a voluntary, informal, non-binding and government-led process open to all members and observers of the United Nations (UN) and involving academics, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), trade unions, the private sector and civil society representatives, as well as migrants and diaspora representatives, the GFMD marks the culmination of the global-level dialogue on the importance of the link between migration and development. At its annual meetings the GFMD discusses the migration-development nexus with the aim of advancing understanding and cooperation and fostering practical and action-oriented outcomes as well as policies which further enhance the positive impact of migration on development. (Matsas 2008)²

However there is another debate at the UN-level regarding the relationship between refugees as well as other forced migrants and development. This debate led by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was known as Refugee Aid and Development during the 1980s and was revived as Targeting Development Assistance (TDA) in the early 2000s. (Betts 2009a: 4, 7-8) The UNHCR-led discussion on TDA was launched in the framework of the so-called Convention Plus initiative. During the 53rd session of the Executive Committee of the UNHCR in October 2002 High Commissioner Ruud Lubbers called for the development of new arrangements and tools for improving refugee protection worldwide and facilitating durable solutions for refugees and other people of concern. This can be achieved through international cooperation and the linking of refugee protection to migration, security and development. The outcome was expected to take the form of multilateral special agreements complementing the 1951 Geneva Convention. For this reason the UNHCR launched the Convention Plus process to run from 2003 until 2005. The TDA strand is one of the three generic strands of the initiative, the other two being *strategic resettlement* and *irregular secondary movements*. TDA aims to facilitate local integration and repatriation by

² For further information on the GFMD and its beginnings see Matsas 2008 and www.gfmd.org.

incorporating refugees and other forced migrants in national development plans and allocating additional development assistance thus enabling them to contribute to development in their host country or their country of origin upon their return. A Forum focussing on the progress made in the different Convention Plus strands was convened biannually by the High Commissioner. (UNHCR 2005)³

3 The purpose of the thesis and research questions

The fact that the UNHCR-led TDA discussion on forced migration and development sidelines the GFMD dialogue on migration and development raises the question of what the differences and what the commonalities between the two dialogues are when linking migration to development. Or more precisely, which migration is addressed, how are migrants expected to contribute to development, who benefits from their contribution and what are the dominant development concepts, theories and strategies?

By answering these sub-questions the thesis seeks to reveal the issues, concepts and theories which dominate the two dialogues. The deconstruction of the 'hegemonic readings of the migration–development nexus' (Raghuram 2009: 107) as initiated by Raghuram et al. will make the GFMD and the UNHCR-led discussion on TDA accessible to the academic discourse thereby allowing a deeper insight. When the dominant issues, concepts and theories have been unravelled, the two cases will be compared in order to discover commonalities and differences in their dominant readings. This will suggest an answer to the question of whether the GFMD has included the issues, concepts and theories dominating the UNHCR-led discussion on TDA, which had already been finished before the GFMD started, or not and whether or not it would be favourable.

The thesis will answer the following research questions:

- 1 Which conceptual and theoretical assumptions dominate the global-level dialogue on migration and development? More precisely, in what manner is which kind of migration linked to what concept of development by the participants in the Global Forum on Migration

³ For further information on the TDA and its precursor see Betts 2009c and www.unhcr.org/convention-plus.

and Development and the UNHCR-led Convention Plus discussion on Targeting Development Assistance?

- 2 What are the differences and what are the commonalties in the dominant issues, concepts and theories when linking migration to development in these dialogues?

The search for answers will be guided by these sub-questions:

a) Questions on the phenomenon of migration itself:

- Which migration?
- Who are the migrants under review?
- How do they migrate?
- Where are they expected to migrate to?

b) Questions on the migration-development nexus:

- How are migrants expected to contribute to development?
- Who benefits from their contribution?

c) Questions on the phenomenon of development itself:

- What are the dominant concept and theories of development?
- What are the dominant development strategies?

4 The research method

Due to the complex issue of migration and development the study will be facilitated by a cross-disciplinary approach. The cross-disciplinary study of International Development at the University of Vienna, which provided insight into different disciplines, allowed such a cross-disciplinary analysis drawn on development, migration and forced migration studies.

In order to answer the first research question about which issues and conceptual and theoretical

assumptions dominate the GFMD and the UNHCR-led discussion on TDA, both dialogues were analysed as single case studies in the first part of this study. This was reached through the analysis of relevant documents which summarised the content of each dialogue. Each case was analysed separately, first the GFMD and then the UNHCR-led TDA discussions. The method used was the qualitative structuring as regards content analysis according to Mayring. While drawing on some relevant migration approaches as well as development approaches and expert knowledge, the examination of how is which kind of migration linked to what concept of development by the participants of the dialogues, leads to the disclosure of the dominant issues, concepts and theories of migration and development. Finally both debates were put into the context of the academic debate on migration and development.

In order to examine the differences and commonalties in the dominant readings when linking migration to development in these dialogues, the case studies were compared in the second step of the analysis and therefore a comparable cases strategy drawing on the findings of the single case analysis was used. Such a comparison proved useful because it helped to highlight differing and common dominant issues, concepts and theories of the dialogues thus identifying a potential option for combining both in a comprehensive, coherent and improved initiative for fostering the link between migration and development.

5 The structure of the thesis

The first chapter is this introduction where the issue of migration and development is contextualized, the research interest stated and connected to prior research. The research questions and the research guiding sub-questions are posed and a short overview of the study is given.

The second chapter gives a detailed description of the method. The qualitative research perspective of the study is outlined, the material sampling displayed and the way the data is analysed is explained.

The third chapter differentiates the research by an explanation of the conceptual and theoretical background on which the research questions and the guiding sub-questions rely, drawing on development, migration and forced migration studies as well as the academic debate on the

migration-development nexus.

Chapter four presents and interprets the results of the research with respect to the research questions, drawing on the conceptual and theoretical considerations concluded in Chapter III as well as expert knowledge.

Finally, the fifth chapter summarizes the findings of the study while comparing both dialogues with regard to their dominant issues, concepts and theories and puts the research cases into the context of the academic debate on migration and development. The findings are discussed and a final conclusion is drawn on the question of whether the phenomenon of two separated dialogues, one about migration and development, the other about forced migration and development, is justifiable or not. Moreover the implications of the findings for the global-level dialogue on migration and development are stated and follow up studies suggested.

CHAPTER II

Method

This chapter will explain the perspective and method of research used in carrying out the study. Special emphasis will be given to the way the data was analysed. It should be noted that although the research design is guided by Flick's explanations of how to plan qualitative research (Flick 2009), it is the outcome of a research process during which the definite shape evolved.

1 The general research perspective: Qualitative research

Qualitative research is distinguished from quantitative research by its concentration on a small number of cases which are being analysed. This characteristic is affiliated to the aim of qualitative research which is the argumentative and comprehensive examination of a case and its data (Blatter 2007: 25). As Flick, Kardoff and Steinke stress qualitative research seeks 'to draw attention to processes, meaning patterns and structural features. Those remain closed to non-participants but are also as a rule not consciously known by actors caught up in their unquestioned daily routine' (Flick/ Kardoff/ Steinke 2004: 3). These characteristics and aims of qualitative research make its application convenient for the research aim of this thesis. As outlined in Chapter I the aim of this thesis is to reveal the issues, concepts and theories which dominate the established global-level policy dialogue on migration and development and the sidelined discussion on forced migration and development, as represented through the GFMD and the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA but which until now have neither been questioned nor been made accessible to the academic and public discourse through in-depth analysis. According to Blatter qualitative methods are able to meet this interest in political decisions and actions such as global-level policy dialogues which are regarded as complex processes of interpretation and (re)construction, representing the ideas, identities and general principles of the actors (Blatter 2007: 17). The way these were revealed in the case of the GFMD and the UNHCR-led discussion on TDA is here explained.

The study started with the consideration of a feature which is essential in qualitative methodologies; this is the rejection of hypotheses formulated in advance. Such research practice is inspired by the awareness that knowledge influences observation and action. For the research process this means that through the formulation of ex-ante hypotheses as well as through prior knowledge of the

researcher the research will be oriented towards the theoretical and everyday knowledge of the researcher thus determining the results of the research. To be strictly correct, as Meinefeld stresses, this epistemological view would require the suspension of prior knowledge in favour of the greatest possible openness to the research object. (Meinefeld 2004: 154 seq.) But, Meinefeld argues:

If we consider this from a distance, it is striking that this methodological idealization is both in contradiction to one of the core theoretical principles of qualitative research ('the interpretation of a situation depends on knowledge') and also not a true reflection of research practice (Meinefeld 2004: 155).

Furthermore, Meinefeld sees a contradiction between ex-ante hypotheses which define and restrict the research process while fixing the observation on particular aspects on the one hand and the fact that without selection criteria the research practice would overburden the researcher because he or she would have to explore all aspects that are of possible interest. Thus Meinefeld concludes that openness to the research object (as qualitative research asks for) will not be reached through the rejection of ex-ante hypotheses and previous knowledge but through their sensible and reflective application. (Meinefeld 2004: 153-158)


In this sense I refrained from formulating hypotheses at the beginning of the study. This means that I made no specified assumptions which might be the dominant issues, concepts and theories in the two dialogues in order to avoid a certain bias which would guide the analysis in a certain direction and thereby distort the findings of the thesis. My previous knowledge of the issue under study should instead be taken into account and it should be ensured that this knowledge does not construct the study but that the case and the material to be analysed should direct the research process. This was reached through the formulation of the research questions, the guiding sub-questions as well as the categories and subcategories used to analyse the material in the light of this previous knowledge as well as theoretical and conceptual assumptions on the issue of migration and development, and their modification throughout the research process in correlation with the material to be analysed. This research procedure meets the requirements of comparable case studies which were guided by and focused on the research questions and theoretical considerations. The absence of ex-ante hypotheses will be compensated by these research questions which guarantee a certain focus of data collection and analysis. This specified direction allows a standardised data collection and thus the comparison of the analysed cases. (Blatter 2007: 140-141)

2 The research method: Qualitative structuring as regards content analysis combined with a comparable cases strategy

As the study to be carried out was to be based on qualitative research and on the analysis of documents produced by the GFMD and the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA, qualitative content analysis as one of the classical procedures for analysing any kind of textual material in a qualitative manner (Mayring 2000: 2) was the reasonable method to choose for this study.

Thus the research procedure and its several steps used in carrying out the study is based on a qualitative contents analysis model provided by Mayring (2003) but modified throughout the research process and adjusted to this study as well as modified according to the comparable cases model of Lauth, Pickel and Pickel in order to meet the comparative aspects of the thesis. Such a qualitative study which describes a concrete case in order to discover dominant conceptual and theoretical assumptions will, in combination with a comparable cases strategy aiming for the identification of differences and commonalities while emphasizing the unknown or the particular, contribute to a better understanding. In turn it can inspire new and enhanced political practice in the field of migration and development. Thus the research procedure consisted of the following eight steps:

Figure 1: Model of research procedure (according to Lauth/ Pickel/ Pickel: 2009: 232-245, Mayring 2003: 53-54)



In order to make the research procedure transparent and comprehensible each step will be further explained and the method of analysis will be described in detail.

2.1 Contextualization of the research and case selection

The first step of the research procedure consisted of four aspects. Firstly, the research had to be embedded in the broader context of the issue under review that is the migration-development nexus. Secondly, the cases to be analysed in this thesis were presented. Their selection was guided by two recommendations by Blatter (Blatter 2007: 142). First, to compare cases which have the most context factors in common. These were their actuality, a certain duration that is a realization of the dialogue for some proceeding years, their global-level orientation, their embedding in the UN and their inclusion of governments, international organizations as well as representatives of the civil society. Second, the cases should differ in regard to the aspect under review which - in this case - is the conceptual and theoretical assumptions on migration, development and the migration-development nexus. Then, in a third step, the issue of interest was linked to earlier research and the research questions and research guiding sub-questions were presented. These three steps can be found in Chapter I, the introduction to this thesis. The fourth aspect was to differentiate between the research questions due to the examination of the conceptual and theoretical background on which the research questions and the guiding sub-questions rely. As migration and development is a cross-disciplinary issue this background consists of Development, Migration and Forced Migration studies. This will be done in Chapter III.

2.2 Material sampling

The second step of the research procedure was to sample and define the material. The material analysed was some selected documents which were representative of the numerous written records of the discussions of the two cases, first the GFMD and second the Convention Plus strand TDA. The aim was to select material that covered the whole debate of the cases. At this point attention has to be paid to the difficulty of qualitative research which tries to understand reality through the analysis and interpretation of texts. The text is here a substitution for the reality under study, a reality which is never one-to-one caught up in the text but which was constructed through its transcription. So during the research process and when presenting the results, it has to be recognized that the documents analysed as substitutes for the dialogues are just summaries of the discussions

but do not reflect the whole debate in all its details. (Flick 2009: 75-76)

While the GFMD produced many records, the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA yield fewer documents. A selected number of these records were analysed due to the limited resources. The material sampling was guided by some criteria which not only guaranteed a high quality of material but furthermore allowed a reasonable comparison of the analysed cases. These criteria were as follows:

The first criterion was convenience which refers to those materials which were the easiest to access under the given conditions (Flick 2009: 122). Only certain documents are available to the public through the internet which is at the same time their official representation. Only these documents were considered as material to be analysed.

Because not all of these records are relevant to answering the research questions the second sampling criterion was whether or not the records dealt with the discussion of the participants about linking migration and development were appropriate. As Flick suggests, '[t]he appropriateness [...] can only be assessed with respect to the research question of the study' (Flick 2009: 125). This guaranteed the relevance of the selected material.

According to Lauth, Pickel and Pickel the third criterion provided the representativeness of the material concerning the main units of the case (Lauth/ Pickel/ Pickel 2009: 238). As the second criterion already addressed the content unit, the third criterion was left to respond to the actors or participants unit. This meant that material was chosen according to the criterion that the different participants of the debates, who are the representatives of international organizations, governments and the civil society, are represented.

While this material sampling corresponds to the qualitative research's aim of applying a systematic method of analysing (Mayring 2003: 42), attention must be paid to the fact that '[i]n sampling decisions, the reality under study is constructed in a specific way: certain parts and aspects are highlighted, others are phased out' (Flick 2009: 125).

2.3 Genesis and formal characteristics of the material

When the material has been selected according to the above criteria the third step of the research

process was the analysis of the genesis of the material as well as the definition of its formal characteristics. The following description of the material is based on the guidelines of document analysis as presented by Noetzel, Krumm and Westle (2009).

Global Forum on Migration and Development:

To ensure neutral reporting the authors of the reports of the GFMD are all anonymous. The report of the Civil Society Day of the GFMD in 2007 summarises the outcomes and findings of their sessions. It was presented to the government representatives for discussion at the first plenary session of the governmental discussions of the same GFMD in 2007. The report of the Civil Society Day of the GFMD in 2008 reflects the recommendations resulting from the sessions. At the opening session of the government meeting members of the Civil Society delegation submitted the report to the GFMD Chair. The representatives of the Civil Society Days held in 2009 in Athens presented their findings and recommendations resulting from the discussions in the form of a report to the governments at the Opening Plenary Session of the Government Meeting of the same GFMD in 2009. The reports of the proceedings of the first, second and third GFMD, held in Brussels in 2007, in Manila in 2008 and in Athens in 2009, represent the detailed records of the preparation, the proceedings and outcomes of all the meetings and reflect the discussions held at the round-tables. As a follow-up measure they were distributed to all concerned parties. Furthermore all reports were made available to the public through the website of the GFMD. (www.gfmd.org)

UNHCR-led discussions on TDA in the framework of Convention Plus:

The document called Framework for Durable Solutions for Refugees and Persons of Concern, developed in 2003 by the UNHCR, provides methodological models to integrate refugees better into development planning and to facilitate the proper targeting of development assistance. Thus this document functions as a basis for the TDA discussions. The other documents of the dialogue in DTA were presented at the UNHCR Forum's meetings between 2003 and 2006. The Forum comprises UNHCR's member states including Executive Committee members, Standing Committee observers and NGOs. The documents and their authors are varied. The document Convention Plus: Targeting Development Assistance to Achieve Durable Solutions for Refugees is a discussion paper

presented by the facilitating states Denmark and Japan in the Forum in 2004, and was intended to stimulate discussion; it is an official document of the Forum. The draft Issues Paper on Targeting of Development Assistance was produced in 2004 by the UNHCR Convention Plus Unit which is responsible for encouraging an outcome of the discussions outlining the issues relating to the targeting of development assistance. The 2004 document Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper: A Displacement Perspective is an analysis of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers for countries affected by population displacement, produced by the UNHCR for the World Bank. It identifies the role displaced people are perceived to play in eradicating poverty and assesses the priority given to displacement issues in the papers. The Convention Plus Work on Targeting Development Assistance to Achieve Durable Solutions is a statement on behalf of NGOs which participated in the discussions and who presented their statements orally at the Forum in 2004. The author of the document Putting Refugees on the Development Agenda: How Refugees and Returnees Can Contribute to Achieving the Millennium Development Goals, presented at the High Commissioner's Forum in 2005, is not mentioned although it is an official document of the Forum. The Statement of Good Practice on Targeting Development Assistance for Durable Solutions to Forced Displacement is a revised version, based upon discussions during an open meeting held in Geneva in 2005. The document attempts to highlight policies and practices which are needed to realize durable solutions for refugee problems through the more effective targeting of development assistance and was presented to the Forum in 2005, written by an unknown author. The document Putting Refugees on the Development Agenda, also presented at the Forum in 2005 and scripted by another unknown author, seeks to show how the strategic targeting of development assistance can enable countries, communities and the displaced populations themselves, to achieve the MDGs. Finally the Convention Plus: Targeting of Development Assistance for Durable Solutions to Forced Displacement is a joint statement by the co-Chairs which summarizes the viewpoints expressed by states and other participants in the discussions. It was prepared by the facilitating states Denmark and Japan with the support of UNHCR and represents an official document of the Forum, dated the 10 February 2006. (www.unhcr.org/convention-plus)

2.4 The direction of analysis

In the fourth step of the research process the direction of analysis was defined as follows:

Firstly, by analysing the material the particular case had to be characterised and thereon general knowledge of the issue on migration and development on the one hand and forced migration and development on the other, have to be generated. More precisely, the aim is to expose in what manner which kind of migration was linked to what concept of development in both debates. Thereby research question 1 is answered. This meant the unsettling of the dominant theoretical and conceptual assumptions of migration, development, as well as the migration-development nexus in each case. The appropriate method for doing this was a qualitative content analysis based on categories derived from the research question and the material.

In the second step a comparable cases strategy was used as a method of comparing both debates in order to identify differences and commonalties in the dominant conceptual and theoretical assumptions when linking migration to development in the two debates, thereby answering research question 2. Some considerations for a more effective debate on migration and development were raised on the basis of the findings. In doing so, the categories which were generated in the first step by qualitative content analysis were used as the basis for the comparison.

2.5 Definition of the analytical technique


The fifth step of the research procedure was to define the analytical technique. The concrete methodical procedure of analysing according to Mayring basically includes three techniques: the summarizing content analysis, the explicative content analysis and the structuring content analysis. The last is the most central technique of qualitative content analysis. It looks for structures in the material. More precisely, it breaks the material open in order to analyse its inner structure such as its components, the content, its central proposition and so on. (Mayring 2003: 58, 82-83) This technique, the structuring content analysis, seemed to be the most appropriate for the aim of this thesis because it seeks to extract systematically that information from the material which is able to give an answer to the research questions.

The structuring content analysis is divided into four subgroups each representing a specialised form of analysing the material with regard to a different goal. First is the formal structuring which aims to filter the internal structure of the material according to certain formal aspects. Second is the typifying structuring which looks for a salient feature in the material and describes it more exactly. Third is the scaling structuring which intends to rate the material according to dimensions in the form of scales. Finally there is the structuring as regards content analysis which extracts and condenses passages of the material according to certain domains of content. (Mayring 2003: 85) This last technique which focuses on certain themes, contents and aspects of the material, seemed to be the most appropriate for extracting that information from the material which is able to give an answer to the research questions.

2.6 Determination and implementation of the model of analysis

In the sixth step, the concrete model of analysis was determined and implemented. It consists of the following four steps:

Figure 2: Model of the method of analysis (according to Mayring 2003: 84, 89)



2.6.1 Formulation of theoretical derived categories

The qualitative structuring content analysis aims to break the material down in order to analyse its content. Therefore passages of the material were systematically extracted by means of categories. These categories are derived from the research questions, are related to migration and development theories and were formulated in advance. They were then divided into subcategories representing different specifications of the category. These deductive categories were in the next step applied to the material. (Mayring 2003: 58, 82-83)

2.6.2 Composition of a coding agenda

After their formulation the (sub)categories were connected to the material from which they were developed and modified through the methodological controlled assignment of the category to a passage of the text material. The circumstances under which a text passage can be coded with a category were determined through explicit definitions, examples and coding rules for each deductive category, the so-called transcription rules. The category definitions determine which text passages belong in which category. The examples are prototypical text passages which belong in a specific category. Coding rules are rules formulated in order to distinguish between the different categories. These tools were formulated with respect to theory and material and were put together within a coding agenda. The outcome was theoretically derived categories modified in correlation with the material. (Mayring 2003: 74 et seq., 82-83; Mayring 200: 4-6)

2.6.3 Data analysis

Next, the analysis of the material was completed. This meant that each document was analysed separately. Thus the text passages which fitted a (sub)category due to the previously formulated coding agenda were marked and extracted. Of crucial importance to the analysis besides the defined coding agenda was a thorough understanding of the relevant theories in order to recognize evidence for a certain theory in the material (Blatter 2007: 178). This means that the analysis was not only concentrated on the definite application of the categories on a text passage but that unapparent

evidence for the fitting of a category was also cached. Furthermore some overlapping of text passages fitting more than one category was allowed. This interpretative connecting between theory and empiricism has a high relevance in qualitative methods (Blatter 2007: 178). Having done this, the analysis results were merged by case and categories with no fitting text passage were deleted.

2.6.4 Paraphrasing, generalization and summarizing

In the next step the remaining categories and text passages of each case were edited in such a way that at the end a few paraphrases represented one category or subcategory. This was done following some rules outlined by Mayring (Mayring 2003: 59-62):

Firstly the marked text passages had to be paraphrased. Paraphrasing means transcribing the identified text passages into a content centred formulation. Thus components of the text passages which did not sustain the content – such as decorating, recurring or clarifying phrases – had to be deleted. The content sustaining components of the text passages had then to be transcribed into a standardised stylistic level of language using a grammatical short form. Every paraphrase which did not reach a certain level of abstraction had to be generalised; every paraphrase which reached the level of abstraction was left unchanged. Paraphrases with the same content were deleted as well as unimportant and meaningless paraphrases. The outcome was content centred and uniform paraphrases for each text passage fitted to a (sub)category. The case, the (sub)category and the corresponding paraphrase were recorded in a table. In the last step the paraphrases were summarised per category and subcategory. In doing so paraphrases with similar statements had to be combined into one paraphrase and paraphrases with different statements had to be combined into one new formulated paraphrase. These paraphrases were recorded in the last column of the table representing the analysis results.

2.7 Determination and implementation of the comparable cases method

In the seventh step of the research procedure the comparable cases method was determined and implemented. In order to examine the differences and commonalties regarding the dominant theoretical and conceptual assumption of the two debates when linking migration to development, the two cases which represent the respective debates were compared when the results of the analysis

of each case were available. The comparable cases strategy, as outlined by Lauth, Pickel and Pickel (2009) represents an adequate strategy for carrying out such a comparison between cases, based on qualitative data (Lauth/ Pickel/ Pickel 2009: 58, 249). Since the thesis deals with cases analysed on the basis of categories and subcategories instead of quantitative data, the comparable method as outlined in Lauth, Pickel and Pickel (2009) was modified. Instead of systematically arranging and structuring variables with different specifications per case in order to construct typologies which would then be compared (Lauth/ Pickel/ Pickel 2009: 39-51) the comparison was conducted on the basis of the categories and related subcategories with their corresponding paraphrases, representing the results of analysis. More precisely, the occurrence of (sub)categories in the second case were compared to the (sub)categories which occurred in the first case. In this way not only similar and different categories were uncovered but also the dominance of some and the marginalization of others. The categories and related subcategories were organized and compared with respect to the guiding sub-questions of which migration, what development and the link between them.

