

This article was downloaded by: [85.101.203.135]

On: 24 March 2015, At: 02:53

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Migration and Development

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rmad20>

EU migration legacies - perspectives from sending countries

Bastian A. Vollmer^a, Deniz Şenol Sert^b & Ahmet İçduygu^c

^a Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, University of Oxford, 58 Banbury Road, Oxford OX2 6QS, UK

^b Department of International Relations, School of Social Sciences, Özyeğin University, 34794 Cekmekoy, Istanbul, Turkey

^c College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Migration Research Program (MiReKoc), Koc University, Rumeli Feneri Yolu, 34450 Sariyer, Istanbul, Turkey

Published online: 19 Mar 2015.



CrossMark

[Click for updates](#)

To cite this article: Bastian A. Vollmer, Deniz Şenol Sert & Ahmet İçduygu (2015): EU migration legacies - perspectives from sending countries, Migration and Development, DOI: [10.1080/21632324.2015.1022085](https://doi.org/10.1080/21632324.2015.1022085)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21632324.2015.1022085>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms &

Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

EU migration legacies – perspectives from sending countries

Bastian A. Vollmer^{a*}, Deniz Şenol Sert^b and Ahmet İçduygu^c

^aCentre on Migration, Policy and Society, University of Oxford, 58 Banbury Road, Oxford OX2 6QS, UK; ^bDepartment of International Relations, School of Social Sciences, Özyeğin University, 34794 Cekmekoy, Istanbul, Turkey; ^cCollege of Social Sciences and Humanities, Migration Research Program (MiReKoc), Koc University, Rumeli Feneri Yolu, 34450 Sariyer, Istanbul, Turkey

(Received 1 February 2015; final version received 20 February 2015)

Introduction: Eurocentrism and the field of migration research

The study of migration has been established as a discipline in its own right, and yet, is arguably still in the process of ‘becoming’ (Garelli & Tazzioli, 2013). In regions where migration became a matter of politics and political management, one can observe a particularly stark development of research agendas. Migration became one of the central challenges of the twenty-first century. For instance, for Europe and the EU, migration has ever more increased in its significance as being one of the major determinants that steer the future and welfare of European populations and societies (e.g. European Commission, 2014). From a European perspective, immigration flows and its implications were meticulously examined and strategies of ‘how to manage this phenomenon’ were developed over the years. Numerous studies contributed to the field of regulating migration and understanding the motives of people leaving their countries of ‘origin’. Castles and Miller’s *Age of Migration* (1993) is currently published as 5th edition (now with de Haas), one of the seminal contribution, providing a comprehensive overview of international migration history, flows and consequences including future challenges of human migration such as climate change. Cornelius, Martin, and Hollifield (1994) – for instance – addressed migration from a different angle: How the Western world reacts and deals with the phenomenon of migration. This volume has been updated 10 years later in 2004 (now with Tsuda). Authors try to elaborate the implications of migration for industrialized democracies including France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Spain and the United States (for the second edition, Australia, Canada, the Netherlands and South Korea were added). How public policy is challenged and how this new driving factor for democratic elections plays out in these industrialized societies are the central themes of these compendia. Authors discuss selection and controlling measures and how and why they often fail. From other angles – and this could be continued ad infinitum – such as history, Hoerder (2002) provided an in-depth insight into the migratory world, while for example, Bartram (2013) intends to speak to economists and psychologists alike.

Nevertheless, taking stock of the research agenda of migration, Eurocentric perspectives dominate the field. Within this context, it is the European understanding of the nation state that becomes the major focus of research, which represents the social, political and economic imagination on the migration phenomenon, especially after the

*Corresponding author. Email: bastian.vollmer@compas.ox.ac.uk

Second World War. As rightfully underlined by Chakrabarty (2008), the ideas and discourses, or the discursive formation of labels, concepts, and categories of migration, nation-state, and globalization, are universalized by the West. This imaginary figure of Europe is built into the social sciences, carrying with it some uniquely European expectations about space, secular time and sovereignty. All these are provincialized by the Rest – what is called ‘the provincializing Europe’ (Chakrabarty, 2008). Specifically looking at the context of mobility of individuals, the migration phenomenon has been conceived as part of the power and the capital that flows from the East to the West, from the South to the North, i.e. from ‘the Rest’ to ‘the West’, mostly reflecting the latter’s experiences (Hall, 1992; McKeown, 2004). The imagery of ‘the age of migration’ has generalized the conceptualization of the Rest as the nomadic poor, whose mobility has effects on the modern West’s economic, social, cultural and political structures. This understanding largely ignores the effects of the same mobility on the Rest, i.e. the migrant sending countries of the world. This observation is not directly related to the above contributions to the field, but it is rather a general trend that research agendas lack non-Eurocentric perspectives, e.g. insights of motives and determinants of migration from a sending country perspective. Equally, from a sending country perspective, the question of motives and reasons not to migrate and staying in the country of origin arises, which has been largely missing on research agendas across the field of studying migration. Only limited and very scattered information is available from this side of the coin and the cluster of articles in this issue intends to make a contribution that sheds light on issues and cultures of migration from such a sending country perspective.