2.8 Presentation and interpretation of the research results

Finally, in the eighth step, the (sub)categories and the corresponding paraphrases as a result of the qualitative content analysis of the first case were firstly systematically presented and interpreted with respect to the first research question. Next the results of the second case were presented and interpreted with respect to the first research question in a comparative manner thus highlighting differences and commonalties between the first and the second case when linking migration to development, thereby answering the second research question.

Theories and concepts of the appropriate disciplines which are the Development, Migration and Forced Migration studies, as briefly outlined in Chapter III have been studied as well as other background and expert references. This theoretical framework of analysis is of high relevance to qualitative research (Blatter 2007: 35). Because qualitative research is based on a detailed analysis of the coincidence of different elements from different theories and concepts, '[q]ualitative policy research requires [...] a high degree of theoretical knowledge and a competent handling of this knowledge while relating theory to empiricism' (Blatter 2007: 35; translation S. K.).⁴

⁴Original quotation: 'Qualitative Politikforschung erfordert [...] ein hohes Maß an theoretischem Wissen und einen souveränen Umgang mit diesem Wissen beim Vergleich von Theorie und Empirie' (Blatter 2007: 35).

CHAPTER III

Migration and Development –

**Some conceptual and theoretical
considerations**

The second chapter of this thesis includes some conceptual and theoretical considerations on the three guiding sub-questions posed in Chapter I, referring to the subjects of migration, development and the migration-development nexus.

1 Migration

One of the major challenges for migration researchers today is that the process has become multi-layered and dynamic – taking on new forms, involving new populations and destinations, and adapting to the ever changing global context (IMI 2006: 2).

Due to the multi-layered and dynamic character of the migration processes as highlighted in the quotation above, the question of how to make the term *migration* ascertainable arises. Thus, the first conceptual difficulty to be explored in this chapter relates to the word *migration*. Who migrates, in what circumstances and how? These are the questions to be answered briefly in the following explanations.

1.1 The conceptualization of migration

The constitutive element which is common to all definitions of migration derives from its etymological origin: the Latin term *migrare* means *to change the place of or to move out*. Therefore the characteristic of *travel* constitutes an indisputable definition of migration. (Düvell 2006: 5) Politicians, researchers and practitioners have confronted more or less the same criteria or dimensions in order to differentiate this broad concept of migration, making it manageable for their interests. The three main dimensions according to Düvell (Düvell 2006: 6-10) are: firstly, the spatial-legal dimension, secondly, the time dimension, thirdly, the motivational-decisional dimension.

Within the spatial-legal dimension, the most frequent differentiation is made between internal and international migration. Internal migration occurs when moving from one area to another within the country of origin, without changing the legal status but in connection with the establishment of a

new residence⁵. International migration, in contrast, means leaving the country of origin thus crossing a state border, while changing the legal status and establishing a new residence abroad. (IOM 2004: 32-33) Recently transnational migration has enjoyed raised attention. This is an international form of migration where the migrant shuttles between the country of origin and destination thus taking residence in both countries, or where the migrant establishes permanent residence in the country of destination but still maintains strong connections with his or her origins. Thereby new transnational spaces and identities are created. (Düvell 2006: 25, 27; Parnreiter 2000: 38-41)

The time dimension differentiates between temporary and permanent migration, with different categories in between. Permanent migration means changing the permanent residence to another country. Temporary migration is restricted in time, that means that the migrant returns to the starting point within a definable period and thus does not change his or her permanent residence. Circular migration describes a situation in between, where the migrant regularly migrates between the usual place of residence and another place. (Düvell 2006: 27, 130)

In relation to the motivational-decisional dimension a distinction can be drawn between the voluntary decision of a person to migrate for one or several motives and a person being forced to migrate without any possibility of deciding whether to migrate or not, while the motivation, the origin of force, can differ. (Düvell 2006: 14-16) The most frequent types of voluntary migration are labour and economic migration, which can often be used interchangeably but which feature a distinct definition. While a labour migrant moves for the purpose of seeking employment an economic migrant leaves his or her usual place of residence in order to improve his or her living standards. (Düvell 2006: 28; IOM 2004: 21, 38) The most common types of forced migration are asylum-seekers, refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs).

Asylum-seekers are people who cross an international border and seek asylum under international law in the receiving country, and whose claim to asylum has not yet been finally decided upon (Düvell 2006: 14-16). Refugees on the other hand are those people whose claim for asylum has been positively decided by UNHCR or states during an individual refugee status determination procedure. Furthermore a refugee can be a person forming part of a mass refugee inflow, being regarded as refugees on a *prima facie* basis which is through a group determination of refugee

⁵ 'The act or fact of living in a given place for some time' (IOM 2004: 56).

status. (UNHCR 2006: 10, 17) Refugees meet the eligibility criteria under the appropriate refugee definition as provided for in international or regional refugee instruments, under UNHCR's mandate and/or national legislation. According to Article 1 of the most common legal instrument, the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, a refugee is defined as a person who resides outside his or her country of origin and who is unable or unwilling to return or to avail him- or herself of the protection of that country because of a fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion. In contrast to other forced migrants refugees have a clearly defined legal status, are entitled to a set of rights and enjoy the protection of the UNHCR. (Düvell 2006: 14-17) IDPs are '[t]hose persons forced or obliged to flee from their homes, '...in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflicts, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters and who have not crossed an internationally recognized state border' ' (UNHCR 2006: 12). They are often described as people *in a refugee-like situation* because they flee for the same reasons as refugees, only with the difference that they remain within the borders of their country of origin and thus cannot demand international protection. However, since the end of the twentieth century there has been a growing awareness of the circumstances of IDPs. Thus, the UN worked towards the development of a legal and normative international framework for their protection. The outcome was the creation of a soft-law framework in 1997 which defined the obligations of States towards IDPs, the so-called Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (Betts 2009b: 7-8)

1.2 Voluntary or forced migration? How to distinguish between them?

Due to phenomenon of two separated dialogues, one about migration and development and one about forced migration and development, the dimension of high concern is the motivational-decisional dimension. Therefore, the motives for and constraints to migrate as criteria to differentiate between voluntary and forced migration will be discussed in greater detail.

'Forced migration is often assumed to have a political basis, being based on flight from persecution or conflict; voluntary migration is generally assumed to be underpinned by economic motives' (Betts 2009b: 4). In practice it is most difficult to make a clear distinction between migration based

on a voluntary decision to migrate due to economic motives, and forced migration without any possibility of deciding, based on political violence. There are several reasons for this:

Firstly, because migration is often motivated by complex, mixed and shifting motives (IMI 2006: 8). These can be 'work, joining family members, study or retirement and the search for protection from violent conflict, political oppression or human rights violations' (IMI 2006: 3). Even the UNHCR which for a long time stressed the fundamental distinction of forced migrants, especially refugees and their special status and protection needs as defined and ensured in terms of the Geneva Convention, recently turned to the notion that 'human mobility is growing in scale, scope and complexity. New patterns of movement are emerging, including forms of displacement and forced migration that are not addressed by international refugee law' (Crisp 2008: 3). Thus, the UNHCR indeed maintains its position that it is possible to identify refugees as a special category of people, protected under international law; however, the UNHCR became engaged in the broader migration discourse arguing that often there is no clear distinction between forms of forced and voluntary migration (Crisp 2008: 2, 5).

Secondly, because the essential question of whether or not circumstances leave the possibility of choosing to migrate is not to be answered simply. As de Haas argues, migration occurs in 'complex realities in which all migrants deal with structural constraints although *to highly varying degrees*' (de Haas 2009: 3). The problem of distinction becomes apparent when looking at an example set up by Demuth:

many of the Philippina [sic] women, for example, have children and family they have to leave to help support their families. To provide for a good education for their children they may have to leave their loved ones although no one actually forces them and they would possibly make ends meet without leaving. Still, working way below their own good educational standards, their wages in the Gulf will usually still be several times higher than what they could earn at home (Demuth 2000: 29).

The question is whether this situation is a matter of voluntary migration because the circumstances allow the possibility for the woman to choose to migrate or not, or is this a matter of forced migration because the motive of finding a better job cannot be fulfilled within her place of origin which forces the women to migrate? Since we deal with migration which is ostensibly motivated by economic factors, the criteria for being persecuted as outlined in international refugee law would not be fulfilled. Thus, we are not dealing with forced migration in a legal sense; the economic

conditions however could be regarded as forcing the women to migrate. Hence, according to Demuth, this type of migration 'must be called a mixed voluntary and involuntary migration' (Demuth 2000: 29). According to de Haas, '[t]he fact that all migrants face constraints [...] upsets the conventional dichotomy between forced and voluntary migration' (de Haas 2009: 3). He therefore argues it is possible 'to conceive of a continuum running from low to high constraints under which migration occurs' (de Haas 2009: 3). Betts instead favours defining the distinction between voluntary and forced migration as a spectrum in which the categories are situated in order to handle specific migration related issues (Betts 2009b: 4). De Haas seems to agree when he says that '[t]he sharp distinction between forced and voluntary migration is primarily a policy and legal distinction driven by the interest of states in classifying migrants' (de Haas 2009: 3). Also Demuth argues that 'politico-administrative categorisation is more often than not objective-driven: fulfil [sic] a goal, such as delimiting the number of entries by limiting the number of accepted entry reasons' (Demuth 2000: 26). In order to call attention to the categorization in the field of migration, the words of de Haas stress that '[s]uch policy and legal categories may be useful tools for states; they only become problematic when they are uncritically adopted as analytical categories and projected onto social realities' (de Haas 2009: 3).

2 What is development?

Development has been taken to mean different things at different times, in different places and by different people in different professions and organizations (Chambers 2004: 2).

The second conceptual difficulty relates to the word development. How is this to be defined? And how is it to be reached? As the quotation above shows, there is no definite development concept but numerous ways of development thinking. This section tries to bring some clarity to the obscurity of development thinking.

2.1 Thoughts on the concept of development

'Development is a concept whose definition is part of the development problem itself'⁶ (Nohlen 2002: 227; translation S. K.). This is because the concept of development is normative in the sense that it carries a specific notion of the kind of development, of the causes of underdevelopment, of the theory of how to reach development and what instruments to use. Therefore the development concept is neither pre-given nor impartially definable. Quite to the contrary, it is context bound and varied over time. Since the post-World War II area of modern development thinking there has been an ongoing questioning, critique and probing of alternative options, giving development its typical character of 'a field in flux, with rapid change and turnover of alternatives' (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 1).

Again, there is no ultimate and exhaustive definition of development. Moreover it can be said that it is this indefiniteness which makes the concept of development so popular and universally accepted because it is flexible enough to be adopted 'at different times, in different places and by different people' (Chambers 2004: 2).

Nevertheless Sumner and Tribe recognize a 'general agreement on the view that 'development' encompasses continuous 'change' in a variety of aspects of human society' (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 11). One of the simplest definitions of development – at least it appears so to be - which draws on this idea about development as change, is probably Chambers' notion of *good change*. But even this definition it is not that simple. More precisely, the definition raises the question of what is *good* and what sort of *change* matters? And whether *bad change* has also to be viewed as a form of development? (Chambers 2004: 2-3) Referring to Rist who defines development as a belief or faith in a concept which leads to an equal and just world, it could be argued that it is exactly this presupposition - that development has a positive value - which leads to the continuity or renewal of development thinking although it is time and again criticized for its lack of success (Rist 2008: 23-24, 261). Furthermore, Chambers asks about the role of values in development thinking. According to Chambers, '[v]alues are central to disputes about the definition of development – what to improve, how to improve it and especially the question of who decides' (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 25). The subject that is the one who defines development has in fact a great influence on the specific

⁶ Original quotation: 'Entwicklung: Begriff, dessen Definition einen guten Teil der Entwicklungsproblematik selbst ausmacht' (Nohlen 2002: 227).

definition. As Rist argues, every definition involves the particular point of view of the subject and hence is constructed within a particular history and culture (Rist 2008: 2). For example, the Eurocentric definition of development as developing countries catching up with the advanced industrialized countries can only be understood in its specific historical context of the post-World War II area and the subject of definition, namely the western industrialized countries (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 5).

2.2 Definitions of and approaches to development

Development theories and definitions are as different as they are numerous. Ideas about development have evolved in a non-linear way, they have always co-existed and overlapped and few of them have disappeared completely. With the change of time new ideas came up and rose to dominance while others were left marginalized only to become dominant at a later date when world history changed again. As Rist pointed out in his book *The History of Development*, development thinking is inseparably aligned with the changes of world history.⁷

In this section there can be no question of trying to trace the chronology of development thinking. Rather some striking definitions of what development is, and theories of how to achieve it will be examined according to Sumner and Tribe (Sumner/ Tribe 2008).

2.2.1 Development as a long-term process of structural socio-economic transformation

The dominant definition in the 1950s and 60s regarded development as a long-term transformation of economies and societies. The focus lay on structural historical change, thus development had a long-term outlook, addressing the big picture. The major example of such a developmental transformation was the change from an agricultural-based traditional society to an industrial-based modern society. (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 12) The term modernity originally describes 'particular forms of economy and society based on the experiences of Western Europe' (Willis 2005: 2). In economic terms modernity means industrialization, urbanization and the use of technology, in societal terms the construction of class, for example due to ownership or the organization of production and, in

⁷ For a detailed explanation of what development has meant throughout history see Rist 2008.

cultural terms, the increasingly rational and scientific explanations of understanding the world (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 12; Willis 2005: 2-3). During that time, the assumption dominated, that '[a]ll countries change over time and generally experience economic growth and societal change.' (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 12) Such transformation was expected not only to involve good change and boom but also decline and crisis. This is called development. (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 12)

Modernization theory and dependency theory, dominating development studies during the Cold War, have strong resonance with the definition of development as being structural socio-economic transformation. Both describe a particular common pathway to an industrial society and economy as being a desirable transformation.⁸ (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 12)

2.2.2 Development as short- to medium-term policy- and practice-related evaluative outcome of desirable targets

The idea of promoting transformation and development in developing countries while alleviating inequalities between North and South was then replaced by measuring and evaluating differences between living standards (Gore 2010: 71). Or in the words of Sumner and Tribe, development now was seen as a desirable 'set of short- to medium-term 'performance indicators' – goals or outcomes - which can be measured and compared with targets' (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 13). This development definition in contrast had a short-term outlook, focusing on the outcomes of change. Sumner and Tribe emphasize the concern that such a short-term and instrumental definition of development may lose the big picture of socio-economic transformation and misses recognizing the interconnections of development and socio-economic structures, social relations and politics, ending up in a de-politicization of development. (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 13-14)

According to Sumner and Tribe such an instrumental or technocratic definition of development is likely to be favoured by the development community because it meets the expectation of being relevant and guiding development practice and policy-making (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 13). However, as Black and White stress, it is not clear what conclusions should be drawn or development practices developed from the measured outcomes. 'Specifically, if a country is falling short of achieving the outcome target, should it receive more assistance or less? Alternatively, should failure to make progress lead to the provision of assistance of a different kind?' (Black/ White 2004: 14)

⁸ For a more detailed explanation of the modernization and dependency theories see section 3.

The problem is that this definition of development presupposes a set of universal values and goals or objectives, which are top-down implemented and thus may not correspond with how the people who are supposed to benefit from development themselves define development. In fact, these universal development indicators are in sharp contradiction to the idea of subjective perception of well-being and development, associated for instance with Chambers who argues in favour of putting the perceptions of the poor and their realities at the centre of indicating development. Thus, questions of participation and ownership of the people were raised. (Chambers 2004; Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 13, 24)

The most dominant objectives of a short-term and instrumental definition of development are economic growth, human development, poverty reduction and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 13) The most frequently used development indicators for measuring these goals are firstly the Gross National Product (GNP) per capita, secondly the UN Human Development Index (HDI), and thirdly the 47 indicators of the MDGs. The GNP measures economic development through the use of the per capita income. The relevant factor is how much of the annual GNP generated in the country each individual receives on average. The HDI measures human development using life expectancy, literacy and the real Purchase Power Parities per capita. (Willis 2005: 3-8) The MDG measures outcomes in the field of poverty reduction, education, health, gender equality and sustainability through one or more indicators for each target (Black/ White 2004: 5).

One has to be aware that because these indicators are based on statistics and other data they are notoriously problematic, first and foremost because many countries have non-existent, incomplete or unreliable data (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 21). Moreover these data mostly have to be related to other factors because they lack meaning when they are evaluated as such. This is the case especially with data on income measuring poverty. 'For example, in a rural area, monetary income may be lower than in the towns and cities but the cost of living is lower and the availability of food from subsistence farming may help save on food costs' (Willis 2005: 10). These data are handled in a systematic way in order to give quantitative information about the change and condition of the development of a specific state as well as by comparison with other states. In short, these indicators measure the development status of a country.

The development status of a country is indicated by common categories and related terminology.

Developing country is one of the main categories in development studies used in dichotomy with *developed country*. The term *developing country* describes a country which has not achieved the same level of development as *developed countries*. As Willis argues, such a categorization 'seems to imply that 'development' is an end point, i.e. once you reach a certain standard of living or economic position then you are 'developed' ' (Willis 2005: 16). Furthermore, sometimes developing countries are referred to as the *poor countries*, indicating high absolute poverty rates and low income per capita (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 17).

Developing countries are accustomed to forming part of the so-called *Third World* (a term used during the Cold War, in order to separate developing countries from the industrialized countries of the First World and the Communist countries of the Second World) or the *South* (a term which lacks geographical correctness but which was used in the Brandt Commission of 1980) (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 16-17), while developed countries, also called industrialized countries, are accustomed to forming part of the *North* (including the countries within Europe, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, the USA and Canada and therefore facing the same problem of geographical correctness as the term global South) and/or the *West* (addressing the USA and Europe). (Willis 2005: 15, 17)

Furthermore, actors within the field of development studies have set up categories based on different development indicators in order to specify the vague term *developing country*. For example the World Bank, using the GNP per capita, differentiates between low, lower middle, upper middle and high income countries. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) instead, using the HDI, differentiates between low, middle and high human development countries.⁹ (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 17-18) However, these categories are often not as clear and appropriate as they may seem to be. It happens that the GNP classified a country as a medium- or low-income country while at the same time the HDI put it in the category of high human development (Willis 2005: 5, 8). The different indicators measuring different development outcomes sometimes make it difficult to classify a country. Thus these categories have to be treated with caution. Post-modernists even reject any categorization as such, arguing 'that any labelling would implicitly or explicitly imply the inferiority of the developing countries, and would thus relate to the control exercised over them by developed countries' (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 17).¹⁰

⁹ For further categories see Sumner/Tribe 2008: 18.

¹⁰ For a further discussion of the differences in measuring development and categorizing countries, as well as the implications for migration statistics, see Bakewell 2009: 2-9.

2.2.3 Development as a dominant Western discourse

A genuine break in development thinking is found in the redefinition of development of the post-development approach (also referred to as the post-modern approach) since the 1990s. As a reaction to development failures throughout the history of development concepts and practices, post-developmentalists argue that 'development has consisted of 'bad' change and 'bad' outcomes through the imposition of Western ethnocentric notions of development upon the Third World' (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 17). Thus the development concept 'has helped incorporate large areas of the globe into a Northern-dominated economic and political system which has destroyed indigenous cultures, threatened the sustainability of natural environments and has created feelings of inferiority among people of the South' (Willis 2005: 28).

Questioning the development concept and the development industry, the post-development approach regards - in the view of Michael Foucault - development as a social construct that does not exist outside of the development discourse but is constructed through the use of specific language and imagery. Post-developmentalists argue that such constructed understandings of development reflect existing power relations. The one who produces knowledge about the South, that is the one who defines the reality of underdevelopment and poverty, exercises power over the South through the imposition of this development qualified as the objective reality. (Sumner/ Tribe 2008: 14; Willis 2005: 28-29) Thus, post-developmentalists argue that development 'is always a product of a particular set of power relations at any one time' (Willis 2005: 207). To overcome this power/knowledge relationship, post-development approaches focus on endogenous development, that is development from within the country, based on traditional and indigenous knowledge (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 101, 103, 107), claiming 'that 'development' should be focused on what local communities want and should not be a response to a Northern-imposed model of what is a correct form of development' (Willis 2005: 207).

3 The academic debate on migration and development

[T]he flows of money, knowledge and universal ideas – called remittances - can have a positive effect on what is called development (Faist 2008: 21).

A third difficulty with any discussion of migration and development relates to the use of the word *and*. What does it imply? How are migration and development linked? As the term *migration-development nexus*, established by Nyberg-Sorensen et al. (Engberg-Pedersen/ Nyberg-Sørensen/ Van Hear 2002) implies, *and* means much more than just the link of two separated fields of study. Instead we are dealing with a complex and multi-dimensional relationship.

This section will focus on the academic debate on migration and development which conceptualized the assumed effects of migration on development. As will be shown, these have not always been as optimistic as the quotation above indicates. It follows an overview of the academic debate on migration and development in order to contextualise the contemporary global-level policy debate on migration and development. According to Castles, Faist and de Haas (Castles 2008; Faist 2008; de Haas 2008), the following three phases will be distinguished:

Table 1: Main phases of the academic debate on migration and development

Phase	View of the effects of migration on development	Migration and development theories	Key words
<u>Phase 1:</u> 1950s and 1960s	Positive	Neoclassical theory	Economic disparities, wage levels, labour supply/demand, labour migration, utility-maximising individuals, factor price equalization, economic growth
		Modernization theory	Transformation from traditional agriculture to modern industry, universal pathway to industrialization, large scale transfers of money, technology and expertise, economic growth, migrants financial and social remittances
		Human capital theory	Human capital accumulation and transfers
<u>Phase 2:</u> 1970s and 1980s	Negative	Dependency theory	Exogenous causes of underdevelopment, development of underdevelopment, emancipation from the capitalist world economy, endogenous economic development

		Cumulative causation approach	Asymmetrical growth, migration creates backwash effects (loss of human capital, remittance dependency, negative effects of social remittances), migration leads to economic spatial and inter-personal disparities
		World systems approach	Core, semi-periphery and periphery, expansion of the capitalist world economy and the marginalized integration into the capitalist world system leads to migration, migration as a world-level labour supply system, perpetuation of underdevelopment and peripheral status
<u>Phase 3:</u> Since the end of 1980s	Positive but more differentiated	New economics of labour migration (NELM)	Societal context of migration, lack of access to capital or insurance institutions, migration as income diversification and risk sharing, remittances, investment in profitable production
		Migration networks theory	Relationship between migrants, former migrants and non-migrants, chain migration, remittances
		Transnational migration theory	Globalization, ties across borders, transnational identity, transnational communities, diaspora, circular migration, collective remittances
		Social capital theory	Resources gained through networks, translation into human or financial capital
		Alternative development	Society and migrants as agency of development, people-centred, participatory, bottom-up, series of alternative development concepts
		Neoliberalism	Non-state approach, homo economicus, market-led economic growth, Washington Consensus, structural adjustment, liberalization, decentralization and privatization

3.1 Phase 1: 1950s and 1960s - the positive view of the effects of migration on development

After World War II and before the oil crisis of 1973 there was a general development and migration optimism, dominated by economic views of the neoclassical theory. As a classical economic theory, economic growth is the aspired development outcome. Looking at the macro-economic level the neoclassical theory assumes that economic disparities between areas, such as wage levels resulting from labour supply/demand, lead to labour migration. Migrants are expected to move from low-wage, labour-surplus areas to high-wage, labour-shortage areas whereas capital is expected to move in the opposite direction. In a perfectly, competitive neoclassical world free labour migration is seen as a form of optimal allocation of production factors leading to labour shortages which will then lead to increasing wage levels which will halt migration. The relevant gain of migration for

development is this process of factor price equalization. From a micro-economic perspective migration is mainly a result of a free choice decision of utility-maximising individuals based on a rational comparison of the relative costs and benefits of remaining or moving. The decision is made upon getting full access to information about the economic factors in the area of origin and destination. Migrants are seen as income-maximising individuals. The social group to which they belong is disregarded. This is one reason why, in a strictly neoclassical view, remittances don't play any role – there is no reason to remit money. The sole development role of migration is the factor price equalization. More precisely, in the structural change model of W. Arthur Lewis, J. Harris and M. Todaro, labour is expected to move from the subsistence agricultural traditional sector to the capitalist modern sector. Thus, by postulating that labour migration contributed to the transfer from traditional agriculture to modern industry they conform to the modernization theory's view of development as a long-term process of structural socio-economic transformation from tradition to modernity coupled with economic growth. (de Haas 2008: 4-6, 24-26; Massey et al. 1998: 18-22 and 228-229; Willis 2005: 42-43) The causes of underdevelopment are identified as the endogenous economic, social, cultural and political characteristics of the traditional society. The traditional societies have thus to follow the linear, universal pathway, consisting of successive stages, ending in a capitalist, industrial society of mass consumption and economic growth. This process of industrialization has to be guided by state planning and intervention and supported by developed countries through large-scale transfers of money, technology and expertise which then have to be invested in infrastructure and industry. The idea that development can be achieved by following the processes of development that were used by the developed countries was defined as a top-down approach. The strategies to foster development apply to the identified causes of underdevelopment. Firstly, certain values and behaviours that are connected to modernity have to be transferred from developed Western countries to the developing countries. Here migrants can play the role of the transmitter of ideas, the way of thinking and economic and political concepts. Migrants thereby foster the spread of the developed countries idea of what development is and ensure that developing countries follow the universal pathway towards industrialization and modernization as provided for by developed countries. The second strategy to support this process of development is large capital transfers in the form of development assistance from outside into the developing countries. Governments of developing countries started to promote out-migration, considering their financial remittances as an alternative form of capital transfer and thus a mean of raising national income,

filling the foreign exchange gap and increasing national savings at a macro-level. At a micro-level remittances were expected to improve income distribution and the general economic situation, and to be productively invested. Thirdly, migrants would be able to transfer the expertise needed for industrialization. (de Haas 2008: 4-6, 24-26; Willis 2005: 2-3, 39-43 and 45-46) This fits within the human capital theory which assumes that through the attended transfer of migrants' human capital such as skills, education and knowledge the productive capacity rises. Migration is thus seen as a form of investment in human capital. In the long run, international labour migration, supporting industrialization, helps to equalize the economic conditions in developed and developing areas while removing the incentives for migration. (de Haas 2008: 5-6)

3.2 Phase 2: 1970s and 1980s – the negative view of the effects of migration on development

After the economic recession of the mid-1970s historical-structuralist views, influenced by neo-Marxist thinking, surfaced. The historical-structuralists understood that migration was linked to structural conditions and placed national development within the global context. Their pessimistic and therefore radically opposite views on the migration development nexus was supported by increasing empirical studies which showed that migration failed to contribute to development; on the contrary migration was seen as undermining the prospects for economic development.

Thus the dependency theory postulates that the causes of underdevelopment are exogenous ones, namely the global economic inequalities between developed and developing countries, characterised by the dependency of developing countries on developed ones. This dependency rose with colonialism and continues beyond decolonization due to unequal terms of trade, as postulated by Prebisch-Singer. André Gunder Frank, the forerunner of the dependency theory assumes that the asymmetrical and dependent incorporation of the developing countries into the capitalist world economy (that means the core developed countries exploiting the developing countries of the periphery) leads to the development of underdevelopment. Development therefore is defined as economic growth, social change and the emancipation of the developing countries from the developed ones. (de Haas 2008: 7-8; Massey et al. 1998: 34-37; Willis 2005: 69-75) This view is analogous to the cumulative causation approach, developed earlier by the economist Gunnar Myrdal

and taken up in the 1970s because it seemed to fit well within the historical-structural and dependency framework of asymmetrical growth. It argues that once asymmetrical growth has occurred, it will deepen. That is because growth in the core will be supported by drawing people, resources and capital to that area contributing to further growth. These flows leave the periphery depleted of the means for development. In this context, migration is expected to create these so-called backwash effects. These are firstly the undermining of the local economies through the loss of human capital. The loss of highly skilled, young and healthy people especially, due to the selective nature of migration, the so-called brain drain, has been perceived to be negative for the home countries' development. Secondly, the negative effects of financial remittances which are not invested in a productive way, which increase socio-economic inequalities due to their unequal distribution as a result of the selective nature of migration and which lead to remittance-dependency, foster the dependent status of the developing countries of the periphery. And thirdly, the negative effects of social remittances, which provoke consumerist, non-productive attitudes. Cumulative causation theory suggests that these backwash effects, generated by migration, lead to economic spatial and inter-personal disparities in the periphery which then lead to a further decrease in productivity thereby stimulating subsequent migration. Furthermore, the positive effect of returning human capital due to return migration was questioned. Since migrants may return because of failure, illness or old age, migration does not necessarily contribute to productivity or development. (de Haas 2008: 26-28; Massey et al. 1998: 36; Willis 2005: 43-44) Similar views about asymmetries in the global economic system form the basis of the world-systems approach, developed by Immanuel Wallerstein. The world-systems theory traces migration back to imbalances between three geographically distinct zones - the core, the semi-periphery and the periphery – according to their marginalized integration into the capitalist world system, i.e. due to international trade, the international division of labour and hegemony. It argues that the constraints imposed on the migrant by his or her home countries' position in the capitalist world system, in combination with the labour demand in the core or semi-periphery leads to migration. Thus the ongoing expansion of the capitalist economy incorporates more and more peripheries putting a migration drain on them. Furthermore, it is suggested that migration is facilitated by historical, cultural, linguistic, administrative and communicational links between the three zones. Migration is seen as a world-level labour-supply system which mobilises cheap labour from peripheral developing countries for capital accumulation in the capitalist core of developing countries or core developed

countries, undermining the economic development of the periphery while perpetuating its peripheral status. Thus migration is not just seen as the outcome of underdevelopment but also as its cause. (de Haas 2008: 7-8; Massey et al. 1998: 3-37; Parnreiter 2000: 32-36)

3.3 Phase 3: Since the end of 1980s - turn-around to a positive and also more differentiated view of the effects of migration on development

Since the end of the 1980s these two opposing views have been replaced by alternative theoretical models with a more comprehensive and pluralist understanding of the link between migration and development as well as development itself. These more moderate approaches stress the ability of individuals and social groups to overcome structural development constraints and their potential to affect positively the social, economic and political development of their countries and communities of origin. Ideas on the migration-development nexus were based on the qualification of migrants, diaspora and transnational communities as agents for development. As a result, the terminology changed from talking about the 'impact of migration on development' to 'migrants' contribution to development'. This people-centred alternative development thinking came along with a general shift towards the neoliberal thinking of liberalization, decentralization and privatization, coupled with development optimism and a non-state approach. The role of the state was now to provide political and legal structures, necessary for development. The most recent approaches of this phase are:

In the 1980s and 1990s the New Economics of Labour Migration (NELM) theory emerged as an improvement of the neoclassical migration theory which was seen as being too individualistic and rigid. It was Oded Stark in particular who changed the thinking about the relationship between migration and development, placing the decision making of the migrant about whether to move or to stay within the wider societal context of families, households and communities. Thus factors other than individual income maximization became important to explain migration. Migration is considered to be a risk-sharing behaviour of the mentioned social entities, diversifying their income while minimising their economic risks. NELM argues that the lack of access to capital or insurance institutions within the country or region of usual residence leads to migration. Remittances are therefore considered to be an integral part of migration as a strategy to overcome such constraints or market failures, financing alternative economic activities, new production technologies and self-

insurance against perceived risks. The positive effect on development consists of investments in new production activities which probably lead to increased production if they are profitable. Contrary to the neoclassical or dependency theory which promotes government's direct intervention in labour markets, NELM urges governments to improve local capital, credit and insurance markets in order to reduce migration and to implement an investment beneficial economic environment in order to foster investment in profitable production. (de Haas 2008: 34-38; Massey et al. 1998: 21-22 and 262-165)

The migration networks theory corresponds with this attempt to treat migrants as an integral part of social groups. The concept of migration network is about an interpersonal relationship that connects migrants, former migrants and non-migrants in areas of origin and destination leading to the so-called chain migration. People draw upon these network connections in order to gain information, assistance and material or financial resources. These will facilitate and channel migration, lowering the costs and risks and increasing the outcome. The idea that these networks transform migration into a self-sufficient process generating new migration processes was formulated in the cumulatively caused migration theory, first identified by Myrdal in a development context and later introduced into the field of migration. It provides an explanation of why migration processes, once initiated, maintain and/or rise, irrespective of whether the primarily prevailing circumstances supporting migration are still existent or changing. Being a part of such a network can also explain the emergence of remittances and why integration at the destination does not automatically reduce the remittances.

This is where the transnational migration theory ties in. It argues that as a result of globalization and new transport and communication technologies, migrants and their societies of origin maintain over sustained periods economic, social, cultural and political links across the borders of their home and destination country. Migrants are conceptualized as acting in a transnational social space, living across international borders and shaping a transnational identity configured in relationship to more than one nation-state or society. They are part of transnational communities which are becoming a development factor in their own right. Knowledge exchange, investments and business were facilitated through circular migration. Because of these transnational ties migrants' contribution to the home country's development can be maintained irrespective of the migrants' integration into the country of origin. Quite the contrary, transnational ties can extend to following generations. Those

migrants and their second and third generations who do not return are expected to form a diaspora, engage in advocacy, networking and development projects as well as collective remittances targeted to their country of origin's development. (de Haas 2008: 19-20, 38-39; Massey et al. 1998: 42-43 and 45-50, Parnreiter 2000: 36-1)

Being part of a migration network, transnational community or diaspora corresponds with what is called social capital in the theory of the same name. Social capital is regarded as the sum of resources gained through the membership of individuals or groups in networks and other social relationships. It is assumed that this social capital can be translated into other forms of capital such as human or financial capital. Thus, according to Faist, the notion of social capital can be regarded as the alliance between market and community principles, using social capital resources for the constitution of capital which yields interests. (Faist 2008: 24; Massey et al. 1998: 42-43; Willis 2005: 110-111)

Yet the agency of development has changed: neither the state nor the market but a third system, society, is the agent of development; the society which can be the community, NGOs or even migrants, diasporas and transnational communities. More precisely, the agency of development is the people's capacity to effect social change. As Nederveen Pieterse pointed out, often a different agency seems to be the key element of an alternative development thinking, that is a people-centred and participatory bottom-up development. (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 75, 83; Willis 2005: 102-110) According to Nederveen Pieterse, '[a]lternative development can be viewed as [...] a series of alternative proposals and methodologies that are loosely interconnected' (Nederveen 2008: 74) which includes concepts such as human development, basic needs, self-reliance, capacity-building, empowerment, participation, sustainability, endogenous development and so on. (Nederveen 2008: 78)

The people-entered alternative development approaches, may be viewed as coinciding with a general trend towards neoliberal thinking and its non-state approach, reducing the role of the state in providing the necessary political and legal structures thus facilitating people's self-development and economic growth (Faist 2008: 24; Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 83; Willis 2005: 111).

By the end of the 1980s neoliberal ideas became central concepts in the economic and development theory. Neoliberalism assumes that human beings are rational, freedom-loving, self-interested individuals, the so-called homo economicus. Their interaction as entrepreneurs and capitalists

within liberal and free markets are assumed to harmonize social and economic relations and equalize prices due to competition relating to economic growth, defined as development. Thus the objective of economic growth will be achieved through structural reform such as deregulation, liberalization and privatization which set up ideal markets. At the core of neoliberal thinking stands a non-state approach calling for the reduction of state intervention in the market, instead providing the necessary infrastructure for market-led growth. Neoliberal theory assumes that developing countries are poor because of state mismanagement. Thus, it argues, that state failures have to be overcome through structural adjustment towards deregulation, liberalization and privatization, regarded as the ideal conditions for well-functioning markets. The Washington Consensus represents a set of such policy reforms, based on neoliberal ideas, which were imposed on debtors, mainly developing countries, by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. This *neoliberal development policy package* (Hartwick/ Peet 2009: 86) includes fiscal disciplines, the reduction of public expenditures, tax reform, interest rates, competitive exchange rates, trade liberalization, the encouragement of foreign direct investment, privatization, deregularization and the securing of property rights. (Hartwick/ Peet 2009: 84-86, 99-100; Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 6, 41, 83, 155; Willis 2005: 111)

CHAPTER IV

Results

As stated in Chapter I the analysis reported here examined in detail the phenomenon of the established global-level dialogue on migration and development exemplified by the GFMD, sidelined by the debate on forced migration and development, exemplified by the UNHCR-led discussion on TDA. This chapter presents the results of the analysis of these case studies and interprets them with respect to the research questions posed in Chapter I. Firstly it examines in what manner which kind of migration is linked to what concept of development by the approach of the participants of the GFMD and the Convention Plus TDA initiative, drawing on the conceptual and theoretical considerations concluded in Chapter III and expert knowledge. With respect to the second research question it then highlights the different and common issues, concepts and theories which dominate the debates when linking migration to development. The third section will then set out some reflections on the findings. The following sections will be organised in terms of the three sub-questions posed in Chapter I:

- Question on the phenomenon of migration itself - Which migration?
- Questions on the migration-development nexus – How do migrants contribute to development? Who benefits?
- Question on the phenomenon of development itself - What development?

Of crucial importance to this research is to discover which definition of development dominates the debates under analysis. Due to the ambiguous nature of development as a concept it is important to examine what exactly is meant by development. Since neither the GFMD nor the UNHCR-led dialogue on TDA gives a definition of development this can be only answered by having a closer look at how migrants are expected to contribute to development and what goals or objectives of development might be reached. This implies that the term development will - at some time - be left undefined until the examinations allow an interpretation of what is meant by it. For now, just to renew the attention to the broad spectrum of the meaning of development, reference is made to the explanations in Chapter III section 2 and 3 of this thesis, giving an overview of different development concepts and theories.

1 The Global Forum on Migration and Development

Each session took place against the background of a shared conviction that migration does contribute to development [...], that migrants should be seen as active participants in development, and that migration policy and development planning should benefit migrants as well as countries of origin and destination (GFMD 2009b: 2).

1.1 Question on the phenomenon of migration itself - Which migration?

This chapter presents what the analysis of the GFMD documents discovered on the questions of who the migrants under review are. How are they expected to migrate and to where? This gives an idea about which migration the GFMD refers to.

Migration at the GFMD is seen primarily as an international movement of people, occurring from South to North between developing and developed countries, from South to South among developing countries, and from North to South, returning from the developed destination country to the country of origin (see for example GFMD 2007b: 47, 82). Thus, migrants originating from developing countries are exclusively addressed in the GFMD discussions (see for example GFMD 2007b: 82).

Return migration plays a central role in GFMD discussions on migration and development. Firstly return, either temporary or permanent, is regarded as being of positive value for development, enabling the migrant to use the skills and resources which were accumulated in the host country productively in the home country (GFMD 2008b: 14; GFMD 2007a: 15). Secondly, permanent return will be accompanied by sustainable reintegration due to the 'assumption that effective reintegration of returning migrants can support development efforts, particularly at community level and specifically in the context of circular migration' (GFMD 2009b: 27). Thirdly, as noted in the quotation above, return migration is regarded as a key element of circular migration which is expected to have a positive effect on the migrants' contribution to development (GFMD 2007a: 15). 'Research shows that circular migration can be beneficial for social, business, investment and other forms of productive transnational activity that benefits development' (GFMD 2007a: 15). In consequence, the GFMD seeks 'to encourage people to return, either temporarily or permanently, or to circulate with enhanced skills and resources and to use these to support development efforts of

their countries of origin' (GFMD 2007a: 15).

The focus of GFMD discussion lies unmistakably on temporary and circular migration. Each of the GFMDs, whether governmental or civil society-led, refers to these forms of migration. Circular migration is defined as 'a situation where migrants can work and settle in other countries and circulate more freely between those countries and their origin countries' (GFMD 2007a: 15), and is therefore 'more dynamic than the temporary migration concept of a single migratory cycle, where workers are expected to return to the country of origin at the end of the cycle' (GFMD 2007b: 76). The advantage of circular migration is seen in the fact that '[i]n contrast to earlier guest worker schemes, circular labour migration may guarantee greater temporariness and legality of migration, while flexibly meeting the labour needs of employers in destination countries' (GFMD 2007b: 77).

These quotations show that the typical migrant addressed in the GFMD discussion is a labour migrant. The terms *labour migration* (see for example GFMD 2007a: 3) and *labour mobility* (see for example GFMD 2008b: 12) appear on a large scale in all GFMD documents. Labour migrants are defined as people who 'keep their home base in the origin country and return their earnings and other resources, including skills, to their families and home communities' (GFMD 2007b: 57). Through their labour market participation (see for example GFMD 2007a: 12) they are expected to 'meet [...] labour shortages in higher income countries, while at the same time alleviate [...] the [...] unemployment pressures in developing countries' (GFMD 2007a: 12). The qualification of labour migration as a strategy for an optimal allocation of production factors and thus as a development strategy, as done in the GFMD (see for example GFMD 2007b: 47), shows parallels with neoclassical theory as outlined in Chapter III section 3, which argues that labour migration leads to an equilibrium of labour and wage levels, a situation which will lead to economic development (see for example de Haas 2008: 4-6).

The GFMD participants seek to foster labour migration by labour migration management (see for example GFMD 2007b: 57-59) and temporary or circular labour migration programmes or agreements (see for example GFMD 2008a: 6). These ensure the temporariness of labour migration (GFMD 2007b: 59) and the meeting of labour market needs (see for example GFMD 2009b: 23), that is the matching of labour demand and supply (GFMD 2007a: 9; GFMD 2008b: 12). The assurance of migrants' human and labour rights is regarded as of high value for the labour migrants' successful development contribution (see for example GFMD 2008a: 2, 6,).

In relation to that return, circular and temporary migration, migrants attributes regarded as necessary for their contribution to development, are described with adjectives such as flexible (GFMD 2007b: 57), quick (GFMD 2007b: 57), dynamic (GFMD 2007b: 76) as well as free (GFMD 2007a: 15) and fluid movement (GFMD 2007b: 75). It becomes clear that they are expected to move flexibly between their countries of destination and origin thus meeting labour shortages in the first and contributing to the development of the latter.

The GFMD participants differentiated between highly skilled and less skilled labour migrants, contributing in different ways to development. 'Low skilled migration can increase labour market participation and income for the poor; highly skilled migration can increase returns to education and help grow the knowledge base of origin countries' (GFMD 2007b: 47) In order to tackle the possible brain drain in developing countries due to emigration of the highly skilled they are – in the sense of circular migration - expected to return periodically to their country of origin (GFMD 2007a: 4).

The paper posits that circular migration is at the cutting edge of the migration and development debate, because it combines the interest of highly industrialized countries in meeting labour needs in a flexible and orderly way with the interests of developing countries in accessing richer labour markets, fostering skills transfer and mitigating the risks of brain drain (GFMD 2007b: 75).

The emphasis of return migration as beneficial to development as presented here represents a central aspect of neoclassical theory. Neoclassical theory expects that the movement of labour migration from 'low-wage, labour-surplus regions to high-wage, labour scarce regions' (de Haas 2008: 4) will be mirrored by the return migration of human capital such as highly skilled workers (Massey et al. 1998: 18-19).

Analysis shows that the GFMD debates are focused on international labour migration. Occasionally other categories of migration found their way into the dialogue. Within the appeal that all forms of migration should be considered (temporary, permanent, circular and return migration, as well as irregular migration) participants in the Civil Society Day of the third GFMD underlined the importance of protecting forced migrants, identified as refugees and displaced persons (GFMD 2009a: 6). Their potential to become agents for development once they have been provided with opportunities to make use of their skills and productive capabilities was acknowledged (GFMD 2008b: 7). 'Here lies a major challenge: to identify whether – and how – migration by necessity can

be turned into an opportunity for development' (GFMD 2007a: 25). Although the whole GFMD is focused on labour migration, because of its economic motives generally defined as a voluntary form of migration (see for example Betts 2009b: 4), some participants argued that '[b]ecause of the variety and interconnection of so many of the root causes of migration, it is often difficult to distinguish between voluntary and involuntary migration' (GFMD 2007a: 27). In fact, as outlined in Chapter III section 1 of this thesis, migration is often motivated by complex, mixed and shifting motives.

The alleviation of these root causes of migration becomes an important horizontal issue within the GFMD (see for example GFMD 2007a: 25), whose aim is to '[c]reate the environment enabling international migration to occur by choice rather than out of necessity' (GFMD 2007b: 141). The belief of the GFMD participants that 'migration should not be a survival strategy but instead should be based increasingly on choice: the choice to migrate' (GFMD 2009b: 5) is based on the assumption, that 'people [who] will migrate by choice [...] [will] contribute more fully and transparently to development back home' (GFMD 2007b: 65). According to the GFMD the root causes of migration 'generally relate to major economic, demographic and social disparities' (GFMD 2007b: 139). These 'can all seriously hamper development and give rise to migration by necessity rather than choice' (GFMD 2007b: 21). Thus in order to make migration occurring by choice, the GFMD participants invoke to address the root causes of migration through development policies (GFMD 2007b: 141; GFMD 2009b: 21).

Referring to Lee's push-pull model (see de Haas 2008: 8-10), the root causes of migration identified by GFMD participants can be divided into push and pull factors. The push factors are located within the migrant-sending country. Amongst others the GFMD identified the following push factors: a lack of development, the violation of human rights, the low status of women, the lack of sufficient and decent employment opportunities, surplus labour, demographic pressures, political instability, insecurity and violent conflicts, climate change and environmental degradation or disasters (see for example GFMD 2007b: 139-140; GFMD 2008b: 22) 'These conditions in countries of origin often result in a lack of development prospects for which migration is too often considered to be the only alternative' (GFMD 2007b: 140). In the group of pull factors which are located in the migration receiving country the GFMD includes for example policies that favour skilled immigration, labour demand and high wage levels (GFMD 2007b: 47, 51). Referring to the

economic push and pull factors, there can be identified an analogy between GFMD arguments on the root causes of migration and the neoclassical migration theory. As outlined in Chapter III section 3 of this thesis, neoclassical theory in fact assumes that economic disparities between areas, such as wage levels and labour supply/demand, lead to labour migration. As de Haas argues, '[t]he push-pull model is basically an individual choice and equilibrium model and is therefore largely analogous to neoclassical micro models' (de Haas 2008: 9). In fact, the neoclassical theory treats migration as a result of a free choice decision of utility-maximising individuals, based on the rational comparison of relative costs and benefits. Migration itself is expected to lead to labour shortages and increasing wage levels in the country of origin thus reducing the root causes of migration and in consequence stopping out-migration. (de Haas 2008: 4-5) This neoclassical way of explaining migration movements can be identified within the GFMD debate which regards migration as supportive in reducing the root causes of migration: 'migrants can help alleviate the root causes of migration and notably increase income levels and reduce poverty [...] by reducing pressures on labour markets' (GFMD 2007b: 140).

According to economic disparities between countries of origin and destination it can be argued that labour migrants are expected to decide to work abroad as a result of the neoclassical pull factor of labour demand and higher wages and the push factors of unemployment and demographic pressures. By arguing that through their migration the migrants help to reduce the push factors identified as root causes of migration, participants of the GFMD portrayed migration not as a solution for but as an opportunity for development (GFMD 2007b: 41, 140). This idea fits very well with the just examined focus on labour migrants whose role is to meet labour shortages in higher income destination countries while alleviating the unemployment pressures in the developing country of origin.

1.2 Question on the migration-development nexus – How do migrants contribute to development?

This section examines the GFMD participants' expectations of how migrants contribute to development and who benefits from their contribution?

At the core of the GFMD debate on migration and development lies the qualification of migrants as

agents for development, recognizing their positive contribution (see for example GFMD 2007b: 16, 44). 'It is widely assumed that migrants [...] act as agents for development for their countries of origin' (GFMD 2007b: 113). Thus the GFMD aims to 'empower migrants as agents for development' (GFMD 2008b: 5). Furthermore, participants 'stressed that diasporas are trustworthy agents of change' (GFMD 2009b: 21) and qualify '[d]iaspora communities as development actors' (GFMD 2007b: 18). GFMD participants define diaspora as

individuals originating from one country, living outside this country, irrespective of their citizenship or nationality, who individually or collectively are or could be willing to contribute to the development of this country. Descendants of these individuals are also included in this definition (GFMD 2007b: 103).

It might be argued that perceiving migrants and diasporas to be agents for development shows an underlying alternative development thinking. As outlined in Chapter III section 3 the agency in alternative development approaches is the people's capacity to effect change. The agent is neither the state nor the market but a third system, the society and in this case the migrant or diaspora (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 75, 83). More evidence of this may be found when looking at the state's role in this process. 'Participants suggested that governments should look at creating an enabling environment' (GFMD 2007b: 109). This claim fits well with the role of the state in alternative development thinking as pointed out by Nederveen Pieterse: '[T]he state is to act as an enabler, a facilitator of people's self-development' (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 83).