Thus, we argue what is needed in the migration literature is to rethink the concepts in order to move beyond the Western Eurocentric perspectives. It is indeed questionable how such a dominating perspective found a firm grounding of justification and a widespread acceptance when Europe itself and its anthropology was and is still – and rightly so – a contested constellation (Balibar, 2002, 2003; De Genova, 2014; Dzenovska, 2013). Thus, the cluster of articles in this issue consist a strategic beginning to de-territorialize the Westphalian nation-state system in order to bring a non-European perspective to the mode of study. More significantly, the articles here aim to move beyond the Westphalian nation-state system’s conception on the nation state as the natural order of things and the container for understanding ‘the social and political form of the modern world’, which is known as methodological nationalism (Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002, p. 302).

Moreover, macrostructural determinants of international migration (as for instance put forward in the past by Piore, 1979; Wallerstein, 1974), assuming migration to be the result of a ‘black box’ of macrohistorical and macrostructural conditions such as globalization, population pressure, dual labour markets, is an acknowledged and established approach and the cluster of articles in this issue does not intend to refute the significance of these macrostructural determinants, but it aims at incorporating additional drivers of migration as well as adding the reasoning for non-migration, for not leaving countries of origin. Four country cases (Morocco, Senegal, Turkey and Ukraine) will represent and elaborate different stages of economic development and will firstly confirm the well-established logic in this field of research that socio-economics determine the migration decision-making processes. However, in a second step original data will bring forward evidence and will demonstrate that socio-economic conditions in the countries of origin are only one part of the complex and multifaceted process determining the decision *to migrate or not to migrate*. Newly generated data will be based on extensive fieldwork, a large-scale survey of 8000 respondents, 320 in-depth interviews with (non)-migrants and 40 interviews

with institutions in the four countries which were conducted between 2010 and 2012 in the framework of a 3-year research project.¹ This large database provides unique and new evidence. It offers insights on the classical determinants of migrations: political history and socio-economic change, but adds a new dimension. The compendium argues that the EU to some extent overestimates the migration potential to the EU and neglects the necessity to acknowledge the complexities and multilayered *problematique* of people considering leaving their countries, families and friends.

With this comparative angle, four different socio-economic contexts show how complex and how convoluted these additional determinants are. The selections of the four countries (Morocco, Senegal, Turkey and Ukraine) from which a large number of the migrants heading to the EU originate have the following background. The country selections are derived from the explicit aim of presenting a non-Eurocentric analysis, which necessitates research in the premigration phase. Thus, all four countries are the source and transit countries of substantial migrant populations in Europe. While the four countries are sources of substantial migrant populations in Europe, they are also attraction poles outside Europe's external borders for migrants coming from further afield. These flows to Europe from and through these four case studies include different types of migration of regular migration based on family formation/reunification, asylum or employment, as well as irregular migration. All four countries have also gone through an evolution in their migration histories.

To begin with, the evolution of the migratory phenomenon in Morocco has led the country to undertake many migratory functions simultaneously. In addition to its historical role as an emigration country, Morocco today assumes to be a country of immigration, where we observe both temporary and permanent settlement of people from the South, as well as of Europeans from Europe. The latter reconfiguration specifically has not yet been taken into account by migration research, while there are initial studies on the former. This multifaceted role of Morocco in its migratory functions causes the difficulties of redefining its status in the regional and world migratory systems and modifies the diagrams of analysis.

Turkey's role in the regional and world migratory systems is also evolving along a similar path. Apart from ethnic- and religious-based population movements, which can be analysed within the context of nation-building, migratory movements from Turkey to other countries were limited until the 1960s. The history of migration movements is initially characterized by labour emigration to Western European countries from 1961 until mid-1970s, which continued through migration movements based on family reunification and asylum. New destinations for labour migration appeared as a result of global changes, such as Middle Eastern and North African countries after the Oil Crisis, or as Commonwealth of Independent States after the collapse of Soviet Union in 1989. In the meantime, like Morocco, Turkey has been interlinked with the European migration system and has become a country of immigration and a transit migration country as well as an emigration country. The country experienced sizable flows of asylum and regular immigration, which are coupled with clandestine transit migration oriented to Europe and irregular labour migration.