The examinations above have shown that migrants and diasporas are expected to benefit both their countries of origin and destination. More precisely, it is assumed that migrants contribute not only to the development of their countries of origin but to the development of their families, households and communities at home as well (see for example GFMD 2007b: 57, 140). Only a few times is migration explicitly qualified as a win-win-win situation benefiting the migrants themselves (see for example GFMD 2009b: 18).

1.2.1 How are migrants expected to contribute to development?

Coming now to the question of what the ways are in which migrants are expected to contribute to development it can be said in sum that participants perceive that:

Migrants and diaspora contribute to positive development in both host and home countries through remittances, investment, knowledge transfer, technology transfer, sharing of ideas, creation and expansion of networks, and the establishment of business partnerships (GFMD 2008b: 9).

These ways are outlined as follows:

Business:

Beside the migrants' role as employees they are regarded as business actors, collaborating with the private sector, pursuing productive investments, building entrepreneurship and participating in trade unions in their country of origin (see for example GFMD 2009a: 9). They are thereby expected to increase trade and investment in their country of origin as well as consumption abroad, acting as non-traditional export partners of their home country (GFMD 2007b: 82, 99, 110). This view of migrants as business actors has several parallels with the market-centred neoliberal development theory. The key words used by GFMD participants, for instance private sector, investments, entrepreneurship, trade and export are the same as those found within Neoliberalism. Assuming that liberal market activity leads to development, neoliberal development policy focuses on market deregulation, trade liberalization and privatization (see for example Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 6). One recommendation of the so-called Washington consensus was to encourage foreign direct investment in order to foster business activities (Hartwick/ Peet 2009: 85). This is exactly what GFMD participants expect from migrants: to pursue productive investments. Qualifying migrants as business actors and entrepreneurs thus fits within the neoliberal idea of market-led development.

Financial remittances:

Within the GFMD migrants' financial remittances are regarded as one of the central development supportive activities of migrants. The first GFMD in 2007 in Brussels dedicated a roundtable to the discussion of remittances but the other two GFMDs also focused on financial remittances. Remittances - as private transfers – are expected to raise incomes, savings, capital, productive investments and the use of financial services (see for example GFMD 2007a: 18; GFMD 2007b: 92), benefiting migrants' families, households and communities (see for example GFMD 2007a: 6, 18). The idea that migration is not an individual benefit-maximising decision, as argued by neoclassical and neoliberal theories (see for example Massey et al. 1998: 19; Hartwick/ Peet 2009: 99-100) but that migration is embedded within a wider societal context, is the central assumption of

the NELM theory. As outlined in Chapter III section 3 in NELM remittances play a central role in supporting the families, households and communities at home.

A key insight of this new approach is that migration decisions are not made by isolated individual actors but by larger units of related people – typically families or households but sometimes communities, in which people act collectively not only to maximize expected income, but also to minimize risks (Massey et al. 1998: 21).

Just as with NELM the GFMD participants argue that labour migration can 'maximize opportunities and minimize risks for the migrants, their families and communities at home' (GFMD 2007b: 46). As outlined in Chapter III section 3 to the NELM remittances are a strategy for diversifying the families' income in order to overcome the lack of access to capital or insurance institutions within the country of origin and to finance economic activities, new production technologies and self-insurance measures. (see for example Massey et al. 1998: 262-265) Also at this point the focus of labour migration becomes apparent. In order to generate financial remittances the migrant has to be employed. While highlighting the positive effect of migrants' financial remittances on the development of their families, households and communities at home through raising incomes, savings, capital, productive investments and the use of financial services, the GFMD participants represent an economic definition of development, as economic growth based theories such as neoclassical theory, modernization theory, NELM and Neoliberalism. These theories connect development to employment, income maximization, productivity and productive investment (see Chapter III section 3) just as the GFMD does. While the GFMD wants 'to manage migration for growth' (GFMD 2007b: 122) it becomes obvious that all these activities are expected to culminate in economic growth. Throughout the whole debate economic growth is consistently connected with development or poverty reduction and in the most recent GFMD even with the well-being of people and countries (see for example GFMD 2007b: 149; GFMD 2008b: 24; GFMD 2009b: 10). Throughout the history of development theory, economic growth has been one of the most dominant concepts (see for example Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 80) and thus it is within the GFMD.

The idea of fostering development through migrants' financial remittances has some parallels with modernization development thinking as outlined in Chapter III section 3. Modernization theory treats capital transfers as a necessary support for the development process. In this case the function of capital transfer in the form of development assistance from developed countries is complemented by migrants' financial remittances. (Willis 2005: 45)

These findings are confirmed by Dannecker who comes in her reflection on the current debate on migration and development to the conclusion that

the focus on international remittances and economic development is reproducing modernisation approaches, defining economic development and capital transfer as the core meaning of development while only the agency has changed: that is, not the state or the market, but increasingly migrants and the remittances they transfer (Dannecker 2009: 121).

Participants of the GFMD noted that '[e]ducation and health expenses are typical investments in remittance recipient families' (GFMD 2007a: 6) and that 'remittances today mostly support investments in real assets including building schools and clinics, rather than productive investments' (GFMD 2007b: 93). In fact, as de Haas highlighted, '[i]nvestments only come in the fourth place of remittance use' (de Haas 2008: 29).

While participants [of the GFMD] stressed that these [investments in education and health] should be considered as investments, they also noted that the reason why people allocate part of their remittances to these services rather than to savings or 'productive' investment, is sometimes due to the quality gap between public and private education or health services. This is a key development issue and reminded participants that remittances are not an alternative to national development responsibilities (GFMD 2007b: 94).

In this argument the balancing act of the GFMD between economic growth and human development becomes apparent. By urging to 'mobilize savings generated by remittances towards productive investments' (GFMD 2007b: 93) the GFMD participants remain within the *neoliberal development policy package* (Hartwick/ Peet 2009: 86), encouraging investment. At the same time participants highlight the importance of education and health as key elements of human development. The importance of human development for economic development was clearly highlighted by GFMD participants. For instance, the participants of the Civil Society Day of the first GFMD stated that '[d]evelopment is much more than economic growth' (GFMD 2007a: 7). They went to such lengths as to claim that '[w]ithin the migration and development nexus, the total human development of the migrant workers and members of their families should be at the core of the discourse' (GFMD 2007a: 7). In the same way participants of the third GFMD argued, that '[d]evelopment should be understood in broad terms as in the concept of human development [...] and not merely focus on economic growth' (GFMD 2009a: 6).

Human development is characterized within the GFMD as a broad concept going beyond economic growth, focusing on social aspects such as human rights, well-being, health, education and training, employment, the ability to care for family, stability, democracy, security, environment and future prospects (GFMD 2007a: 7, 26; GFMD 2008b: 7). What Nederveen Pieterse examined becomes apparent here, namely that the concept of human development with its focus on peoples' capacity building has been inspired by Amartya Sen's capability approach (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 121). This approach defines development as a process of enlarging people's choices and capabilities, seeing the cause of underdevelopment in personal unfreedom, leaving people unable to exercise their agency (Sen 1999: xi-xii, 3-5). Sen especially emphasises the importance of human freedom, consisting of 'social and economic arrangements (for example, facilities for education and health care) as well as political and civil rights (for example the liberty to participate in public discussion and scrutiny)' (Sen 1999: 3) for the people in order to exercise their free and sustainable agency regarded as 'a major engine of development' (Sen 1999: 3). In this sense the GFMD participants argue that '[e]nhancing the capacity for development of diasporas and migrant organizations enables them to support themselves' (GFMD 2007a: 22). Furthermore by increasing their capacity, migrants' productive activities are expected to be facilitated (GFMD 2007b: 143). Thus it could be argued that GFMD participants support migrants' and diaspora's human development and capacity building with the aim of fostering their productive activities thereby contributing to economic growth. This reflects the human development thinking addressing the need to invest in the people (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 100) and thus fits very well with the argument made by the participants, that '[e]conomic development cannot occur without human development, that is without human beings who are healthy, educated, employed and able to care for their families' (GFMD 2008b: 7). Hence, capacity building was one of the horizontal issues of the first GFMD (GFMD 2007b: 33), arguing that '[p]eople and their education and skills are key to any country's development and growth' (GFMD 2007b: 47). The idea that investment in human capacity fosters economic development is analogous to the human capital theory. As outlined in Chapter III section, according to the human capital theory investment in human capital, such as skills, education and knowledge, raises the individual's productive capacity (de Haas 2008: 6).

The linking of human well-being and the migrants' individual capacity to contribute to development with productivity and economic growth, is an indicator of GFMD's efforts to combine the human

development approach with neoclassical and neoliberal development thinking of utility-maximising individuals, competing under market conditions leading to economic growth (see chapter III, section 3). As argued by Nederveen Pieterse, human development, inspired by Amartya Sen's capability approach and following the human capital theory, can be regarded as part of neoclassical and neoliberal mainstream development thinking (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 120-121).

Social and other remittances:

Beside financial remittances, the GFMD participants recognized that migrants and diasporas contribute to development through the transfer of knowledge and skills and the sharing of ideas (see for example GMFD 2007b: 170; GFMD 2008b: 9).

The addressed transfer of knowledge and skills can be aligned with the concept of human capital and capacity building in the sense of human development and the capability approach as outlined above. The transfer of migrants' 'new-found skills and knowledge' (GMFD 2007b: 45) fosters human capital formation or capacity building in the country of origin thus contributing to development.

By talking about the transfer or sharing of ideas, GFMD participants address the so-called social remittances. As Levitt defines them, social remittances are 'the ideas, practices, identities and social capital that migrants remit home' (Levitt 2006: 2). GFMD participants do not go into detail of what the assumed contribution to development through social remittances looks like nor do they specify the effects of social remittances on the country of origin. Remaining on the surface some parallels can be drawn of the assumption that social remittances foster development on the one hand and modernization thinking on the other. As outlined in Chapter III section 3, modernization development theory argues that certain values and behaviours leading to social transformation have to be transferred from developed countries to the developing countries, ensuring that the developing countries follow the universal pathway towards industrialization and modernization as provided for by the developed countries. A modern society based on the individualistic and rational capitalist society in Western Europe was regarded as being prepared for successful development. (Willis 2005: 116-117, 122) In this sense, migrants can be seen as guiding the development process in a certain direction, identified by the host country, due to the transmission of values and behaviours in the form of social remittances.

A closer look however shows that in practice social remittances are not about a one-to-one transfer of values and behaviours but a complex process of remitting and adopting ideas, practices and social capital. In her working paper on social remittances, Levitt differentiates between three types of social remittances, namely normative structures, systems of practice and social capital (Levitt 2006: 2).

Normative structures are ideas, values and beliefs. They include norms for behavior, notions about family responsibility, principles of neighborliness and community participation, and aspirations for social mobility. They encompass ideas about gender, race and class identity. They also include values about how organizations should work, incorporating ideas about good government and good churches and about how politicians and clergy should behave. Systems of practice are the actions shaped by normative structures (Levitt 2006: 2-3).

Social capital, the third type of social remittance as observed by Levitt, is based on the first two types as well as constituting an element of social remittances in its own right (Levitt 2006: 3). As noted already in Chapter III section 3 of this thesis, social capital can be defined as 'the sum of the resources, actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships' (Massey et al. 1998: 42). Thus, social remittances as normative structures, systems of practice and social capital acquired by migrants in their host country, affect 'the daily lives of those who remain behind, altering their behaviour, and transforming notions about gender relations, democracy and what states should and should not do' (Levitt 2006: 2). Faist determines these effects more precisely, identifying democracy, gender equality and human rights as examples of concrete social remittances (Faist 2008: 22). However, as Levitt pointed out, the evaluation of the initiated change may differ: 'What some consider a force for greater democratization and accountability others hold responsible for rising materialism and individualism' (Levitt 2006: 6). The transformation of gender relations is another effect of social remittances which is controversially discussed. For instance, in her analysis of labour migration between Bangladesh and Malaysia, Dannecker examined the migration experience of Bangladeshi women which challenged existing gender relations. While the female migrants criticized the existing structures and therefore would have welcomed new gender practices the public at large criticized female migration as a violation of the existing gender relations. (Dannecker 2009: 124-126)

Nevertheless, Levitt believes that '[s]ocial remittances are an under-utilized development resource

that have the potential to be purposefully harnessed to improve socioeconomic [sic] outcomes in both sending and receiving countries' (Levitt 2006: 6).

Two further points, interconnected with social remittances, were advanced within the GFMD discussions: one on the migrant's integration in the host country, the other on migrants' ties and networks, their so-called social capital.

Integration into the host country:

GFMD participants linked the migrants' contribution to development to their integration into the host country and their human development (GFMD 2009b: 25). They assume that the migrant's ability to accumulate social, human and financial capital in the host country to then be remitted to their relatives and communities in the home country rises with the migrant's integration into the host country. Especially the transfer of social remittances is regarded as an outcome of human development which is enhanced through migrants' social integration. (GFMD 2009b: 25)

At the third GFMD,

[t]he session [on inclusion, protection and acceptance of migrants in society] explored the assumption that the more migrants are included, protected and accepted in their host societies, the better they are able to secure the well-being of their families and contribute to development in host and origin countries (GFMD 2009b: 25).

The participants argued that integration is not only relevant for permanent immigration but also for temporary and circular migrants responding to the 'emerging forms of temporary and circular mobility, which are challenging traditional approaches to immigrant integration in host countries' (GFMD 2009b: 24). 'Despite inconclusive research, well integrated migrants [...] are considered to be better equipped to play a role in home country development' (GFMD 2007b: 105). Hence GFMD participants stress that '[p]olicies are needed to [...] foster more integration of migrants in host countries' (GFMD 2007b: 22).

Ties and networks:

Within the GFMD concern was expressed that remittances may decline over time due to the integration of migrants into the host country (GFMD 2007b: 100). Therefore the participants insist upon implementing measures in order to sustain migrant's and diaspora's connection to the home country so that their sustained contribution to the development of their home countries will be

ensured (GFMD 2007b: 47-48; GFMD 2008b: 10). These measures on the one hand might foster the migrants' integration into the host country (which is expected to increase their ability to contribute to development) and on the other hand allow them to circulate between the home and host country thereby sustaining connections and benefiting the home country (GFMD 2007b: 47-48). These policies seem to fit well with the observations made by Levitt, namely that migrants integrate into the host countries while at the same time they sustain strong ties to their countries of origin (Levitt 2006: 1).

Referring to the migration network theory as outlined in Chapter III section 3, these migrants and diasporas who sustain ties and connections to their home are expected to be part of the so-called migration networks. These are 'sets of interpersonal ties that connect migrants, former migrants and non-migrants in origin and destination areas' (Massey et al. 1998: 42). As already mentioned, the resources which the migrants gain due to their membership in these networks are called social capital. The social capital theory assumes that the social capital gained due to the participation in networks is able to increase the migrant's human or financial capital (Massey et al. 1998: 42). Thus this theory supports the GFMD assumption that supporting migrants' connections and ties will foster development.

A similar approach is followed by the transnational migration theory. Arguing that migrants and diasporas maintain links with their societies of origin across the borders of their home and destination country, the transnational migration theory draws the picture of transnational migrants, communities and associations, living in a transnational space in between (Parnreiter 2000: 38-41). GFMD participants regard these transnational experiences and activities as productive for development and therefore want to foster them (GFMD 2007b: 109; GFMD 2007a: 15). As Faist pointed out, 'in the current round of the migration-development nexus, [...] transnational migrant associations in particular have emerged as significant agents' (Faist 2008: 22).

Due to globalization processes and new transport and communication technologies, migrants and their societies and countries of origin are able to maintain ties even without returning home.

It has long been assumed that migrants' integration would necessarily coincide with a gradual loosening of ties with societies of origin. This explains much of the prior pessimism on the sustainability of remittances as well as the fact that migrants' contribution to development in origin countries was typically linked to *return* migration. However, it has become increasingly clear that this is not necessarily the case, and that

many migrant groups maintain strong transnational ties over sustained periods. Migrants' engagement with origin country development is not conditional on their return but can be sustained through telecommunication, holiday visits and pendular or circular migration patterns (de Haas 2008: 39).

This is what participants of the GFMD stand for: the fostering of migrant's and diaspora's connection to their country of origin through allowing circular migration, and fostering their integration into the host country in order to better equip them to contribute to their home country's development.

Diaspora and transnational community:

As the analysis reveals, not only migrants but also diasporas are regarded as development actors in their own right (GFMD 2007a: 18), namely as 'trustworthy agents of change' (GFMD 2009b: 21). Especially round-table two of the first GFMD and session 1.2 of round-table one of the third GFMD discussed the diasporas' capacity for development. In sum they are expected to have the same development supportive behaviour as migrants (see for example GFMD 2008b: 9). Additionally the diaspora submits collective financial remittances to be used in a collective manner in the country of origin (GFMD 2009b: 19). Regarding the concrete use of these remittances, 'participants saw the need to align diaspora development activities with local and national development plans in the beneficiary country and donor development cooperation planning [...]. [...] Diaspora should therefore be consulted in the development planning processes' (GFMD 2007b: 108). But diasporas not only participate in national development activities, they are also expected to conduct diaspora-driven development initiatives (GFMD 2007a: 6-7). More precisely, GFMD participants stress that diasporas as well as migrants, finance and support development projects and philanthropy or charity activities in their country of origin (see for example GFMD 2007b: 82; GFMD 2009b: 19). They are involved in post-conflict situations, providing emergency assistance during natural disasters and reconstruction thereafter (GFMD 2007b: 97; GFMD 2009b: 26). Here, an additional form of the migrants' and diasporas' role as development actors becomes apparent.

Beside this development of supportive activities of migrants and diasporas the GFMD addresses gender and human rights as horizontal issues which are perceived to be relevant to each of these activities.

1.2.2 Gender

Within the GFMD a growing number of female migrants and a feminization of migration are recognized (see for example GFMD 2009b: 23). Participants state that '[f]eminization of migration is a reality' (GFMD 2007a: 5). Düvell quite to the contrary argues that the feminization of migration did not occur only since the 1990s but already began in the 16th century. Moreover he even questions that there was a feminization phenomenon but suggests that women always migrated and that they were merely not recognized. Therefore he speaks about a feminization of science. (Düvell 2006: 179)

However, whether female migration has grown or not the observation of Parnreiter that women migrate at least as often as men (Parnreiter 2000: 41) is not questioned. But both Parnreiter and the participants of the GFMD offer the criticism that policies and practices ignore this fact and 'tend to be either silent on gender or to focus on the situation of male migrants, with women often still seen as dependants despite their active and growing economic roles' (GFMD 2007b: 149; see also Parnreiter 2000: 41). Therefore the participants stress the need for a gender-based approach for the development of coherent policies in the field of migration and development (GFMD 2009b: 18, 33).

Participants of the GFMD perceived female migrants to be major contributors to economic growth and poverty reduction. As senders and recipients of remittances women contribute to development and ensure the welfare of their families (see for example GFMD 2007b: 149). The participants stress that '[i]n this context, due attention should be paid to gender particularly as women [...] have different remitting patterns than men and tend to prioritize different types of consumption, investment and savings' (GFMD 2007b: 94). The question, however of what these differences are remains unanswered within the GFMD debates.

The aim of the participants is to foster female migrants' contribution to 'economic growth and poverty reduction' (GFMD 2007b: 149). In this sense they claim that '[g]overnments should empower women to access productive opportunities as well as capital and financial resources and services' (GFMD 2007b: 94). Here the dominance of economic development in the GFMD becomes once more apparent. As already mentioned the focus on productivity and economic growth is a central aspect of economic development theories such as the neoclassical theory, Neoliberalism, the modernization theory and the NELM theory. Productivity, as focused on in the above quotation, is

an inherent element of these theories. Furthermore the link between economic development and the migrant's access to capital and financial resources and services, as made by the GFMD participants, has parallels with the NELM theory, regarding imperfect or inaccessible capital and credit markets in developing countries as an obstacle to economic development (Massey et al. 1998: 22).

GFMD participants see female migrants often engaged in low skilled, unprotected and poorly-regulated sectors such as domestic work, agriculture, service industries, manufacturing and sex work. Therefore, the GFMD participants consider them to be more vulnerable than men to exploitation and abuse as well as illegal migration (see for example GFMD 2007b: 63, 148-149).

Illegal or irregular migrants – both terms are used within the GFMD debates – are qualified to be vulnerable to abuse and exploitation (see for example GFMD 2007a: 7) as are female migrants and to be less able to contribute to development (GFMD 2008b: 16).

There is a strong conviction and some evidence that irregular migration increases personal risks and reduces developmental gains. When migrants find themselves in irregular status, particularly through the criminal actions of *migrant smugglers and traffickers in human beings, or the exploitative behaviour of recruiters or employers*, they are at high personal risk. For example, they have less access to social welfare and medical attention or to formal banking and other financial systems, and little access to grievance mechanisms in case of exploitation or abuse (GFMD 2008b: 16).

Another aspect addressed by the GFMD participants is that female migrants in their role as employees are subject of double discrimination: as foreigners and as women (GFMD 2009b: 23). This observation is supported by Parnreiter who adds two further characteristics which may lead to women's discrimination in employment, these are their class and their belonging to an ethnic group (Parnreiter 2000: 42).

Beside the diminished development potential of female migrants due to their probable illegal and/or vulnerable status and their being discriminated against, GFMD participants observed that women are frequently excluded from diaspora organizations, marginalized and discriminated against which is regarded as reinforcing their diminished development potential. (GFMD 2007b: 105, 149)

The GFMD therefore sees a need for specific measures to protect and empower female migrants in order to enable them to exercise their full potential as agents of development (see for example GFMD 2009b: 23, 26). Thus the participants stress that

[g]overnments need to give due consideration for the gender perspective in any policy coherence strategy. They also need to promote legislation, policies and practices for gender-based development and create enabling environments for gender equity by empowering women e.g. through training and skills upgrading, information and orientation, and strengthening female engagement in diasporas' development activities (GFMD 2007b: 22).

The GFMD discussion on gender as presented here, needs to be examined critically. As argued by Cornwall/ Harrison/ Whitehead in their book *Gender Myths and Feminist Fables*, the field of development discourse and practice is dominated by particular ideas and images about gender and women's role in development (Cornwall/ Harrison/ Whitehead 2008). Their observation that

[w]omen often appear in narratives of gender and development policy as both heroines and victims: heroic in their capacities for struggle, in the steadfastness with which they carry the burdens of gender disadvantage and in their exercise of autonomy; victims as those with curtailed choices, a triple work burden and on the receiving end of male oppression and violence (Cornwall/ Harrison/ Whitehead 2008: 2),

shows suspicious parallels with the argument of GFMD participants as examined above. This regards female migrants on the one hand as a major contributor to development qualifying them as heroines and on the other hand as being vulnerable to abuse, exploitation and discrimination, thus regarding them as victims.

1.2.3 Human rights

Human rights and their relationship with development constitute an essential element of all GFMD debates and were addressed as a horizontal issue in the first GFMD. They were addressed in correlation with social rights (see for example GFMD 2007b: 65) and migrants' labour rights. In accordance with an overall focus of the GFMD debates on labour migration, the latter, the migrants' labour rights, were emphasized (see for example GFMD 2007b: 148; GFMD 2008a: 6).

Due to the assumption that human rights violations in the context of migration are the result of 'conflicting interests between the need to respect migrants' rights and the need for private actors involved in recruiting and employing migrants to pursue some profit' (GFMD 2007b: 145) participants called upon governments to foster migrants' rights in cases where economic interests might be touched (GFMD 2007a: 8).

Participants assume that the development contribution of migrants is closely linked to the protection of their human rights (see for example GFMD 2007b: 141). Some even see the respect of migrants' human rights 'as an essential prerequisite to migrants contributing to development' (GFMD 2007b: 22). Thus the participants agree that 'migrants whose rights are respected are best able to develop their potential, make their contribution to the economy of destination countries and act as agents for development for their countries of origin' (GFMD 2007b: 144-145). Through the protection of their rights, participants seek to maximise the benefit of migration for development (GFMD 2009b: 16).

The human-rights based approach to migration and development as promoted by the GFMD shows two characteristics which are common to all rights-based approaches: firstly, human rights are regarded as a method for achieving development; secondly, human rights are regarded as an objective of development in their own right (Willis 2005: 206). Thus the idea that '[p]rotecting the rights of migrants allows them to contribute better to development' (GFMD 2007b: 7) leads to the conclusion that human rights are regarded as a method for achieving development. According to Nederveen Pieterse the change of mainstream development methods into human rights, as occurred here, can be regarded as evidence of alternative development thinking (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 75-76). Willis further argues that a rights-based approach is a people-centred approach (Willis 2005: 206) thus representing another element of alternative development as already examined above. And with their emphasis that 'it is important to include non-economic, less measurable factors such as increased recognition and respect for human rights' (GFMD 2007a: 7) the GFMD participants stress that '[d]evelopment is much more than economic growth' (GFMD 2007a: 7). This is the same argument used to support human development, one of whose elements is human rights (see above).