Unlike Turkey and Morocco, Senegal lost its status of being an immigration country in the early 1980s to become an emigration country (Fall, 1998). Well documented in terms of its historical development and stages, the migration process in Senegal is divided into two: the movements caused by successive droughts and the impoverishment of rural areas and the movements subsequent to the choice of policies that led to the destruction of industries as diverse as fisheries and textiles (Fall, Carretero, & Sarr,

2010). The change was a result of the deepening urban crisis in the 1970s that led rural–urban migration or seasonal movements to move to neighbouring countries. The phenomenon heightened in the 1980s/1990s, which constituted a pivotal time in migration shift. In time, the migration system involving Senegal has changed considerably both in terms of host countries and emigration basins.

The case of Ukraine might be the most distinguished. The country became an independent state in 1991, after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Ukraine has been under foreign rule of different countries for centuries, which caused considerable population movements that made Ukraine a multiethnic and multireligious population, while inner turbulences and economic shocks led to high rates of emigration. Once the country became independent, migration flows were dominated by reverse/return migration and emigration. In terms of emigration, while East Ukrainians tended to move east, i.e. to Russia, west Ukrainians with the exception of Zakarpattya tended to move westwards. However, this pattern has altered over time and East–West movements increasingly lost its relevance (see Malynovska, 2004; Pirozhkov, Malinovskaya, & Homra, 2003; Vollmer, Bilan, Lapshyna, & Vdovtsova, 2010). Gradually, the first refugees and asylum seekers and an increasing number of ‘non-traditional’ migrants arrived in Ukraine (i.e. migrants outside the system of the former Soviet Union and her befriended states) (Braichevska et al., 2004). Since the early 2000s, Ukrainian migration flows are dominated by circular migration, (irregular) transit migration and immigration (Vollmer, 2013). Due to the events that have taken place in the late 2013 and in the course of 2014 (civic uprising, annexation of Crimea by Russia and an ongoing military conflict in the east of the country), Ukraine will not only experience a renewal of migration flows, but will also potentially face a new form of statehood (Vollmer, *in press*).

Apart from the macrostructural determinants reflected by the migration histories of the four country cases, aspirations of migration are born from a plethora of social circumstances and a diverse variety of migration cultures in the four different contexts. Among these macrostructural determinants and migration cultures, synergetic effects and at times interdependent relationships exist. This compendium of four articles intends to offer a multiperspective and diversified approach of how to discuss the leading objective of this special issue: relationships between the state of development of a country, that is the socio-economic conditions in a country, and the decision process of migration including imaginations and aspirations of people in these countries. It will provide explanations for current migratory cultures or migratory developments in each country or specific regions in these countries. It goes beyond the usual socio-economic determinants or ‘drivers’ of migration but shows more specific evidence from the subjects that are directly involved: the people themselves.

In the first article, Helene Marie-Lou De Clerck points to the critical assumption that sub-Saharan Africa is often regarded as a region in crisis, and from here she develops her argument of the fading image of Europe seen as the ‘El Dorado’. On the basis of a case study of Senegalese migrants in Istanbul, she challenges the validity of the transit hypothesis (stating that Senegalese migrants are stranded in Turkey and wait to move on) by pointing to the complexity of migratory aspirations that she found in her qualitative data and by showing evidence that Europe is only one possible destination for sub-Saharan Africans among many other destinations.

Followed by this train of thought initiated by De Clerck, the image of Turkey as a transit zone or as emigration country is discussed in more detail by the following article in this special issue. Deniz Karcı Korfalı and Deniz Şenol Sert address similar leading questions but focussing on ‘why do people migrate’ and ‘why do they not migrate’.

They emphasize the flipside of the migration decision, and that is the analysis of non-migration in Turkey. Socio-economics and other developments in Turkey have strongly influenced the population's attitude on leaving the country. Evidence points to people's increasingly positive attitude on the current standard of living, financial situation, schools and healthcare in Turkey. They furthermore assess this development–migration linkage and the ramifications of the Turkey–EU relationship.

Somewhat less economic development (than in Turkey) was experienced by the Moroccan population and Aysen Üstübici addresses policy agendas that intend to manage continuing emigration, the Moroccan diaspora abroad and irregular migration flows to and through Morocco. Novel institutional settings explain how the needs of Moroccans abroad (and their rights) have moved into the focus of policy agendas. At the same time, EU law and institutions put Moroccan authorities under pressure to secure their borders and effectively control irregular border crossings through Morocco. Aysen Üstübici points to alarming coercive measures taken against irregular border crossings violating human rights. However, the ongoing emigration narratives shed a brighter light on the migration discourses in Morocco. Narratives of emigrants abroad and returnees in Morocco could have a positive impact on the treatment of immigrants currently regularly or irregularly residing in the country.