Beside the developmental effect of human rights the assumption was made that the respect and protection of human rights will make migration a choice rather than a necessity. Thus protecting human rights would be a means of eliminating one of the root causes of migration mentioned above, namely the violation of human rights (see for example GFMD 2007b: 21) and a means of reaching the GFMD overall aim to '[c]reate the environment enabling international migration to occur by choice rather than out of necessity' (GFMD 2007b: 141).

The GFMD participants recommend the following measures for safeguarding the migrants' rights in order to create an enabling environment for migrants to contribute to development. Governments should ratify and effectively implement relevant international instruments on human and labour

rights (see for example, GFMD 2007b: 146; GFMD 2008b: 6) and legislate national laws and policies to promote and fulfil the rights of labour migrants (GFMD 2007a: 26). Furthermore migrants should be empowered (GFMD 2007b: 147) and their legal migration ensured (GFMD 2007b: 170).

As the headings of the round-tables and discussion sessions showed, the overall focus of the GFMD lies on the question of what policies should be implemented in order to improve the political and legal conditions and structures thereby establishing an environment which increases and optimizes the migrant's contribution to development. Protecting the rights of migrants is one strategy, others being migration management, fostering opportunities for legal migration, improving remittance transfer mechanisms, empowering migrants to be better equipped to act as agents for development and implementing policies which strengthen the diasporas' engagement in development-supportive activities.

1.3 Question on the phenomenon of development itself - What development?

This section examines to which kind of development the migrants are expected to contribute. That is, how is development defined and what is the prevailing concept of development?

At the core of the GFMD stands an alternative development approach which qualifies the migrant as the agency of development.

The examinations above have already shown that the GFMD debates on migration and development are dominated by an economic development thinking with elements of neoclassical theory, the modernization theory, NELM and neoliberal theory, equating development with income maximization, employment, productivity, productive investment and economic growth, all of which have to be supported by the remittance of social, human and financial capital. More precisely, the focus on labour migrants who are perceived to have decided to work abroad due to the pull factor of labour demand and higher wages and due to the push factors of unemployment and demographic pressures, while reducing the root causes of migration, shows parallels with neoclassical theories and push-and pull models. The emphasis of return or circular migration as beneficial to

development corresponds also with neoclassical theory seeing migration mirrored by the return migration of human capital such as highly skilled workers. Coming to the question of how migrants are expected to contribute to development, the analysis has shown that the qualification of migrants as business actors and entrepreneurs fits within the neoliberal idea of market-led development. The dominant idea of fostering development through migrants' financial remittances has some parallels with modernization development thinking treating capital transfer as a necessary support for the development process. The expectancy that migrants spend their earnings and financial remittances on productive investments again corresponds with the neoliberal development theory which encourages investment for development. The assumption that migration is embedded within a wider societal context, benefiting migrants' families, households and communities is the central assumption of NELM. Also the expectation that migrants' financial remittances raise incomes, savings, capital and the use of financial services corresponds with the NELM theory. GFMD participants perceived female migrants as senders of remittances to be a major contributor to economic development. Their aim is to empower women to access productive opportunities which is an inherent element of the above-named economic theories, as well as their access to capital and financial resources and services which shows parallels with the NELM theory.

These concepts were combined with human development and Sen's capability approach, including capacity building and human rights, which explains how migrants will be enabled to contribute better to economic development. Thus, the examinations above have shown that the spending of migrants' remittances on education and health are expected to foster human development at home. A special focus was put on migrants' human development, capacity building and human capital formation. These are perceived to enable migrants to exercise their agency, to facilitate their productive activities and to contribute better to economic development. Moreover, GFMD participants expect that migrants and diasporas contribute to development through the transfer of knowledge and skills and the sharing of ideas. The addressed transfer of knowledge and skills can be aligned with the concept of human capital and capacity building in the sense of human development and the capability approach. This transfer is expected to foster human capital formation and capacity building in the country of origin thus contributing to the human development at home. The expected sharing of ideas means the so-called social remittances. These are ideas, practices, identities and social capital that migrants earned abroad and remit home where

they affect the lives of those in the country of origin. Their influence on development thinking and objectives corresponds with a modernization way of development thinking, arguing and expecting that certain values and behaviours which lead to social transformation have to be transferred from developed countries to the developing countries.

Beyond that the GFMD highlighted the migrant's potential for reducing poverty (mainly addressed in the first GFMD) and achieving the MDGs (mainly addressed in the third GFMD).

Poverty reduction is one of the most dominant development goals. It has been prominent since US President Truman's famous speech in 1949 where he stressed the need for Northern states to make available development assistance for the world's poor in the South thus marking the beginning of post-World War II modern development thinking (Willis 2005: 38-39). Since then 'poverty has been a concern for development agencies though the extent to which it has received explicit attention has varied greatly across time and between different agencies' (Black/ White 2004: 10). Several times GFMD participants stressed the migrants' potential for contributing to poverty reduction (see for example GFMD 2007b: 62, 140). Poverty reduction was thereby mostly conjoined with economic growth (see for example GFMD 2007b: 122, 149). That poverty reduction constitutes an element of economic development becomes even more apparent when looking at the definition of poverty. Extreme poverty occurs when people are living on less than one US dollar a day whereas people living on less than two US dollars a day are defined as living in poverty. (Willis 2005: 13-14) Supporting this observation, Nederveen Pieterse argues that '[p]overty as an indicator follows from the development-as-growth paradigm: 'the poor' are the target of development because they lack economic resources' (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 88).

Poverty reduction also stands at the top of the MDGs. These are a widely accepted series of time-bound and measurable targets adopted at the Millennium Summit held in 2000 at the UN. The eight MDGs represent the basic human rights and are to be reached by 2015 through a global partnership of the international community and the private sector. As outlined in Chapter III section 2 the MDGs represent technocratic development thinking, due to the assumption that development is a quantifiable and measurable outcome of desirable targets - the same idea which shapes the economic development thinking, measuring GNP per capita as an indicator of development. (Hartwick/ Peet 2009: 94-97)

But going beyond poverty reduction and economic growth, the MDGs define some alternative

development goals. These are education, health, gender equality and environmental sustainability. According to Black and White the MDGs and their related targets can be divided into three fields namely economic well-being, social development and environmental sustainability. Today, the MDGs are highly significant for the international community. As Gore argues, 'the MDGs have provided the basis for a new international development consensus' (Gore 2010: 70) and thus 'it is possible to speak of the current MDG paradigm' (Gore 2010: 71). Hence, the MDGs entered the GFMD discussions on the migration-development nexus. GFMD participants stressed the potential of migrants to 'work for the achievement of the MDGs' (GFMD 2009b: 15). Although migration is not specifically mentioned in the MDGs participants see a close link between migration and the achievement of these goals. For instance, migrants potential to reduce poverty, enhance gender equality and improve health, is highlighted. (GFMD 2009b: 15). Within the GFMD debates it is not explicitly mentioned how migrants are expected to contribute to the achievement of these goals. Regarding the first goal of poverty reduction, the participants stressed that migrants contribute through their skills and remittances (GFMD 2007b: 94, 99, 157). As already mentioned above, migrants' remittances were spent on investments in health and education and on real assets such as in the building of clinics and schools. This can be regarded as the migrants' contribution to the attainment of the health and education goal. Migrant's social remittances are expected – among others – to influence gender roles. It can therefore be argued that they are perhaps a contribution to enhanced gender equality. However these contributions to the achievement of the MDGs are still vague and the GFMD participants stress that more research is needed on the general impact of migration on development (see for example GFMD 2009b: 34) and on the spending of remittances (see for example GFMD 2007b: 20).

2 The UNHCR-led Convention Plus discussion on Targeting Development Assistance – a comparative perspective

[D]evelopment aid has a great[...] potential in terms of assisting the empowerment of refugees and enhancement of productive capacities and self-reliance pending durable solutions; and allowing them to be instrumental in reducing poverty and contributing positively to the development process in the areas where they live (UNHCR 2003: 11-12).

2.1 Question on the phenomenon of migration itself - Which migration?

This chapter presents what the analysis of the TDA documents discovered on the question of who the migrants under review are. Where are they expected to migrate to and how? This provides an idea about which migration the TDA refers to.

The UNHCR-led discussion on TDA refers to forcibly displaced persons (see for example High Commissioner's Forum 2005a: 2), more precisely, refugees, IDPs and returnees¹¹ (see for example UNHCR 2004: 3) who are affected by forced displacement (see for example High Commissioner's Forum 2005a: 1). Another usual term for forced displacement is forced migration and forced migrants as outlined in Chapter III section 1.

Participants in the TDA discussion assume that this type of migration occurs mostly in the South, either within a developing country or between neighbouring developing countries. That is because forced migrants mostly remain within their regions of origin (see for example High Commissioner's Forum 2004: 1-2) In fact 89,38 per cent of the total population of concern to UNHCR, that includes refugees, asylum-seekers, returnees, IDPs, stateless persons and others or 30.762.200 people of concern of a total 34.415.600 are located in regions of the so-called South, where the majority of countries are developing ones. These developing regions are Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean and Oceania.

¹¹ 'Refugees who have returned to their country or community of origin' (UNHCR 2006: 19).

Table 2: People of concern to UNHCR by region of destination at end of 2008 (UNHCR 2009)

Region (UN Major area)	Refugees, incl. refugee-like Situations	Asylum-seekers	Returned refugees	IDPs protected/ assisted, incl. IDP-like situations	Returned IDPs	Stateless persons	Others of concern	Total
Africa	2.332.900	326.600	294.500	6.343.000	1.032.800	100.100	-	10.429.900
Asia	5.706.400	67.300	306.300	4.618.000	325.900	5.808.800	63.400	16.896.100
Europe	1.602.200	257.700	3.000	444.400	2.700	663.300	103.500	3.076.800
Latin America and the Caribbean	350.300	50.000	-	3.000.000	-	-	-	3.400.300
Northern America	453.200	123.400	-	-	-	-	-	576.600
Oceania	33.600	2.300	-	-	-	-	-	35.900
Various	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	10.478.600	827.300	603.800	14.405.400	1.361.400	6.572.200	166.900	34.415.600

Even when deducting the people of concern hosted in countries of these regions which are, in the common practice of the UN, classified as developed countries (these are Australia, Japan and New Zealand,¹²) the numbers hardly change. Still 30.730.374 people of concern of total 34.415.600 are located in the South, that is 89,29 per cent of the total people of concern of UNHCR.

Table 3: People of concern to UNHCR by selected country of destination at end of 2008 (UNHCR 2009)

Country	Refugees, incl. refugee-like Situations	Asylum-seekers	Returned refugees	IDPs protected/ assisted, incl. IDP-like situations	Returned IDPs	Stateless persons	Others of concern	Total
Australia	20.919	2.159	-	-	-	-	-	23.078
Japan	2.019	2.288	-	-	-	1.573	-	5.880
New Zealand	2.716	152	-	-	-	-	-	2.868

¹² <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm#developed> [Date accessed: April 2010]

2.2 Question on the migration-development nexus – How do forced migrants contribute to development?

This section examines how the participants of the UNHCR-led discussion on TDA, link forced migration and development, answering the question of how forced migrants are expected to contribute to development and who benefits from their development supportive activities.

An essential difference between the GFMD who focus on labour migration and the DTA who focus on forced migration in qualifying migrants as agents for development, is their assumption regarding the migrants' capability of contributing to development. Participants of the GFMD assume that migrants - at the time of their move – already have the capability of acting as an agent of development (whose contribution to development may be further increased through the migrant's human development and the implementation of policies which improve the conditions and structures which shape migrants' and diasporas' development-supportive activities). Within the TDA dialogue there is agreement that forced migrants indeed possess the potential to contribute to development (see for example High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 2; UNHCR Convention Plus Unit 2004: 5) but that this capacity is stifled due to the fact that forced migrants are often passive recipients of humanitarian aid while they are limited in their freedom of movement and their access to productive livelihoods (UNHCR 2003: 4). Livelihood is defined as

[a] combination of the resources used and the activities undertaken in order to live. Resources include individual skills (human capital), land (natural capital), savings (financial capital), equipment (physical capital) as well as formal support groups and informal networks (social capital) (UNHCR 2006: 14).

Thus participants in the TDA discussions stress that forced migrants have first to be enabled to use their potential in order to contribute to development.

The main argument is that targeted development assistance and the inclusion of forced migrants in development cooperation and related instruments such as development policies, programmes and practices, poverty reduction strategies as well as post-conflict transition plans (High Commissioner's Forum 2004: 3; High Commissioner's Forum 2005a: 3; High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 2-3) will meet the needs of forced migrants, reduce their poverty, ensure their human development and self-reliance. This will enhance their productive capacities and enable them to

make a positive contribution to the development of their host countries and communities, equipping them for one of the three durable solutions i.e. voluntary repatriation to their country of origin, local integration into the country of asylum or resettlement to a third country (see for example UNHCR Convention Plus Unit 2004: 2; UNHCR 2003: 11-12)

2.2.1 Who benefits?

It becomes clear that the beneficiaries of the development supportive activities of the forced migrants and the development assistance and cooperation they attract, are the forced migrants themselves as well as the communities and states within which they live (see for example High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 3). Returnees are expected to benefit their home country and community to which they return just as returning migrants within the GFMD are expected to do. Contrary to the return migration addressed in the GFMD which preferentially occurs temporarily in the context of circular migration (see above) returnees in the TDA debate are perceived to reintegrate permanently in the post-conflict situations of their home country, contributing to long-term reconstruction, peace consolidation and the prevention of renewed displacement (High Commissioner's Forum 2004: 3; UNHCR Convention Plus Unit 2004: 2). Refugees and IDPs instead are expected to benefit their host country and community (see for example High Commissioner's Forum 2004: 2). This is in sharp contrast to the GFMD expectancy that migrants contribute to their home country's development.

Two reasons for this can be identified. Firstly, refugees and IDPs, due to the fact that they were forced to leave their usual place of residence because of a fear of being persecuted by implication are not able to return to their home country or area, nor are they able to circulate between the host and home place. As a consequence forcibly displaced people lack networks and connection with their home (UNHCR 2003: 12) and are likely to concentrate their activities on the place where they are living.

Secondly, forced migrants are required to contribute to their host country's development because hosting them has an economic and social impact for the host countries which are in the majority of cases poor developing countries (UNHCR 2003: 9) as Table 1 above shows.

The majority of countries hosting large refugee populations are developing and poor

countries. During 1997-2001 developing countries hosted some 66 % of the global population of concern to UNHCR; the share of the 49 Least Developed Countries (LDCs) alone amounted to almost 30 % (UNHCR 2003: 9).

Thus, to avoid forced migrants becoming a burden on these countries they are expected to make a positive contribution to their host country and community.

2.2.2 How are forced migrants expected to contribute to development?

Coming back to the question of how forced migrants contribute to development, the procedure of enabling forced migrants to use their productive capacity as described above will now be examined more closely.

At the core of the GFMD debate on migration and development lies the fact that

[s]ome States took issue with qualifying forcibly displaced persons as agents of development since, in their experience, displaced persons represented a burden on the host State and often competed for already limited natural and other resources. At the same time, many States felt that more could be done to benefit from the initiative and capacities of forcibly displaced populations so as to not only mitigate the impact of the presence of large refugee populations but also to demonstrate to the local population the tangible benefits of hosting refugees. (High Commissioner's Forum 2005a: 4)

Thus, enabling forced migrants becomes the main aim for the participants of the TDA discussions, which represents an alternative development thinking, where 'the state is to act as an enabler, a facilitator of people's self-development' (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 83).

Development assistance and cooperation are regarded as adequate means to ensure forced migrants' development, enabling them to contribute to development. But forced migrants are usually excluded from benefiting from long-term development activities; instead they are the beneficiaries of humanitarian aid, providing short-term relief. Relief and development are different processes, each with its own values. What the TDA approach is concerned about is the gap between both which leaves forced migrants as passive recipients of humanitarian aid, stifles their productive capacity and withdraws their potential to make a positive contribution to development. (UNHCR Convention Plus Unit 2004: 2, 5) Therefore the TDA participants want to include forced migrants in development instruments and to target development cooperation and assistance so that forced migrants can benefit from them, with the effect that they will be enabled to use their productive

capacities (High Commissioner's Forum 2004: 3; High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 3; UNHCR Convention Plus Unit 2004: 6).

As outlined in Chapter III section 3 development assistance is a typical means of the modernization theory and mainstream development thinking, arguing in favour of the necessity to transfer money, technology and expertise to the developing countries in order to foster economic development (Willis 2005: 45). While the goals of development assistance have changed over time, mirroring the dominant development thinking at the time, the concept of bilateral and multilateral aid remained (Goldin/ Reinert 2006: 118). Thus, participants of the TDA discussions called to meet the UN target of spending 0.7 per cent of the GNP as Official Development Assistance (ODA) to developing countries (UNHCR Convention Plus Unit 2004: 7) as well as to target additional assistance to forced migrants. Participants emphasise the additionality of TDA in order to avoid tensions between forced migrants and the local population which may see their ODA as being lost to the hosted forced migrants (see for example UNHCR Convention Plus 2004: 6-7). But in contrast to modernization development activities allocating development assistance for industry and infrastructure (Willis 2005: 46) in the case of TDA development assistance is anticipated to finance forced migrants' basic needs, poverty reduction, human development and self-reliance. These coincide with what Goldin and Reinert call the 'modern goals of development assistance' (Goldin/ Reinert 2006: 124), that is 'increasing the control that poor people have over their lives – through education, health and greater participation, as well as through their income gains' (Goldin/ Reinert 2006: 124).

The inclusion of forced migrants in development initiatives and the targeting of development assistance are expected to meet the needs of forced migrants, reduce their poverty, ensure their human development and self-reliance, so goes the argument of the TDA participants. The objectives will be further explained.

Basic needs:

Forced migrants are assumed to have basic needs which have to be met before they are able to use their development capacity (see for example High Commissioner's Forum 2005a: 2). Among these basic needs are food, water, housing, health, education and work. This argument is in line with the so-called basic needs approach of the 1970s which argues that poverty and unsatisfied basic needs are causes of underdevelopment which in turn hinder economic growth. The basic needs approach

is often termed a bottom-up approach because development policies which were directly focused on the poorest people in society claim to meet their real needs. With its bottom-up demand it could be regarded as an alternative to previous top-down development approaches (Willis 2005: 93 seq.).

Poverty reduction:

'Poverty reduction is the overarching objective of development assistance' (UNHCR Convention Plus Unit 2004: 3) and regarded as the second condition for the realization of forced migrants' development potential. Since forced migrants are regarded among the most vulnerable and poor (UNHCR 2004: 3, 6) TDA participants argue that the recognition of their needs in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers must be ensured (UNHCR 2004: 9). It has to be highlighted that the TDA approach has a broad definition of poverty, regarding forced migrants as victims of income poverty as well as multidimensional poverty (UNHCR 2004: 3) contrary to the exclusively economic definition of poverty within the GFMD. Multidimensional poverty instead includes lack of opportunity, limited capabilities, low level of security and lack of empowerment (UNHCR 2004: 3). Thus poverty reduction addresses a broad and comprehensive spectrum of issues such as the legal status of forced migrants, human rights, property rights, access to the labour market, adequate health services, income support, quality education and housing (High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 11). There is some overlap between this multidimensional poverty concept and the basic needs approach on the one hand and the human development approach – at which the DTA is explicitly aimed (High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 2) - on the other.

Human development:

The human development of forced migrants is of high importance within the TDA discussions. Participants argue that '[i]nvesting in the human development of refugees and returnees in order to boost their productive capacity has the potential further to enhance the impact of additional investments towards development' (High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 3). Here it becomes clear that the human development of forced migrants is perceived as enhancing their productive capacity and in turn fosters development initiatives. Human development is defined within the TDA dialogue according to the UNDP as

a complex concept of development, based on the priority of human well-being, and aimed at ensuring and enlarging human choices which lead to equality of opportunities for all people in society and empowerment of people so that they participate – and

benefit from – the development process (High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 2).

Due to the key words of *human choices, opportunities, empowerment* and *human well-being*, this definition has clear parallels with Amartya Sen's capability approach. As already outlined above, this is an alternative development approach due to its objectives and values which differ from mainstream development thinking. Sen defines development as a process of enlarging people's choices and the expansion of their capabilities, enabling them to exercise their agency to gain human well-being, consisting of a set of conditions, for instance food, health and education (Sen 1999: xi-xii, 4-5). Thus, further overlapping can be discovered between the mentioned basic needs approach, the multidimensional poverty reduction concept and human development.

Self-reliance:

The promotion of forced migrants' self-reliance is another crucial element of the TDA dialogue. Participants assume that the targeting of development assistance and the inclusion of forced migrants' needs in development initiatives will 'assist the displaced in rebuilding their lives and enable them to resume supporting themselves and their families' (High Commissioner's Forum 2005b: 4). Thus the forced migrants' self-reliance is defined as

[t]he ability of an individual, household or community to depend (rely) on their own resources (physical, social and natural capital or assets), judgement and capabilities with minimal external assistance in meeting basic needs, and without resorting to activities that irreversibly deplete the household or community resource base (UNHCR 2006: 20).

The concept of self-reliance used here is a specific adaptation of the development concept of self-reliance which arose in reaction to the dependency theory as outlined in Chapter III section 3. The dependency theory argues that state autonomy and the emancipation of the developing countries from the developed ones is the only means of achieving development. Self-reliance here is instead focused on the people and not the state. Development should be based on people's own efforts and the locally available resources. Thus self-reliance can be regarded as a bottom-up initiative in the light of alternative development thinking (Rist 2008: 123-139). According to Nederveen Pieterse self-reliance is an element of endogenous development, that is development generated from within, accompanied by a *revalorization* and adaptation of local social and cultural capital (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 86). Nederveen Pieterse assume that self-reliance 'does not simply concern the means but the ends of development: the goals and values of development' (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 86).

This endogenous outlook is crucial for alternative development thinking and it is a central element of post-development approaches, stressing the need for more endogenous development concepts and local autonomy (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 86, 101, 104). However, within the TDA discussions, forced migrants' self-reliance is not only expected to improve their own living conditions, representing the goal of forced migrants' own development but in turn self-reliance is expected to enable forced migrants to contribute to the development of their host countries and communities (or their home countries and communities upon their return) which pursue goals other than self-reliance, for instance the MDGs (High Commissioner's Forum 2005b: 2; High Commissioner's Forum 2004: 1; UNHCR Convention Plus Unit 2004: 2). Thus, although self-reliance in the TDA context could be seen as an endogenous, alternative development concept, representing the goal of forced migrants own development from within, it nevertheless is also a means of furthering endogenous development aims.

In order to enhance their self-reliance and related self-sufficiency in terms of food production (High Commissioner's Forum 2005b: 5-6) participants argue that forced migrants have to be supported by services and assistance in sectors such as health, education, agricultural production and income generation (High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 13). Here the close link between self-reliance, human development, poverty reduction and basic needs becomes apparent.

In sum, self-reliance means economic and social empowerment of forced migrants (High Commissioner's Forum 2005b: 5; High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 14), that is the capacity to ensure their well-being by themselves and to gain a sustainable livelihood. As argued above, TDA participants expect that this allows the forced migrants to use their potential and capacities in order to contribute to the development of their host countries and communities as well as their home countries and communities upon return. But as Crisp pointed out,

[r]ecent research undertaken by UNHCR's Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit indicates that many of the world's refugees are unable to establish and maintain independent livelihoods because they cannot exercise the rights to which they are entitled under international human rights and international law (Crisp 2003).

This interrelation between forced migrants' rights and their ability to gain self-reliance and a sustainable livelihood is also recognized within the TDA dialogue which pursues a rights-based approach (High Commissioner's Forum 2005a: 2) – just as the GFMD does - calling for the

protection of forced migrants' basic rights (High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 11) in the light of human development and multidimensional poverty approach. The guarantee of forced migrants' basic human rights is one way in which the UNHCR fulfils its core mandate of protecting forced migrants¹³. Thus the TDA is not only rights-based but also protection-orientated (High Commissioner's Forum 2005a: 2). Just as in the GFMD but also in the TDA discussions forced migrants are primarily regarded as vulnerable people who have to be protected (see for example High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 6). Thus, in line with the UNHCR's core mandate, participants recall 'that the effective protection of refugees is the ultimate goal of any initiative under Convention Plus' (UNHCR's Forum 2004: 2).

Summing up, a central aim of the TDA approach is to enhance the productive capacity of forced migrants (High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 3) and to enable them to realise their potential (High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 2). This will be achieved through the meeting of their needs, the reduction of their poverty and the guarantee of their human development and self-reliance. This capacity building also constitutes an element – although a marginalized one - of GFMD efforts to support migrants' capability to act as agents of development. Now participants in the TDA discussions argue that once forced migrants' productive capacities have been enhanced and once they are enabled to use their potential, forced migrants will contribute to the development of their host countries and communities as well as their home countries and communities upon return, in the following ways:

Firstly, forced migrants are expected to contribute to development through their productive capacities and potentials such as skills and knowledge (see for example High Commissioner's Forum 2005b: 4). Here we again find the human capital idea which is a central aspect of the GFMD in linking migrants to development.

A second important aspect of the TDA approach is that forced migrants are expected to contribute to development through business activities and employment which meets the labour market demands (see for example High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 6) just like the migrants addressed in the GFMD.

Thirdly, TDA participants welcome forced migrants' active participation in development programmes, policies and practices (High Commissioner's Forum 2005a: 2-3) as well as in post-

¹³ <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646cc8.html> [Date accessed: April 2010]

conflict transition strategies (High Commissioner's Forum 2005a: 4) just as GFMD participants recognize migrants' and diasporas' engagement in development and post-conflicts activities.

However, the ideas of how forced migrants can contribute to the development of their host countries and communities, as well as their home countries and communities upon return, remain vague. The attention of the participants in the TDA discussions lies primarily on the question of how to enable forced migrants to be development-supportive thus focussing on their own development.

2.3 Question on the phenomenon of development itself - What development?

This section examines how development is defined within the UNHCR-led discussion on TDA and what the prevailing concept of development is.

The assumption that forced migrants self-development is necessary in order to enable them to contribute to the development process in the areas where they live is based on a bottom-up and people-entered alternative and post-development approach.

As outlined above, among the enabling factors are the forced migrants' basic needs, poverty reduction, human development and self-reliance. They are characterised by the basic needs approach, the multidimensional poverty reduction concept, human development, Sen's capability approach, as well as endogenous development concepts of alternative and post-development approaches. These are framed by a rights-based and protection-orientated approach.

Beside the forced migrants' potential for their own human growth and development, they are perceived to have the potential to make a positive contribution to the economy and society of their host and home countries and communities (UNHCR Convention Plus Unit 2004: 2). The development concepts envisaged here are the same as in the GFDM dialogue.

Firstly, forced migrants are perceived to have the potential to contribute to poverty reduction (see for example UNHCR 2004: 9). There is an 'understanding that refugees bring human and material assets and resources, can become productive members of a host society and can play a positive role in alleviating poverty' (High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 14). Thus poverty reduction is an overall aim, benefiting the forced migrants themselves as well as the host or home countries and communities. Although poverty reduction is a central aim in the GFMD the TDA explicitly stresses

not only the reduction of income poverty but also of multidimensional poverty (UNHCR 2004: 3).

Secondly the participants' belief that 'where given the opportunity, displaced and formerly displaced populations can make a difference in terms of meeting the MDGs' (High Commissioner's Forum 2005b: 4). As well as for the participants of the GFMD, for the participants of the TDA approach the achievement of the MDGs is of high relevance. Thus, one document of the Convention Plus strand of TDA is dedicated to the question of how forced migrants can contribute towards achieving the MDGs and furthermore how donors can achieve the MDGs through including forced migrants in their activities (High Commissioner's Forum 2005b).

In sum the economic mainstream development thinking which dominates the GFMD debate is missing in the TDA discussions. A clear analogy between both can be found in the dominance of the MDGs as an overall development goal as well as in the old and perennial concept of poverty reduction. Furthermore the concepts of human development, the capability approach and human rights, all three representing alternative development thinking which were adopted by the GFMD, clearly dominate the TDA discussions. Human development is the main development approach of the overall people-centred development thinking within the DTA initiative, supplemented by the capability approach, the basic needs approach and the self-reliance approach.

The results presented in this chapter indicate that there are clear differences between both dialogues in their focuses on linking migration and development. However, some commonalities were also examined. A more general summary of the main findings and a broader discussion of these are presented in the next chapter. But before drawing a final conclusion and making some decisions about whether the findings argue for or against the inclusion of the forced migration and development dialogue in the established dialogue on migration and development, the third section of this chapter will first make some selected reflections on the findings presented in the two sections above.

3 Reflection on the findings

This section will reflect critically on some of the findings presented in the two sections above. It will make one crucial point related to each of the three sub-questions, structuring section 1 and 2, while referring to conceptual and theoretical explanations made in Chapter III as well as expert knowledge.

3.1 Reflection on the dominant migration concept - Which migration?

As the analysis has shown, the GFMD focuses on international labour migrants from developing countries migrating temporarily or circularly, while the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA deal with internal and international forced migration within or between developing countries as permanent out-migration or permanent return. However, bearing in mind the explanations of the complex reality of migration made in Chapter III sections 1 and 2, such a focus on specific migration categories as made within both dialogues, has critically to be questioned.

Firstly, because '[p]eople's motivations for migration are rarely straightforward and they do not easily fit the bureaucratic and legal categories required by states' (IMI 2006: 3). Quite to the contrary, migrants' motivations are complex, mixed and shifting (IMI 2006: 8). This is what participants of the Civil Society Day of the first GFMD stated: 'Often the motivations for migration overlap. In today's interconnected world most migration flows are caused by a complex mix of social, political, economic and ethno-religious factors that are inextricably connected' (GFMD 2007a: 25).

Secondly, because dichotomies such as origin vs. destination, temporary vs. permanent have been recently discounted due to the phenomenon of transnational migration. Several researchers such as de Haas and Faist recognise a growing transnationalization of migrants' lives (de Haas 2008: 38, Faist 2008). However, the common assumption that transnationalization contributes to development stands in sharp contrast to the dichotomies which dominate the debate (de Haas 2008: 38). According to de Haas these

clear-cut dichotomies of 'origin' or 'destination' and categories such as 'permanent',

'temporary' and 'return' migration are increasingly difficult to sustain in a world in which the lives of migrants are increasingly characterised by circulation and simultaneous commitment to two or more societies (de Haas 2008: 38).

The same argument is made by Faist who emphasises that '[t]he spaces 'in between' states have multiplied' and '[t]herefore dichotomous distinctions such as 'origin' vs. 'destination' and 'emigration' vs. 'destination' no longer hold' (Faist 2008: 36). Against the background of these findings, the GFMD especially gets caught up in contradictions: on the one hand they serve the dichotomies of origin vs. destination and temporary vs. permanent, addressing for example migrants' integration into the country of destination and their temporarily or permanently return to their country of origin in order to contribute to its development. On the other hand however, participants favour migrants circular movement, stress the productive contribution of migrants' transnational activities for development and call upon governments to create an environment that enables migrants to live transnational lives (see for example GFMD 2007a: 15, 29; GFMD 2007b: 109).

The transnationalization argument however, does not fit the phenomenon of forced migration as addressed in the TDA discussion. This is because forced migrants, due to the fact that they were forced to leave and seek protection, are not able to return to their country of origin and therefore lack networks and connections with their home (UNHCR 2003: 12).

Thirdly, because classifications of developing countries and their location within the so-called South differ, depending on the development indicator used. For example, as outlined in Chapter III section 2 it can happen that one and the same country is classified as developed and developing at the same time, depending whether the HDI indicating the human development of a country or the GNP measuring the economic development through the use of the per capita income, were used. Thus, relating on different data based on the development indicators of first the income level, second the HDI and third the UN criteria-mix of low-income level of human capital and economic vulnerability, Bakewell comes to the conclusion that 'it is impossible to separate sharply South-South, South-North and North-North migration' (Bakewell 2009: 7). In this fashion he takes up the critique already mentioned in Chapter III section 2 namely the synonymous use of the developing country and South, as well as the developed country and North, pointing out that 'the South includes many countries in the physical North, such as the countries of Eastern Europe' (Bakewell 2009: 6).

It can be concluded that classical and simple categorization has to be called into question if the goal is to establish a comprehensive, coherent and constructive approach to the issue of migration and development, reflecting the complex and transnational reality of migration.

3.2 Reflections on the migration-development nexus – For whose benefit?

The participants in the GFMD and the TDA discussions expected migrants to contribute to development. This raises the question of who benefits from the migrants' development-supportive activities? Who will be developed?

As Raghuram emphasizes, the subject of migration and thus of the migration-development nexus is the migrant. It is the migrant's mobility that generates the whole field and thus, he argues, the migrant's own development, that is his or her individual betterment, should be the focal point of interest (Raghuram 2009: 105, 110). But far from it, Raghuram suggests in his article that the discussions on migration and development generally put a moral responsibility on the migrant to contribute to the development of those located in the home territories or the country of origin as such (Raghuram 2009: 109 et seq.). This tendency can also be examined in the GFMD discussions. Although the GFMD participants qualify the migrant as the agency of development they do not first and foremost strive for the migrant's self-development but expect that the migrants will contribute to the development of their countries of origin, their families, households and communities at home (see Chapter IV section 1.1). Hence, they call upon migrants' sense of responsibility to contribute to their societies (GFMD 2007b: 54). Their self-development is not a central issue within the discussions. Rather the migrants' own human development is merely seen as a factor which improves migrants' contribution to the general economic development (see for example GFMD 2008b: 7). Here the observation made by Raghuram in his article applies: Migrants are 'both required to move in order to strategise their human capital but also to act morally for the collective good of a distant place/community' (Raghuram 2009: 110). Raghuram uses financial remittances, the dominant development means of migrants, to exemplify what this means in the reality of migration and the development processes. He argues that remittances 'are also about money that is no longer available to individual migrants to secure their own well-being or indeed gain access to further education' (Raghuram 2009: 110). However aside from this common understanding some

participants of the first Civil Society Day in Brussels in 2007 stressed that '[w]ithin the migration and development nexus, the total human development of the migrant workers and members of their families should be at the core of the discourse' (GFMD 2997a: 7). But this position is unrepresented due to the fact that it was only once claimed during a Civil Society Day which has a rather marginal position in contrast to the governmental discussions.

Quite contrary to the GFMD the TDA puts the migrants' self-development in the areas where they live at the centre of the discussion, arguing that forced migrants have to be enabled to use their potential to contribute to development (High Commissioner's Forum 2005c: 2-3) which will be achieved through the meeting of their needs, the reduction of their poverty and the guarantee of their human development and self-reliance (see above).

This reflection on the question of whose development is focused on in the discussions on migration and development does not in any sense question the aim of developing home countries, or paying back debts made by communities, households and families which made the migration possible. Anyhow, it will draw attention to some dominant assumptions which often remain unquestioned. Since the subject of the migration-development nexus is the migrants, their own development should not be neglected within the discussions but addressed equally alongside their contribution to a wider development.

3.3 Reflections on the dominant development concept - What development?

Without neglecting the importance of the development objectives aimed for in the GFMD and TDA dialogues, it nevertheless raised the question of whether or not they correspond to the development needs, resources, conditions or capacities of the migrants and their families, households and communities which will be developed. The qualification of migrants as the agency of development, as made in the GFMD dialogue and to some extent in the TDA discussions, legitimises the question of who defines development, and whose reality counts (Chambers 2004) for the definition of development objectives.

Once again, without questioning the development objectives of economic development, poverty reduction, MDGs, human development, basic needs and self-reliance, which dominate the dialogues, it should be emphasised that some of these are typical top-down approaches which are

contradictory to the attempt to put the migrant at the centre of the migration-development nexus.

The MDG paradigm which dominates the current international development community and thus both the GFMD and the UNHCR-led Convention Plus discussion on TDA, is an example of a top-down approach. The MDGs consist of universal and widely accepted values and goals which are adopted in the development plans and policies for virtually all developing countries. This means that the goals of poverty reduction, education, health, gender equality and environmental sustainability as well as the targets to achieve them, are top-down implemented irrespective of local development needs, resources, conditions or capacities. This is what Black and White argue, namely that these goals 'have devised from the 'top down', rather than on the basis of criteria identified from the bottom up' (Black/ White 2004: 17) which leads to the question of whose goals they actually are (Black/ White 2004: 16). Therefore, as already outlined in Chapter III section 2, the MDGs stand in contradiction to each other with an approach such as Chambers' which puts the perceptions of those to be developed and their realities at the centre of defining development (Chambers 2004).

But in fact participatory empirical studies have shown that 'local people have again and again presented values and preferences which differ from those of outsiders' (Chambers 2004: 8). Based on his findings¹⁴, Chambers identifies responsible well-being, linked with capabilities and livelihoods, based on equity and sustainability as a development concept which meets the realities of the local population (Chambers 2004: iii).

A similar argument is made by Dannecker who, in her actor-oriented analysis of the development visions of temporary labour migrants from Bangladesh, examined the migrants' visions and those of their families and found they do not necessarily correspond with the development concepts of national and international actors. Dannecker recognises that the diverse development visions and interest of migrants are not sufficiently considered in the current debate on migration and development. She emphasized that not only do migrants' visions of development differ from those of dominant development actors but they also differ from each other and are changing due to the migration experience, where gender represents a relevant aspect of these development definitions. (Dannecker 2009) Thus Dannecker argues that '[t]o stick to structural, technocratic or uniform development concepts and approaches [...] does not reflect the new complexity of migration processes and actors' (Dannecker 2009: 129).

¹⁴ See Chambers 2004: 9-13 for the detailed findings.

In this regard other theoretical approaches such as alternative development and post-development pursue a bottom-up approach, putting the development concepts of the ones who are supposed to be developed at the centre. As Nederveen Pieterse pointed out, endogenous development is a central element of alternative development thinking. Endogenous means that 'the goals and values of development are to be generated from within' (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 86). The people, the community, the local population and grass-root organizations become central actors in their own development, based on existing capital (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 86). The idea that development should be based on people's own efforts and the locally available resources corresponds with the concept of forced migrants' self-reliance as focused on in the TDA discussions (see Chapter IV section 2.2).

This endogenous outlook is also a central element of post-development approaches. 'According to Escobar, [one of the main post-developmentalists,] the problem with 'Development' is that it is external, based on the model of the industrialized world and what is needed instead are 'more endogenous discourses' ' (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 101). Thus, post-development criticizes development thinking as 'telling other people what to do – in the name of modernization, nation building, progress, mobilization, sustainable development, human rights, poverty alleviation and even empowerment and participation' (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 105) This criticized *managerialism* of development actors (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 106) will be countervailed through the focus endogenous development, based on traditional and indigenous knowledge (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 101, 103, 107).

Alternative development as well as post-development approaches stress the need for more local and grassroots autonomy and self-reliance (Nederveen Pieterse 2008: 104). Such bottom-up approaches which meet local basic needs and are based on the development assumptions of the people concerned, were partly addressed in the TDA discussions of fostering forced migrants' basic needs and self-reliance and remain marginalized in the GFMD discussion although they would fit better with the qualification of migrants as agents for development as done in global-level dialogue on migration and development.

Chapter V

Summary, Discussion, Conclusion

This final chapter restates the research starting point and reviews the methods used to carry out the study. It then summarizes the main findings and contextualizes them within the academic debate on migration and development. The findings will then be discussed with regard to the concluding question of whether the findings argue for or against the separation of the debates on migration and development on the one hand and forced migrants and development on the other. This will lead to some implications on the current global-level dialogue on migration and development. The chapter concludes with some suggestions for follow-up studies on the issue of this thesis and finally rounds off with a recurrence to the preface of the thesis.

1 The research starting point

The linkage between migration and development is nothing new. Key issues such as remittances, circular migration and diaspora became present characteristics of any research, discussion or examination of the migration-development nexus. Recently the global perspective of the issue was recognized with the consequence that it rose high on the agenda of the international community, ending up in the establishment of the GFMD in 2007. As a voluntary, informal, non-binding and government-led process open to all members and observers of the UN as well as several actors from the private sector and civil society, the GFMD at its annual meetings discusses the migration-development nexus with the aim of fostering practical and action-oriented outcomes as well as policies which further enhance the positive impact of migration on development.

There is however an older debate at the UN-level regarding the relationship between refugees and other forced migrants on the one hand and development on the other. This debate was reviewed in 2002 as Targeting Development Assistance, one of the three generic strands of the Convention Plus initiative launched by the UNHCR to run from 2003 until 2005. TDA aims to facilitate local integration and repatriation by incorporating refugees and other forced migrants into national development plans and allocating additional development assistance thus enabling them to contribute to development in their host country or their country of origin upon return. The idea behind Convention Plus was to conclude in December 2005 with a multilateral special agreement for each strand through a process of discussions and negotiations between member states of the UNHCR, observers and NGOs. These agreements were intended to complement the 1951 Geneva

Convention and to be applied to future action by the UNHCR and its partners.

This phenomenon of two separate dialogues, one about migration and development, the other about forced migration and development has been examined in this thesis.

The aim was to reveal the conceptual and theoretical assumptions on migration and development which dominate these two dialogues, while discovering which migration is addressed, how migrants are expected to contribute to development, who benefits from their contribution and what the dominant development concepts, theories and strategies are. The study continued with examining the attempt of Piper, Raghuram and Dannecker to unsettle the dominant perspectives of the discussions on migration and development, to discuss them critically and to introduce marginalized issues, actors and concepts. A comparison of the two dialogues highlighted differences between and commonalities in the issues, concepts and theories dominating the debates. Based on these findings, this chapter will draw a conclusion about whether an inclusion of both debates would be possible and of added value in the sense of a comprehensive, coherent and improved dialogue on migration and development.

2 Review of the method

As explained in Chapter II the study presented here was based on a qualitative methodology which draws upon a mixed-methods design. The qualitative content analysis according to Mayring (2003) was combined with a comparable cases strategy as suggested by Lauth, Pickel and Pickel (2009). More precisely, in the first part of the analysis two case studies, namely the GFMD and the UNHCR-led discussion on TDA, were carried out. They relied on the qualitative content analysis of some selected documents which were representative of the numerous records of the discussions of the two cases. In the second part of the analysis the two cases were compared on the basis of the analysis results. As migration and development is a cross-disciplinary issue the study consulted theoretical and conceptual as well as expert knowledge from the cross-disciplinary field of development, migration and forced migration studies in order to analyse, interpret and to discuss them.

The outcome of the first step was an understanding of the particular case regarding research

question 1 on the issues, concepts and theories dominating the GFMD and the UNHCR-led Convention Plus discussion on TDA. The outcome of the second step was the acquisition of a broader knowledge of how the cases stand in relation to each other, finding the differences between and commonalities in the dominant issues, concepts and theories when linking migration to development in these dialogues, as asked for in research question 2.

The research perspective was a qualitative one as it shows several factors of convenience for the study. Most importantly, qualitative research concentrates on a small number of cases which are being analysed in an interpretative and comprehensive way. Thereby it draws attention to meanings, ideas, identities and general principles within the cases which remain closed to non-participants and are not necessarily consciously known by the participants. This perspective was appropriate to the aim of the first research question, namely to reveal the issues, concepts and theories which dominate the dialogues but which to date were not questioned or made accessible to the academic and public discourse through in-depth analysis. A second feature of qualitative analyses used for this study was the restraint from formulating hypotheses about the dominant issues, concepts and theories at the beginning of the study. This procedure avoids the study being oriented towards the previous knowledge of the researcher thus predetermining the results of the research. Instead, the required openness to the research object was preserved through the formulation of research questions, the guiding sub-questions as well as the categories and subcategories used to analyse the material under reflection of this previous knowledge as well as theoretical and conceptual assumptions on the issue of migration and development and their modification throughout the research process in correlation with the material to be analysed. This ensured that the case and the material to be analysed directed the research process and not the hypotheses. This procedure furthermore guaranteed a certain focus of data collection and analysis which enhanced the comparison of the analysed cases.

3 Summary of the findings and contextualization within the academic debate

Previous studies attempting to unsettle the dominant perspectives of the discussions on migration

and development have shown that 'some forms of migration and particular forms of development come to be visible, while others become 'invisibilised' ' (Raghuram 2009: 103). The present study arrives at the same finding. Although the assumptions, expectations, arguments and ideas about the migration-development nexus within the GFMD and the UNHCR-led discussion on TDA are as manifold as their participants, some issues, concepts and theories are more dominant than others. Some of the main conclusions can now be examined.

3.1 Summary of the findings

3.1.1 The Global Forum on Migration and Development

The migration and development dialogue of the GFMD is primarily concerned with migrants from developing countries crossing international borders in order to work and later returning in a free and flexible manner, temporarily or circularly to their home country. Circular migration especially is highlighted as being positive for the development of the migrants' countries of origin because, through their circular movement, migrants are expected to meet labour market demands in a flexible manner and mitigate the risk of brain drain.

Through their financial, social and human capital remittances as well as business activities and productive investments, and their participation in, conducting of and/or financial support for national development activities, migrants are expected to contribute to the development of their countries of origin, their families, households and communities at home while reducing unemployment pressures and thereby benefiting the countries of destination due to meeting labour shortages.

At the core of the GFMD debate on migration and development lies the qualification of migrants and diasporas as agents for development. Their development supportive activities will be strengthened and optimized through the implementation of policies improving the political and legal conditions and structures. Among the factors which are regarded as fostering the migrants' contribution to development are: Firstly the alleviation of the root causes of migration through development supported by migration which will ensure that migration occurs from choice and thereby influences the migrants' contribution to development positively. Secondly the migrants'

integration into the host country and the protection of their human rights is regarded as enhancing their human development and thereby their ability to accumulate social, human and financial capital in the host country which can then be remitted to their relatives in the home country promoting development. Thirdly the migrants' development supporting behaviour is regarded as being maintained or even consolidated through migrants' ties and networks with their home.

The GFMD participants recognize a feminization of migration and perceive female migrants also to be senders of remittances and to be major contributors to economic development. As a result of their employment in low skilled, unprotected and poorly regulated sectors however, the GFMD participants consider female migrants to be vulnerable to exploitation and abuse. Furthermore they are discriminated against as foreigners and as women, at work as well as within diaspora organizations; this is considered a diminishment of their development potential. The GFMD therefore sees a need for specific measures to protect and empower female migrants in order to allow them to exercise their full potential as agents of development.

Within the GFMD development is defined in economic terms such as income maximization, employment, productivity, investment and economic growth, all of them representing elements from neoclassical theory, the modernization theory, NELM and neoliberal theory. Aside from this economic development thinking, the GFMD debate is shaped by the current MDG paradigm and the old and perennial concept of poverty reduction.

Beyond that, some marginalized concepts of development thinking were revealed, primarily human development in combination with a capability approach, the human capital theory and a human rights-based approach. These are perceived as supporting migrants in exercising their agency, to facilitate their productive activities and to contribute better to the development goals of economic growth, poverty reduction and the achievement of the MDGs.

Summing up, it can be argued that the GFMD integrates a human development concept in its focus on economic development, characterized by elements of economic growth theories such as the neoclassical, the modernization, the NELM and the neoliberal theory as well as the old and perennial concept of poverty reduction and widened by the current MDG paradigm. The GFMD follows an alternative way of achieving these development objectives of economic growth, poverty reduction and MDGs as it qualifies migrants and diasporas as agents of development. Their economic-defined contribution to development will be fostered through the migrants' human

development and capacity building and be supported by enabling political and legal conditions which are provided by the state.

These findings confirm what previous studies have concluded: that 'the economic lens still predominates, treating migrants as economic actors, and to a far lesser extent as socio-political actors' (Piper 2009: 94) and that 'the debates seems to be stuck in modernistic development thinking, and a narrowly-defined economic paradigm prevails. Development in this framework is mainly related to remittances and knowledge, and their economic and rather presumed social impact in the less developed migrant countries or communities of origin' (Dannecker 2009: 120). Concerning the kind of migration addressed, the analysis has shown what others have already examined: 'Refugees [as well as other forced migrants] have been largely absent (and to some extent deliberately excluded) from this discourse' (Crisp 2008: 6).