The final article takes a perspective from a post-Soviet country that is Ukraine. Iryna Lapshyna and Franck Düvell explore the nexus between life (dis)satisfaction, migration aspirations and return in the context of a country that has experienced relatively high rates of development but is today in a deprived condition. They found that life dissatisfaction significantly contributes to the emergence of migration aspirations and thus is an important driver of migration in Ukraine. They argue that a correlation between the state of development of a country in accordance with life (dis)satisfaction of its populations' and their propensity to migrate exists. Further determinants in their study as regards the decision to migrate or to stay in the country are the level of education and the circumstances that migrants from abroad have to face once they have returned to Ukraine. So far, absent discussions on diaspora politics or reintegration measures draw the article and the special issue to a close.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Note

1. Imagining Europe from outside (EUMAGINE) funded by the European Union 7th Framework Programme for Research, see also www.eumagine.org.

Notes on contributors

Bastian A. Vollmer is a Leverhulme Fellow at COMPAS, University of Oxford. His main research interests are migration processes, control mechanisms and securitization regimes of migration, border theory, discourse theory, and discourse analysis. His work is published in various academic journals and with Palgrave Macmillan. He will soon publish his next research monograph entitled 'Ukrainian Migration and the European Union – Dynamics, Subjectivity, Politics'.

Deniz Şenol Sert is an assistant professor of International Relations at Özyeğin University, Istanbul. Her areas of expertise are conflict, forced migration, international migration, irregular migration, transnationalism, border management and civil society.

Ahmet İcduygu is the director of the Migration Research Center at Koç University, MiReKoc and the dean of the College of Social Sciences and Humanities. His academic interests include migration studies, theories and practices of citizenship, international organizations, civil society, nationalism and ethnicity, and research methods.

References

- Balibar, É. (2002). *Politics and the other scene*. London: Verso.
- Balibar, É. (2003). *We, the people of Europe? Reflections on transnational citizenship*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bartram, D. (2013). Happiness and 'economic migration': A comparison of Eastern European migrants and stayers. *Migration Studies*, 1, 156–175.
- Braichevska, O., Volosiuk, H., Malynovska, O., Pylinskyi, Y., Popson, N., & Ruble, B. (2004). *Non-traditional immigrants in Kyiv*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars.
- Castles, S., & Miller, M. J. (1993). *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2008). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Cornelius, W. A., Martin, P. F., & Hollifield, J. F. (Eds.). (1994). *Controlling immigration – A global perspective*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Cornelius, W. A., Tsuda, T., Martin, P. L., & Hollifield, J. F. (Eds.). (2004). *Controlling immigration: A global perspective* (2nd ed.). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- De Genova, N. (2014). Ethnography in Europe, or an anthropology of Europe? *Social Anthropology*, 22, 293–295.
- Dzenovska, D. (2013). Historical agency and the coloniality of power in postsocialist Europe. *Anthropological Theory*, 13, 394–416.
- European Commission. (2014, February 2). *Report on the implementation of the global approach to migration and mobility*, COM(2014) 96 final, Brussels.
- Fall, P. D. (1998). Stratégies et implications fonctionnelles de la migration sénégalaise vers l'Italie [Strategies and functional implications of Senegalese migration to Italy]. *Migrations Société*, 10, 7–33.
- Fall, P. D., Carretero, M. H., & Sarr, M. Y. (2010). *Country report: Senegal*, EUMAGINE Project. Retrieved from http://www.eumagine.org/pages/eumagine_country_details.aspx?cid=2
- Garelli, G., & Tazzioli, M. (2013). Challenging the discipline of migration: Militant research in migration studies, an introduction. *Postcolonial Studies*, 16, 245–249.
- Hall, S. (1992). The west and the rest: Discourse and power. In S. Hall & B. Gieben (Eds.), *Formations of modernity* (pp. 275–332). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hoerder, D. (2002). *Cultures in contact*. Duke: Duke University Press.
- Malynovska, O. (2004). *International migration in contemporary Ukraine: Trends and policy. Global migration perspectives, No. 14*. Geneva: Global Commission on International Migration.
- McKeown, A. (2004). Global migration, 1846–1940. *Journal of World History*, 15, 155–189.
- Piore, M. J. (1979). *Birds of passage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pirozhkov, S. I., Malinovskaya, E., & Homra, A. (2003). *Vneshnijetrudovymigratsyi v Ukraine: sotsyal'no-ekonomicheskij aspekt* [Foreign labor migration in Ukraine: Socio-economic aspect]. Kyiv: National Institute for International Security Studies.
- Vollmer, B. (2013). Ukraine, migration, early 20th century to present. In I. Ness (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of global human migration* (pp. 1–5). New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Vollmer, B. (in press). *Ukrainian migration and the European Union – dynamics, subjectivity, politics*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vollmer, B., Bilan, Y., Lapshyna, I., & Vdovtsova, S. (2010). *Ukraine: Country and research areas report*, EUMAGINE Project paper No. 3. Oxford: Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS), Centre of Sociological Research (CSR).
- Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The modern world-system: Capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Wimmer, A., & Glick Schiller, N. (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks*, 2, 301–334.