3.1.2 The UNHCR-led TDA dialogue on forced migration and development

The UNHCR-led discussion on TDA quite to the contrary deals exclusively with forced migration including refugees, IDPs and returnees. These migrants are not expected to migrate circularly but to do so either temporarily or permanently in the South, either within a developing country or between neighbouring developing countries. In contrast to the labour migrants of the GFMD contributing to the development of their countries of origin, their families and communities at home, forced migrants are required to contribute to the host countries' and communities' development or the home countries' and communities' development upon return. The transnational aspect of the GFMD falls completely away within the discussions on TDA.

In contrast to the GFMD which assumes that migrants dispose of their capability to act as agents of development and whose contribution to development merely has to be increased through their human development and the implementation of policies which improve the existing conditions and structures, participants of the TDA discussions see forced migrants primarily as a burden to the host country and community and who for a start have to be enabled to use their development-supportive potential.

Thus the enabling of forced migrants becomes the main aim for the participants in the TDA discussions. Among the enabling factors are the forced migrants' basic needs, poverty reduction,

human development and self-reliance. They are characterised by the basic needs approach, the multidimensional poverty reduction concept, human development, Sen's capability approach as well as endogenous development concepts of alternative and post-development approaches, framed by a rights-based and protection-orientated approach. These enabling factors are to be found through the inclusion of forced migrants in development cooperation and post-conflict transition activities and through targeting development assistance.

As with the migrants addressed in the GFMD, forced migrants, once they are enabled to use their capacity, are expected to contribute to development through their human capital, business activities and employment, that is through income generation. Beyond that the focus of the TDA approach lies on the forced migrants' self-development.

To sum up it can be argued that the UNHCR-led dialogue on TDA is based on a combination of mainstream, alternative and currently dominant development thinking. In the first step the UNHCR-led dialogue on TDA follows a mainstream development way, qualifying the international development community as the agency of development, of achieving alternative bottom-up and people-centred development objectives such as basic needs, multidimensional poverty reduction, human development and self-reliance through mainstream methods of development assistance and cooperation. The second step is characterised by an alternative way, qualifying forced migrants as agents for development, of achieving the current dominant development objectives of poverty reduction and the MDGs through the alternative methods of self-help development.

3.2 Contextualising the debates within the academic debate on migration and development

3.2.1 The Global Forum on Migration and Development

Putting the GFMD in the context of the academic debate on migration and development it can be said that the dialogue is rooted in the old concepts of modernization and economic growth as the 1st phase of the academic debate and rests upon the pluralist models of the 3rd phase such as the NELM, the migration network, the transnational migration and the dominant neoliberal theory. Thus the view of the effects of migration on development is positive throughout. Additionally, while serving the old and perennial concept of poverty reduction and economic growth there is

nonetheless a perception of human development thinking, fostering the positive view on migrants' development potential. These indicate an orientation towards the 3rd phase of migration and development thinking, putting the migrants and their capacity at the centre. As a result the terminology changed from talking about the 'impact of migration on development' to the 'migrants' contribution to development'.

3.2.2 The UNHCR-led TDA dialogue on forced migration and development

The focus of the discussions on TDA lies on the forced migrants' self-development. This is why the TDA discussions on forced migration and development have some similarities with the 2nd phase of the academic debate on migration and development, dominated by dependency development thinking, arguing in favour of autonomous development. But in contrast to the 2nd phase the TDA discussion is dominated by a more positive view on the effects of forced migrants' activities on development. People-centred development thinking dominates the discussion marked by a human development and capability approach, a basic needs approach and the concept of self-reliance. Because this endogenous thinking corresponds with alternative and post-development concepts, it can be argued that the TDA discussion corresponds with the 3rd phase in migration and development thinking.

4 Discussion

This section will discuss the findings of the analysis with regard to the concluding question as to whether the findings argue for or against the separation of the dialogues on migration and development and forced migration and development.

4.1 Categorization in the dialogue on migration and development

The difficulty of categorizing migration due to the mixed, complex and shifting motivations of migrants and therefore the problem of a sharp distinction between forced and voluntary migration

was addressed in Chapters III and IV. The use of simple categories in the field of migration was questioned and criticised as not being adequate to capture the complex reality of migration.

This view is also shared by some participants of the GFMD who stressed the difficulty of distinguishing between migration categories due to the overlapping motivations for migration. They argue that '[b]ecause of the variety and interconnection of so many of the root causes of migration, it is often difficult to distinguish between voluntary and involuntary migration' (GFMD 2007a: 27).

A similar observation was made by the UNHCR which became engaged in the broader migration discourse arguing that '[r]efugees and other migrants increasingly move alongside each other' (Crisp 2008: 4) and that 'people are prompted [to] leave their own country by a combination of fears, uncertainties, hopes and aspirations which can be very difficult to unravel. (Crisp 2008: 5)

Nevertheless, as the analysis has shown, both dialogues, the GFMD and the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA, are focused on specific categories of migration. While the former primarily addresses labour migrants the latter is concerned with forced migrants. This focus on simple categories has to be called into question when the goal is to reflect adequately the complex reality of migration as recognized by both dialogues. The only solution therefore would be to integrate both debates in favour of creating a comprehensive, coherent and constructive debate on migration and development.

4.2 Focussing migrants as the subject of the migration-development nexus

4.2.1 Migrants as agents for development

Examination has shown that the qualification of migrants and diasporas as agents for development lies at the core of the GFMD debate. Looking at migrants as the agency of development processes or more precisely their capacity to effect change, was identified as a central element of alternative development thinking characterized as a people-centred and participatory bottom-up approach. Within the discussion on TDA instead, participants took issue with qualifying forced migrants as agents of development since they often represent a burden on the hosting developing countries. Nevertheless their potential to contribute to development was recognized and the enabling of forced migrants to make use of it became the central aim of the TDA discussions.

An integration of forced migrants in the GFMD could now further support their qualification as agents of development. Due to the shared discussion of migrants' and forced migrants' contributions to development, the forced migrants' potential to make a positive contribution to development would be further emphasized which could lead to their enhanced support.

This would firstly meet the assumption made by some participants of the GFMD, namely that '[r]efugees can become agents of development if they are provided with opportunities to make use of their skills and productive capabilities' (GFMD 2008b: 7). Secondly, it would be a success for UNHCR' efforts to underline the direct relevance of the migration-development nexus for forced migrants and to correct the fact that they have been largely absent from the dialogue on migration and development (Crisp 2008: 6).

4.2.2 Migrants' self-development

The people-centred alternative development approach of the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA which put the forced migrants' self-development at the centre of the debate, would be an enrichment of the GFMD. The discussions of the GFMD which are first of all focused on the development of the migrants' country of origin and their relatives at home, does not fit very well with their approach of qualifying migrants to be agents of development. As already outlined in Chapter IV section 3, a dialogue on migration and development which is based on the agency of the migrants and their capacity to contribute to development, cannot only expect them to contribute to the development of others but has also to foster the migrants' own development. This is what some of the GFMD participants stress, namely that '[w]ithin the migration and development nexus, the total human development of the migrant workers and members of their families should be at the core of the discourse' (GFMD 2007a: 7). In his article Raghuram argues in favour of the legitimate self-development of the migrant as follows: 'Migrants make the sacrifices necessary to ameliorate the effects of years of development disasters. And it is a sacrifice because what is unfortunately missing [...] is any sense of individual betterment and purposive development' (Raghuram 2009: 110).

4.2.3 Migrants' contribution to development

The participants of the GFMD call upon the migrants' responsibility to contribute to society (GFMD 2007b: 54) thereby trying to foster their 'moral sentiment that is a sense of commitment to a collective group' (Raghuram 2009: 109). This is a factor which is not only characteristic of the GFMD but also of the general migration and development discussion, as pointed out by Raghuram and as discussed in Chapter IV section 3.

However, a dialogue which is based upon the will of migrants to contribute to development, has to bear in mind two crucial points.

Firstly, and as some GFMD participants admit, 'it should be remembered that not all diaspora organizations and individuals are development-oriented by nature' (GFMD 2007b: 104). The migrants may not have a moral sentiment of commitment and therefore are not going to contribute to the development of their country of origin or their families and communities at home. Participants in the first Civil Society Day stated that '[t]he discourse on migration and development must start with recognizing that migrants are human beings, not [...] means to governments' ends' (GFMD 2007a: 22). A more people-centred approach which focuses on the migrants' self-development as pursued by the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA would therefore direct the GFMD to a more realistic approach, breaking away from the supposition that migrants are definitely willing and are going to contribute to the development of their countries of origin and relatives at home.

Secondly it should be remembered that migrants have their own and personal development priorities. As outlined by participants in the first Civil Society Day, '[m]igrants' approaches to development may differ from those of the formal development community and these differences should be respected' (GFMD2007a: 22). This finding is supported by empirical studies of Chambers and Dannecker as pointed out in Chapter IV section 3. They have shown that the visions of development of local people and migrants differ from those of dominant development actors just as they differ from each other. Therefore the pursuit of development approaches which are focused on development objectives which are defined by locals and migrants themselves, for instance alternative and post-development approaches, could have a positive effect on the migrant's motivation to make development contributions. As Dannecker argues,

Without understanding the different visions of the actors and without analysing the respective social and cultural contexts in which these visions are embedded and localised, intervention strategies regarding migration or development policies will fail, as have previous development approaches and concepts (Dannecker 2009: 129).

Assuming that migrants are more motivated to participate in development when they are supported in the pursuit of their own ideas and goals, the inclusion of these bottom-up development approaches of the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA would be of added value to the efforts of GFMD participants to encourage migrants to contribute to development.

4.3 The overall development goals of the dialogue on migration and development

A clear analogy between the GFMD and the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA can be found in their dominant development goals. Both debates highlight the relevance of the old and perennial concept of poverty reduction and the current MDG paradigm as overall development objectives. While participants of the GFMD highlight the migrants' potential for reducing poverty and achieving the MDGs, the TDA discussion participants stress that forced migrants can play a positive role in alleviating income and multidimensional poverty and that they can contribute towards achieving the MDGs.

As already outlined in Chapter IV section 1.3, poverty reduction has been one of the most dominant development goals since the beginning of post-World War II modern development thinking. That poverty reduction constitutes an element of economic development becomes apparent when looking at the definition of poverty which is based on the number of US dollars a person lives on per day. Poverty means a lack of financial resources. The reduction of this income poverty is a dominant development goal within the GFMD discussions where poverty reduction has mostly been conjoined with economic growth. Poverty reduction also stands at the top of the MDGs which represent technocratic development thinking due to the assumption that development is a quantifiable and measurable outcome of desirable targets. This fits well with poverty reduction and economic development thinking, measuring GNP per capita as an indicator of development. Beyond poverty reduction and its economic definition the MDGs include education, health, gender equality and environmental sustainability as alternative development goals.

The fact that poverty reduction and the MDGs are dominant development objectives of both debates, which means that both are aiming for the same goals, argues for the integration of the GFMD and the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA in favour of a comprehensive, coherent and inclusive debate on migration and development.

Furthermore because the TDA discussions explicitly stress not only the reduction of income poverty but also of multidimensional poverty, its inclusion in the GFMD would, against the background of the overall orientation of the dialogue on TDA on the forced migrants' own development, lead to an emphasis on the migrants' human development as marginally addressed in the GFMD. The integration of both dialogues, the one on migration and development and the other on forced migration and development, represents therefore an upgrading for the GFMD in the sense of a broad development concept which not only focuses on economic factors but equally on human development.

5 Implications of the findings on the global-level dialogue on migration and development

The analysis of the GFMD dialogue on migration and development and the UNHCR-led TDA discussion on forced migration and development revealed which migration and development issues, concepts and theories dominate the debate. These findings and their discussion allow a final conclusion to be drawn on the question of whether the separation of the dialogues is convenient or not.

The findings and discussions of this thesis argue for the broadening of the agenda of the GFMD in order to include the dialogue on forced migration and development as carried out by the UNHCR-led dialogue on TDA which ended in 2005. This would be desirable and of added value to both the dialogue on migration and development and dialogue on forced migration and development.

For the latter this inclusion would mean the continuity of the debate on the relationship between forced migration and development in the context of an established and institutionalized forum after the end of the UNHCR-led discussion on TDA in the framework on Convention Plus. Furthermore it would be a success for the UNHCR attempt to become engaged in the broader migration

discourse stressing that forced migrants have the potential to contribute to development. In concrete terms this inclusion could support the qualification of forced migrants as agents of development while enhancing their support and mitigating their reputation as burdens to the hosting country.

Also for the GFMD the inclusion of the issues, concepts and theories dominating the UNHCR-led debate of TDA would be an enrichment. As the discussion above has shown, through this inclusion the GFMD could meet the observation made by some participants, namely that forced migrants have the potential to become agents of development. Moreover, because bottom-up development approaches which are focused on development objectives defined by locals and migrants themselves are central to the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA, its inclusion could be of added value for the efforts of GFMD participants to encourage migrants to contribute to development while meeting the claim of some Civil Society Day participants to respect migrants' approaches to development which may differ from those of the development community. Also the people-centred alternative development approach as favoured by the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA which put the forced migrants' own development at the centre of the debate, would be of added value for the GFMD, some of whose participants admitted that the human development of the migrants should be at the core of the discourse. This would also lead to a more realistic approach, recognizing, that some migrants may not have a moral sentiment of commitment and therefore are not going to contribute to the development of their country of origin or their families and communities at home. And finally, the clear analogy between the GFMD and the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA concerning their dominant development goals of poverty reduction and the achievement of the MDG argues for the integration of the GFMD and the UNHCR-led discussions on TDA. Furthermore, because of the multidimensional poverty focus of the TDA and its overall orientation on the migrants' human development, an inclusion would further emphasize human development, an approach which is until now marginalized in the dominant economic development thinking of the GFMD.

The broadening of the agenda of the GFMD in order to include the dialogue on forced migration and development would be the right thing to do for an initiative which strives for a comprehensive, coherent and inclusive dialogue on migration and development, meeting the complex and mixed reality of migration movements as well as the development and development ideas of their subjects, the migrants themselves.

The findings confirm what academics, international organizations and organizations of the civil society claim. Alexander Betts for example, researcher at the Refugee Studies Centre at the Department of International Development of the University of Oxford, stresses that '[t]he GFMD should recognise that refugees are an important component of the wider 'migration and development' agenda' (Betts 2009: 3). The UNHCR points out that

there is a need for the international community to recognize the important linkages that exist between forced migration and the development process, and to ensure that such linkages are fully addressed in the effort to establish coherent and constructive approaches to the issue of migration and development' (UNHCR 2007: 1).

The Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS), an international Catholic organization argues that '[t]he experiences of JRS in Liberia demonstrate that, given the opportunity, forced migrants can contribute to development and post-conflict reconstruction in host and home communities' (JRS 2008b: 4). The JRS affirms that '[t]hey do have the potential to contribute to both local development and development in the country of origin' (JRS 2006: 2) and therefore '[t]he exclusion of forced migrants from the migration and development agenda withholds a potentially important resource for development from both countries of origin and reception' (JRS 2008a: 1).

Since the UNHCR-led dialogue on TDA in the framework of Convention Plus was a timely limited initiative which ended in 2005, the demand for including both debates can only be meant to put forced migrants and the discussions held within the dialogue on TDA on the agenda of the GFMD.

The first attempt of the UNHCR and others such as the Jesuit Refugee Service to get the forced migration and development approach on the agenda of the GFMD was tried at the first GFMD in Brussels in 2007 and has been repeated every year since then (see for example the following attempts: UNHCR 2007; Jesuit Refugee Service 2008a).

Whether forced migrants and issues discussed at the UNHCR-led dialogue on TDA will be on the agenda of this year's GFMD in Mexico is not yet clear since at the time of finishing this thesis the preparation process for the 2010's GFMD has not been finalized. It can be said on the basis of the published themes concept paper for the GFMD in Mexico that there would be some space for the inclusion of forced migration and development issues, concepts and theories.

Firstly, the central theme of the fourth GFMD which takes place under the heading 'Partnerships for migration and human development: shared prosperity – shared responsibility' is human

development. As the analysis has revealed, human development was already part of the dialogue but it was seen merely as a factor facilitating the migrants' contribution to the achievement of the dominant development goals of economic growth, poverty reduction and the MDGs. Now, at the GFMD in Mexico, the human development of the migrants themselves will be a central theme (GFMD 2010: 4). In fact, the GFMD taskforce states that

[t]he new perspective of human development transcends the usual debates about the economic effects and consequences of migration; and opens a space to discuss certain issues that still need to be addressed more thoroughly, such as health, education, training and gender; and the human rights and protection of all migrants (GFMD 2010: 2).

These are actually issues which lie at the centre of the discussions on TDA as well as the migrants' own human development. Here it could open a space for the inclusion of forced migration and development. This aspiration is affirmed when looking at the following statement made by the GFMD taskforce in the themes concept paper for this year's GFMD in Mexico:

To move forward, we must renew the debate on issues that have previously been neglected, because they were considered too complex for multilateral discussions. We need to revisit some concepts and break some old stereotype (GFMD 2010: 1).

However, issues relating to the TDA discussion on forced migration and development as examined in this thesis have so far not been addressed in the provisional agenda of the GFMD and its roundtables (see GFMD 2010).

6 Suggestions for follow-up studies on the global-level dialogue on migration and development

Of great interest would be follow-up studies which examine the question of whether this year's GFMD includes the issues, concepts and theories of forced migration and development in its agenda. In the longer perspective the question of whether there can be identified a process towards a comprehensive, coherent and inclusive dialogue on migration and development which adequately meets the complex reality of migration movements and the development process and ideas of the migrants themselves, will be interesting.

Although the GFMD is the most important and established global-level dialogue on migration and

development there are other debates at different levels which are just as worthwhile to be examined more closely. As Castles and Delgado stress in their book 'Migration and Development – Perspective from the South',

[t]he debate on migration and development has been dominated by the vision of the North [...]. The vision of the South has been largely absent in this debate. This has led to a distortion of the very idea of development, by leaving out crucial dimensions and potentials of migration for the societies most deeply involved (Castles/ Delgado 2008: 9).

The analysis of debates at a regional level and situated in the South would therefore maybe show different dominant migration and development issues, concepts and theories. The GFMD displayed interest in such regional consultative processes on migration in their annual forums. These processes are usually informal and non-binding dialogues between states, addressing either regional migration patterns or specific migration-related issues. They are numerous and some of them address the migration-development nexus. Among them are for example the Migration Dialogue for West Africa, the South American Conference on Migration and the Inter-Governmental Asia-Pacific Consultations on Refugees, Displaced Persons and Migrants. (GFMD 2007b: 130-131)

Furthermore the initiatives in the field of forced migration and development are interesting, especially as is an examination of the several efforts of academics, international organizations and the civil society to bring forced migrants onto the agenda of the migration-development nexus, for instance as in the European Parliament initiative. These so-called Reflection Dinners address not only the issue of migration and development but also of forced migration and development. They were convened jointly by UNHCR, JRS Europe, the International Catholic Migration Commission, Misereor and Caritas and were held at the European Parliament. (European Parliament 2007; European Parliament 2009)

7 Concluding remarks

Now, when the analysis was conducted, the findings presented and discussed, the implication on a future global-level dialogue on migration and development highlighted and possible follow-up studies suggested, I want to conclude with the recurrence of the quotation which stands at the beginning of the thesis, giving the thesis a greater relevance:

[O]ne cannot be responsible for others' well-being without being responsible for one's own, but neither can one be well on one's own without taking some responsibility for the well-being of others (Scott-Villiers 2004: 200).

This quotation exemplifies the situation in which the migrants and diasporas find themselves. They strive for a better life for themselves and for their relatives. Scott-Villiers makes clear that neither can exist without the other. This truth is what the dialogue on migration and development has to rely on in order to be successful. As Scott-Villiers believes, this concept of responsible well-being, an idea set up by Robert Chambers and influenced by Amartya Sen, 'could be powerful for development policy and decision-makers, because it advised people to look not just outwards, towards solutions for 'the poor', but also inwards towards personal development' (Scott-Villiers 2004: 200).

References

- BAKEWELL, Oliver (2009): South-South Migration and Human Development. Reflections on African Experiences. Human Development Research Paper, No. 7. New York: United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report Office. Available at http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2009/papers/HDRP_2009_07.pdf [Date accessed: April 2010].
- BETTS, Alexander (2009a): Development assistance and refugees. Towards a North-South grand bargain? Forced Migration Policy Briefing, No. 2. University of Oxford: Refugee Studies Centre. Available at http://repository.forcedmigration.org/show_metadata.jsp?pid=fmo:4961 [Date accessed: April 2010].
- BETTS, Alexander (2009b): Forced Migration and Global Politics. Malden/ Oxford/ West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- BETTS, Alexander (2009c): Protection by Persuasion. International Cooperation in the Refugee Regime. New York: Cornell University Press.
- BLACK, Richard/ White, Howard (Ed., 2004): Targeting Development. Critical perspectives on the Millennium Development Goals. London/ New York: Routledge.
- BLATTER, Joachim/ Janning, Frank/ Wagemann, Claudius (2007): Qualitative Politikanalyse. Eine Einführung in Forschungsansätze und Methoden. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- CASTLES, Stephen (2008): Development and Migration – Migration and Development. What comes first? Presentation at the Social Science Research Council Conference Migration and Development: Future Directions for Research and Policy 2008. Revised Paper. University of Oxford: International Migration Institute. Available at <http://www.imi.ox.ac.uk/pdfs/S%20Castles%20Mig%20and%20Dev%20for%20SSRC%20April%2008.pdf> [Date accessed: January 2010].
- CASTLES, Stephen/ Delgado Wise, Raúl (Ed., 2008): Migration and Development. Perspectives from the South. Geneva: International Organization for Migration. Available at: <http://www.heindehaas.com/Publications/Castles%20and%20Delgado%20Wise%20-%20ed>

%20-%202008.pdf [Date accessed: February 2010].

CHAMBERS, Robert (2004): Ideas for Development. Institute of Development Studies Working Paper, No. 238. Available at <http://www.ids.ac.uk/go/idspublication/ideas-for-development-reflecting-forwards> [Date accessed: April 2010].

CORNWALL, Andrea/ Harrison, Elizabeth/ Whitehead, Ann (2008): Gender Myths and Feminist Fables. The Struggle for Interpretive Power in Gender and Development. Malden/ Oxford/ Calten: Blackwell Publishing.

CRISP, Jeff (2003): UNHCR, refugee livelihoods and self-reliance. A brief history. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/search?page=search&docid=3f978a894&query=UNHCR,%20refugee%20livelihoods%20and%20self-reliance> [Date accessed: April 2010].

CRISP, Jeff (2008): Beyond the nexus. UNHCR's evolving perspective on refugee protection and international migration. New Issues in Refugee Research, Research Paper No. 155. Geneva: UNHCR. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/search?page=search&docid=4818749a2&query=crisp%20nexus> [Date accessed: April 2010].

DANNECKER, Petra (2009): Migrant Visions of Development. A Gendered Approach. In: Population, Space and Place, Volume 15, Issue 2, pp. 119–132.

de HAAS, Hein (2008): Migration and Development. A theoretical perspective. IMI Working Paper, No. 9. University of Oxford: International Migration Institute. Available at <http://www.imi.ox.ac.uk/pdfs/WP9%20Migration%20and%20development%20theory%20HdH.pdf> [Date accessed: January 2010].

de HAAS, Hein (2009): Mobility and Human Development. Human Development Research Paper, No. 1. New York: United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report Office. Available at http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2009/papers/HDRP_2009_01_rev.pdf [Date accessed: March 2010].

DEMUTH, Andreas (2000): Some Conceptual Thoughts on Migration. In: Agozino, Biko (Ed.): Theoretical and Methodological Issues in Migration Research. Interdisciplinary, Intergenerational and International Perspectives. Aldershot (et al.): Ashgate Publishing, pp. 21-58.

DÜVELL, Franck (2006): Europäische und internationale Migration. Einführung in historische,

soziologische und politische Analysen. Hamburg: LIT Verlag.

ENGBERG-PEDERSEN, Poul/ Nyberg-Sørensen, Ninna/ Van Hear, Nicholas (2002): The Migration-Development Nexus. Evidence and Policy Options. In: *International Migration*, Volume 40, Issue 5, pp. 49-71.

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT (2007): Migration and Development - Reflection Dinner. Summary Conclusions. Available at [http://www.jrseurope.org/Migration%20and %20Development/ Summary%20conclusions%20-%20final%20for%20web.pdf](http://www.jrseurope.org/Migration%20and%20Development/Summary%20conclusions%20-%20final%20for%20web.pdf) [Date accessed: April 2010].

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT (2009): Forced Migration and Development – Dinner and reflection. Summary Conclusions. Available at [http://jrseurope.org/publications/summary %20conclusions%20reflection%20dinner.pdf](http://jrseurope.org/publications/summary%20conclusions%20reflection%20dinner.pdf) [Date accessed: April 2010].

FAIST, Thomas (2008): Migrants as Transnational Development Agents. An Inquiry into the Newest Round of the Migration-Development Nexus. In: *Population, Space and Place*, Volume 14, Issue 1, pp. 21-42.

FLICK, Uwe (2009): *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Fourth edition. London/ Thousand Oaks/ New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

FLICK, Uwe/ Kardoff, Ernst von/ Steinke, Ines (2004): What is Qualitative Research? An Introduction to the field. In: Flick, Uwe/ Kardoff, Ernst/ Steinke, Ines: *A companion to Qualitative Research*, pp. 3-11.

GFMD Taskforce (2010): Theme Concept Paper. Fourth Meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development Mexico 2010. Partnerships for migration and human development: shared prosperity – shared responsibility. Available at http://www.gfmd.org/en/gfmd-documents-library/mexico-gfmd-2010/cat_view/989-mexico-gfmd-2010/1002-second-sg-and-fof-meetings-28-29-april-2010-geneva.html [Date accessed: April 2010].

GOLDIN, Ian/ Reinert, Nenneth (2006): *Globalization for Development. Trade, Finance, Aid, Migration, and Policy*. Washington et al.: The World Bank and Palgrave Macmillan.

GORE, Charles (2010): The MDG Paradigm, Productive Capacities and the Future of Poverty Reduction. *Institute of Development Studies Bulletin*, Volume 41, Issue 1, pp. 70-79.

HARTWICK, Elaine/ Peet, Richard (2009): *Theories of Development. Contentions, Arguments, Alternatives*. Second Edition. New York: Guilford Press.

IMI (2006): *Towards a New Agenda for International Migration Research*. University of Oxford: International Migration Institute. Available at <http://www.imi.ox.ac.uk/pdfs/a4-imi-research->

agenda.pdf/view?searchterm=imi%20research%20agenda [Date accessed: April 2010].

IOM (2004): Glossary on Migration. International Migration Law No. 1. Geneva: International Organization for Migration. Available at http://www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/site/myjahiasite/shared/shared/mainsite/published_docs/serial_publications/Glossary_eng.pdf [Date accessed: January 2010].

JESUIT REFUGEE SERVICE (2006): Forcibly displaced and development. Jesuit Refugee Service position for the High-Level Dialogue on Migration and Development. Available at <http://www.jrseurope.org/publications/JRS%20Position%20Paper%20Migration%20and%20Development%20final.pdf> [Date accessed: April 2010].

JESUIT REFUGEE SERVICE (2008a): Jesuit Refugee Service statement for the 2nd annual Global Forum on Migration and Development. Available at http://www.jrseurope.org/publications/JRS_statement_GFMD_2008_FINAL.pdf [Date accessed: April 2010].

JESUIT REFUGEE SERVICE (2008b): JRS Liberia. The practical contributions of the forcibly displaced to development. Available at http://www.jrseurope.org/publications/JRS_Liberia_Experiences_in_forced_migration_and_dev_FINAL.pdf [Date accessed: April 2010].

LAUTH, Hans-Joachim/ Pickel, Gert/ Pickel, Susanne (2009): Methoden der vergleichenden Politikwissenschaft: Eine Einführung. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

LEVITT, Peggy (2006): Social Remittances - Culture as a Development Tool. Unpublished Working Paper. Santo Domingo: United Nations International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women. Available at <http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=561717> [Date accessed: March 2010].

MASSEY, Douglas S. (et al., 1998): Worlds in Motion. Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

MATSAS, Romeo (2008): The Global Forum on Migration and Development. A New Path for Global Governance? Paper presented at the 2008 ACUNS Annual Meeting: The United Nations and Global Development Architecture, Bonn, Germany, 5–7 June 2008. Available at <http://www.irri-kiib.be/papers/08/sec-gov/080605-Matsas-Acuns.pdf> [Date accessed: January 2010].

- MAYRING, Philipp (2000): Qualitative Content Analysis. Forum Qualitative Social Research, Volume 1, Issue 2, Article 20. Available at <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1089/2386> [Date accessed: November 2009].
- MAYRING, Philipp (2003): Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Achte Auflage. Weinheim: Beltz UTB.
- MEINEFELD, Werner (2004): Hypotheses and Prior Knowledge in Qualitative Research. In: Flick, Uwe/ Kardoff, Ernst/ Steinke, Ines: A companion to Qualitative Research. London/Thousand Oaks/ New Delhi: SAGE, p. 153-158.
- NEDERVEEN PIETERSE, Jan (2008): Development Theory. Deconstructions/Reconstructions. Los Angeles et al.: SAGE.
- NOETZEL, Thomas/ Krumm, Thomas/ Westle, Bettina (2009): Dokumentenanalyse. In: Westle, Bettina (Hg.): Methoden der Politikwissenschaft. Baden-Baden: Nomos, S. 325-334.
- PARNREITER, Christof (2000): Theorien und Forschungsansätze zu Migration. In: Husa, Karl/ Parnreiter, Christof/ Stacher, Irene (Hg.): Internationale Migration. Die globale Herausforderung des 21. Jahrhunderts? Frankfurt a.M.: Brandes & Apsel, S. 25-52.
- PIPER, Nicola (2009): Guest Editorial. The Complex Interconnections of the Migration-Development Nexus. A Social Perspective. In: Population, Space and Place, Volume 15, Issue 2, pp. 93-101.
- RAGHURAM, Parvati (2009): Which Migration, What Development? Unsettling the Edifice of Migration and Development. In: Population, Space and Place, Volume 15, Issue 2, pp. 103-117.
- RIST, Gilbert (2008): The history of development. From Western Origins to Global Faith. 3rd Edition. London/ New York: Zed Books.
- SCOTT-VILLIERS, Patta (2004): Personal Change and Responsible Well-Being. In: Groves, Leslie Christine/ Hinton, Rachel Barbara (Ed.): Inclusive Aid. Changing Power and Relationships in International Development. London: Earthscan, pp. 199–209.
- SEN, Amartya (1999): Development as Freedom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SKELDON, Ronald (2008): International Migration as a Tool in Development Policy. A Passing Phase? In: Population and Development Review, Volume 34, Issue 1, pp. 1-18.
- SUMNER, Andy/ Tribe, Michael (2008): International Development Studies. Theories and Methods in Research and Practice. Los Angeles et al.: SAGE.

- UNHCR (2005): Convention Plus at a Glance (as of June 2005). Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/403b30684.html> [Date accessed: October 2009].
- UNHCR (2006): Refugees. Master Glossary of Terms Rev. 1. Geneva: UNHCR. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/42ce7d444.html> [Date accessed: January 2010].
- UNHCR (2007): Forced migration and development. Global Forum on Migration and Development (Brussels, 9 - 11 July 2007). Geneva: UNHCR. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/468504762.html> [Date accessed: April 2010].
- UNHCR (2009): Global Trends 2008. Refugees, Asylum-seekers, Returnees, Internally Displaced and Stateless Persons. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/4a375c426.html> [Date accessed: January 2010].
- WILLIS, Katie (2005): Theories and Practices of Development. London/ New York: Routledge.

Analysed Documents

- GFMD (2007a): Report of the Civil Society Day of the Global Forum on Migration and Development, Brussels, Belgium. Available at http://www.gfmd2008.org/component/option,com_repositorio/Itemid,38/func,startdown/id,4/ [Date accessed: January 2010].
- GFMD (2007b): Report of the first meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development, Brussels, Belgium. Available at http://www.gfmd.org/en/gfmd-documents-library/brussels-gfmd-2007/cat_view/934-brussels-gfmd-2007/983-report-of-the-proceedings.html [Date accessed: January 2010].
- GFMD (2008a): Civil Society Dialogue Manila, the Philippines. http://www.gfmd2008.org/component/option,com_repositorio/Itemid,38/func,fileinfo/id,5/ [accessed January 2010].
- GFMD (2008b): Second Meeting of the GFMD. Protecting and Empowering Migrants for Development. Report of the Proceedings, Manila, the Philippines. Available at http://www.gfmd.org/en/gfmd-documents-library/manila-gfmd-2008/cat_view/933-manila-gfmd-2008/984-report-of-the-proceedings.html [Date accessed: January 2010].
- GFMD (2009a): Report of the Civil Society Days of the Global Forum on Migration and

Development. Integrating Migration Policies into Development Strategies for the Benefit of all. Athens, Greece. Available at http://www.gfmdathens2009.org/fileadmin/material/docs/reports/REPORT_CSD_ATHENS2009_en.pdf [Date accessed: January 2010].

GFMD (2009b): Third meeting. Integrating Migration Policies into Development Strategies for the Benefit of All. Report of the proceedings. Athens, Greece. Available at http://www.gfmd.org/en/gfmd-documents-library/athens-gfmd-2009/cat_view/932-athens-gfmd-2009/987-report-of-the-proceedings.html [Date accessed: January 2010].

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S FORUM (2004): Convention Plus. Targeting Development Assistance to Achieve Durable Solutions for Refugees. FORUM/2004/3. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/403ccfa44.html> [Date accessed: October 2009].

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S FORUM (2005a): Convention Plus. Targeting of Development Assistance for Durable Solutions to Forced Displacement: Joint Statement by the Co-Chairs. FORUM/2005/8, 15/11/05. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/437d9f152.html> [Date accessed: October 2009].

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S FORUM (2005b): Putting Refugees on the Development Agenda. How Refugees and Returnees Can Contribute to Achieving the Millennium Development Goals. FORUM/2005/4. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/429431552.html> [Date accessed: October 2009].

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S FORUM (2005c): Statement of Good Practice on Targeting Development Assistance for Durable Solutions to Forced Displacement. FORUM/2005/3. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/426cf2c02.html> [Date accessed: October 2009].

UNHCR (2003): Framework for Durable Solutions for Refugees and Persons of Concern. Core Group on Durable Solutions. Geneva: UNHCR. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/search?page=search&docid=3f1408764&query=framework%20for%20durable%20solutions> [Date accessed: April 2010].

UNHCR (2004): Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers. A Displacement Perspective. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/41b079fe4.html> [Date accessed: October 2009].

UNHCR Convention Plus Unit (2004): Convention Plus issues paper on targeting of development assistance (draft, June 2004). Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/40e408924.html> [Date accessed: October 2009].

UNHCR'S FORUM (2004): Convention Plus Work on Targeting Development Assistance to Achieve Durable Solutions: Statement on Behalf of NGOs. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/407110ce3.html> [Date accessed: October 2009].

Appendices

Abstract

This thesis focuses on the global-level dialogue on migration and development. When talking about the migration-development nexus key issues such as remittances, circular migration and diaspora are high on the agenda. However, beside the 2007 established Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) there is another debate addressing the relationship between refugees as well as other forced migrants and development. This debate was reviewed in 2002 as Targeting Development Assistance (TDA), one strand of the Convention Plus initiative launched by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

The aim of the thesis is to examine this phenomenon of two separate dialogues through the revealing of the issues, concepts and theories on migration and development which dominate these dialogues. Assuming that both focus on specific forms of migration, development and related issues while leaving out others, the thesis raises the question of which migration is addressed, how migrants are expected to contribute to development, who benefits from their contribution and what the dominant development concepts, theories and strategies are.

The research carried out in order to answer these questions is a cross-disciplinary qualitative comparable cases study. As migration and development is a cross-disciplinary issue the study draws on theoretical and conceptual as well as expert knowledge from the cross-disciplinary field of development, migration and forced migration studies. The first step of the research is a separate analysis of the two case studies, based on the qualitative content analysis of some selected documents published in the context of the discussions of the two cases. In the second step a comparison of the two dialogues is carried out in form of a comparable cases strategy. The comparison draws on the findings of the single case studies of the first step and highlights differences and commonalities in the issues, concepts and theories dominating the debates.

The research has shown that the GFMD is dominated by economic development thinking and focuses on circularly and temporarily international labour migration. At the core of the GFMD debate lays the qualification of migrants and diasporas as agents for development. They are primarily expected to contribute to development through their transnational activities of financial remittances, productive investments and entrepreneurship. Their activities are intended to be

directed towards the migrants' countries of origin and their families, households and communities at home. Human development and alternative approaches are marginalized. Human development for example is regarded as supporting migrants in exercising their agency, to facilitate their productive activities and to contribute better to the development goals of economic growth, poverty reduction and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. Forced migrants are largely excluded from the discussions.

The debate on TDA instead exclusively addresses forced migrants; these are refugees, Internally Displaced Persons and returnees, most of them migrating in the South, either within a developing country or between neighbouring countries. Participants put the forced migrants' own development, characterized by basic needs, multidimensional poverty reduction, human development and self-reliance at the centre of their discussions. The TDA debate is dominated by endogenous bottom-up alternative development thinking orientated towards the needs and visions of the migrants themselves, and drawing on existing resources. Once the forced migrants are enabled through their own development to contribute to development in the areas where they live, the overall dominant development goals are the same as in GFMD: poverty reduction and the Millennium Development Goals.

Based on these findings the thesis concludes that a broadening of the agenda of the GFMD in order to include the issues, concepts and theories dominating the dialogue on forced migration and development as carried out by the UNHCR-led dialogue on TDA which ended in 2005, would be of added value in the sense of a comprehensive, coherent and improved dialogue on migration and development. In detail an inclusion would: Firstly, break up the focus on specific categories of migration which is not adequate due to the complex reality of migration movement characterized by mixed motives, which make it difficult to distinguish clearly between labour migration and forced migration. Secondly, give consideration to the acknowledgement that forced migrants have the potential to contribute to development. And thirdly, fulfil the attempt of qualifying migrants as agents of development, because a dialogue on migration and development which is based on the agency of the migrants and their capacity to contribute to development, cannot solely expect them to contribute to the development of others but has also to foster the migrants' own development and their development visions. Therefore the inclusion of the UNHCR-led TDA discussions on forced migration and development with its overall orientation towards the migrants' own human development and their self-reliance in terms of bottom-up defined alternative development would strengthen the recognition of these approaches – human and alternative development - which are until now marginalized in the dominant economic development thinking of the GFMD.

Zusammenfassung

Die vorliegende Arbeit befasst sich mit dem globalen Dialog über Migration und Entwicklung. Wenn man über den Nexus Migration und Entwicklung spricht stehen Schlüsselbegriffe wie Rimessen, zirkuläre Migration und Diaspora ganz oben auf der Agenda. So auch beim 2007 gegründeten Globalen Forum über Migration und Entwicklung (GFMD). Doch daneben gibt es eine andere Debatte, die sich mit dem Zusammenhang zwischen Flüchtlingen sowie weiteren ZwangsmigrantInnen und Entwicklung befasst. Diese Debatte wurde im Jahr 2002 als Targeting Development Assistance (TDA) in der Konvention Plus Initiative des UNO-Hochkommissariats für Flüchtlinge (UNHCR) wieder aufgenommen.

Das Ziel dieser Arbeit ist es, das Phänomen zweier getrennter Dialoge genauer zu untersuchen. Dazu werden die Themen, Konzepte und Theorien über Migration und Entwicklung, die diese Dialoge dominieren, offengelegt. Unter der Annahme, dass sich die Dialoge auf spezifische Formen der Migration, Entwicklung und verwandte Themen konzentrieren, während andere ausgeklammert werden, wirft die vorliegende Arbeit die folgenden Fragen auf: Welche Migration wird angesprochen? Wie sollen MigrantInnen zur Entwicklung beitragen? Wem kommt ihr Entwicklungsbeitrag zugute? Welches sind die dominanten Entwicklungskonzepte, -theorien und -strategien?

Die durchgeführte Untersuchung zur Beantwortung dieser Fragen ist eine fächerübergreifende qualitative Studie von vergleichbaren Fällen. Da Migration und Entwicklung ein interdisziplinäres Thema ist, greift die Studie auf Theorien, Konzepte und Expertenwissen aus den Bereichen Entwicklung, Migration und erzwungener Migration zurück. Der erste Schritt der Untersuchung besteht aus einer separaten Analyse der beiden Fallstudien, basierend auf der qualitativen Inhaltsanalyse einiger ausgewählter Dokumente die im Rahmen der Dialoge veröffentlicht wurden. Im zweiten Schritt erfolgt ein Vergleich der beiden Fallstudien mit Rückgriff auf eine vergleichende Methode. Der Vergleich basiert auf den Ergebnissen der Analyse der einzelnen Fallstudien und führt zur Aufdeckung von Unterschieden und Gemeinsamkeiten bezüglich der jeweils dominierenden Themen, Konzepte und Theorien.

Die Untersuchung hat gezeigt, dass der Dialog des GFMD von einem wirtschaftlich geprägten Entwicklungsdenken dominiert ist und sich auf zirkuläre und temporäre internationale Arbeitsmigration konzentriert. Im Zentrum der Debatte liegt die Qualifizierung von MigrantInnen und Diaspora als EntwicklungsagentInnen. Von ihnen wird vor allem erwartet, dass sie durch ihre

transnationalen Aktivitäten in Form von Rimesen, produktiven Investitionen und unternehmerischen Tätigkeiten zur Entwicklung beitragen. Ihre Aktivitäten sollen auf ihre Herkunftsländer sowie ihre Familien, Haushalte und Gemeinden zuhause ausgerichtet sein. Menschliche Entwicklung und alternative Ansätze sind der dominierenden ökonomischen Perspektive untergeordnet. Menschliche Entwicklung wird beispielsweise als unterstützende Maßnahme für MigrantInnen in ihrer Funktion als EntwicklungsagentInnen, zur Erleichterung ihrer produktiven Tätigkeiten und zur verbesserten Beitragsleistung zu den Entwicklungszielen Wirtschaftswachstum, Armutsbekämpfung und die Erreichung der Millenniumsentwicklungsziele angesehen. ZwangsmigrantInnen bleiben in den Diskussionen weitgehend unberücksichtigt.

Der Dialog über TDA befasst sich im Gegensatz dazu ausschließlich mit ZwangsmigrantInnen, wie Flüchtlinge, intern Vertriebene und RückkehrerInnen. Die meisten von ihnen migrieren innerhalb des Südens, entweder innerhalb eines Entwicklungslandes oder zwischen benachbarten Ländern. Die TeilnehmerInnen des Dialogs stellen die eigene Entwicklung der ZwangsmigrantInnen, charakterisiert durch die Konzepte Grundbedürfnisse, multidimensionale Armutsbekämpfung, menschliche Entwicklung und Selbständigkeit, in den Mittelpunkt ihrer Diskussionen. Innerhalb der Debatte um TDA dominiert ein alternatives, endogenes Bottom-up Entwicklungsdenken. Dieses orientiert sich an den Bedürfnissen und Vorstellungen der MigrantInnen. Sobald die ZwangsmigrantInnen aufgrund ihrer eigenen Entwicklung befähigt sind zur Entwicklung an ihrem momentanen Aufenthaltsort beizutragen, dominieren dieselben allgemeinen Entwicklungsziele wie in den Debatten des GFMD: Armutsbekämpfung und die Millenniumsentwicklungsziele.

Basierend auf diesen Ergebnissen kommt die vorliegende Arbeit zu folgendem Schluss: Eine Erweiterung der Agenda des GFMD um die dominierenden Themen, Konzepte und Theorien des Dialogs über erzwungene Migration und Entwicklung wie er in Form der TDA Debatte des UNHCR bis zum Jahr 2005 geführt wurde, stellt eine Bereicherung im Sinne eines umfassenden, kohärenten und verbesserten Dialogs über Migration und Entwicklung dar. Im Detail bedeutet das folgendes: Erstens wird die Fokussierung auf bestimmte Kategorien von Migration aufgehoben. Diese hat sich aufgrund der komplexen Realität von Migrationsbewegungen, welche durch gemischte Motive der MigrantInnen, die eine klare Trennung zwischen Arbeitsmigration und erzwungener Migration erschweren, gekennzeichnet ist, als nicht angemessen erwiesen. Zweitens erlangt die Feststellung, dass ZwangsmigrantInnen das Potenzial haben zur Entwicklung beizutragen, eine angemessene Berücksichtigung. Und drittens wird dem verfolgten Ansatz, MigrantInnen als EntwicklungsakteurInnen zu qualifizieren, entsprochen. Ein Dialog über Migration und Entwicklung, der auf MigrantInnen und ihrer Fähigkeit beruht, zur Entwicklung

beizutragen, kann nicht nur erwarten, dass sie die Entwicklung von anderen vorantreiben, sondern muss auch die eigene Entwicklung der MigrantInnen und ihre Vorstellungen von Entwicklung unterstützen. Daher würde eine Einbeziehung des vom UNHCR geführten TDA Dialogs über erzwungene Migration und Entwicklung mit seiner allgemeinen Fokussierung auf die menschliche Entwicklung der MigrantInnen und eines Bottom-up definierten alternativen Entwicklungsdenkens den Ansätzen der menschlichen und alternativen Entwicklung, welche bisher im GFMD dem wirtschaftlichen Entwicklungsdenken untergeordnet sind, zu einer gleichberechtigten Berücksichtigung verhelfen.

Curriculum Vitae

Personal information

Name: Saskia Koppenberg
Address: Glumstraße 68, 26203 Wardenburg (Germany)
E-mail: S.Koppenberg@gmx.de
Nationality: German
Date of Birth: 4th July 1985
Gender: Female

Education

2005-2010: International Development Studies University of Vienna (Austria)
Subjects of specialization:
European and International Politics
Law of International Relations

1998-2005: High school Graf-Anton-Günther-Schule
Oldenburg (Germany)

Work experience

Dec. 2009 - Aug. 2010: Volunteering Service Civil International,
Vienna (Austria)

July – Aug. 2009: International Volunteer Workcamp Service Civil International,
Fraipont (Belgium)

March 2009: Delegate Harvard World Model United Nations Conference, Den Haag (Netherlands)

Oct. 2008 - June 2010:	Volunteering	Counselling for Deserters and Refugees, Vienna (Austria)
Sept. - Oct. 2008:	Internship	Counselling for Deserters and Refugees, Vienna (Austria)
July 2008:	Internship	IBIS - Inter Cultural Workplace, Oldenburg (Germany)
July – Sept. 2007:	Internship	CEAR - Spanish Commission for Refugee Aid, Seville (Spain)

Languages

Mother tongue:	German	
1. Foreign language:	English	(fluent, C1-C2)
2. Foreign language:	French	(good, B1-B2)
3. Foreign language:	Italian	(very good, B2)
4. Foreign language:	Spanish/Castilian	(basic, A2-B1)

Lebenslauf

Angaben zur Person

Name: Saskia Koppenberg
Adresse: Glumstraße 68, 26203 Wardenburg (Deutschland)
E-Mail: S.Koppenberg@gmx.de
Staatsangehörigkeit: Deutsch
Geburtsdatum: 4. Juli 1985
Geschlecht: Weiblich

Schul- und Berufsbildung

2005-2010: Internationale Entwicklung Universität Wien (Österreich)
Spezialisierungsfächer:
Europäische und Internationale Politik,
Recht der Internationalen Beziehungen

1998-2005: Gymnasium Graf-Anton-Günther-Schule
Oldenburg (Deutschland)

Berufserfahrung

Dez. 2009 Ehrenamtliche Arbeit Service Civil International,
- Aug.2010: Wien (Österreich)

Juli – Aug. 2009: Internationales Freiwilligen- Service Civil International,
Workcamp Fraipont (Belgien)

März 2009: Delegierte Harvard World Model United
Nations Konferenz, Den Haag
(Niederlande)

Okt. 2008 - Juni 2010:	Ehrenamtliche Arbeit	Deserteurs- und Flüchtlingsberatung, Wien (Österreich)
Sept.-Okt. 2008:	Praktikum	Deserteurs- und Flüchtlingsberatung, Wien (Österreich)
Juli 2008:	Praktikum	IBIS - Interkulturelle Arbeitsstelle, Oldenburg (Deutschland)
Juli – Sept. 2007:	Praktikum	CEAR - Spanische Kommission für Flüchtlingshilfe, Sevilla (Spanien)

Sprachen

Muttersprache:	Deutsch	
1. Fremdsprache:	Englisch	(fließend, C1-C2)
2. Fremdsprache:	Französisch	(gut, B1-B2)
3. Fremdsprache:	Italienisch	(sehr gut, B2)
4. Fremdsprache:	Spanisch / Kastilisch	(elementar A2-B1)