Civic Participation and Integration: A country of origin perspective

Sonia Gsir

INTERACT
**Researching Third Country Nationals' Integration as a Three-way Process -
Immigrants, Countries of Emigration and Countries of Immigration as Actors of
Integration**

**Research Report
Position Paper**

INTERACT RR2014/03

**Civic Participation and Integration:
A country of origin perspective**

Sonia Gsir
Centre d'études de l'ethnicité et des migrations (CEDEM), Université de Liège

INTERACT - Researching Third Country Nationals' Integration as a Three-way Process - Immigrants, Countries of Emigration and Countries of Immigration as Actors of Integration

Around 25 million persons born in a third country (TCNs) are currently living in the European Union (EU), representing 5% of its total population. Integrating immigrants, i.e. allowing them to participate in the host society at the same level as natives, is an active, not a passive, process that involves two parties, the host society and the immigrants, working together to build a cohesive society.

Policy-making on integration is commonly regarded as primarily a matter of concern for the receiving state, with general disregard for the role of the sending state. However, migrants belong to two places: first, where they come and second, where they now live. While integration takes place in the latter, migrants maintain a variety of links with the former. New means of communication facilitating contact between migrants and their homes, globalisation bringing greater cultural diversity to host countries, and nation-building in source countries seeing expatriate nationals as a strategic resource have all transformed the way migrants interact with their home country.

INTERACT project looks at the ways governments and non-governmental institutions in origin countries, including the media, make transnational bonds a reality, and have developed tools that operate economically (to boost financial transfers and investments); culturally (to maintain or revive cultural heritage); politically (to expand the constituency); legally (to support their rights).

INTERACT project explores several important questions: To what extent do policies pursued by EU member states to integrate immigrants, and policies pursued by governments and non-state actors in origin countries regarding expatriates, complement or contradict each other? What effective contribution do they make to the successful integration of migrants and what obstacles do they put in their way?

A considerable amount of high-quality research on the integration of migrants has been produced in the EU. Building on existing research to investigate the impact of origin countries on the integration of migrants in the host country remains to be done.

INTERACT is co-financed by the European Union and is implemented by a consortium built by CEDEM, UPF and MPI Europe.

For more information:
INTERACT
Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies (EUI)
Convento
Via delle Fontanelle 19
50014 San Domenico di Fiesole
Italy
Tel: +39 055 46 85 817
Fax: + 39 055 46 85 770
Email: migration@eui.eu

Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies
http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/

Table of Contents

Abstract

This paper offers an insight into how emigration countries influence immigrants in their host society. Our main objective is to explore the following questions: first, whether and how emigration countries can influence the civic participation of immigrants in immigration countries and second, whether transnational links, in particular political transnational activities, have an impact on civic participation in receiving countries.

Civic participation is approached as a form of political participation outside of traditional political institutions. As an active and collective dimension of engagement in society, one form of civic participation consists in being active in organizations. This paper addresses three forms of involvement: in local politics (mainstream organizations focused on mainstream issues), immigrant and homeland politics (migrant organizations focused on ethnic or country of origin issues) and finally a combination of mainstream and other issues with bi-national associations. The paper also raises the issue of maintaining links with the country of origin and simultaneously integrating into the immigration country. It questions, in particularly, the impact of transnational civic engagement on civic participation in destination countries. Several case studies are presented and, in the case of Mexico/U.S., some show that the Mexican migrant experience in hometown associations help maintain civic ties with Mexico and positively affect civic participation with U.S. issues. Other cases indicate that civic participation can, indeed, be influenced by transnational links, but also that it relies on the institutional context of the receiving country: for example questions such as access to citizenship). Possible conflicts of interests with countries of origin and countries of destination are also raised in relation to the civic participation of emigrants here and there.

Finally, different diaspora policy mechanisms are put forward and in particular, the paper hypothesizes the existence of diaspora empowering mechanism. In order to highlight this mechanism, we map country of origin actors also chart the different kind of actions that can affect civic participation.

Key words: diaspora policies, integration, civic participation, organizations, hometown associations, transnational civic activities.

1. Introduction

The overall aim of this paper on civic participation is: to set out a theoretical framework on the links and ties that origin countries maintain with migrants abroad (the emigrants): and to chart, too, the civic participation of these migrants when they settle in the new country of residence (the immigrants). The INTERACT project focus mainly on legal first generation migrants in Europe. However, diaspora policies can obviously target second and third generation migrants as well. The specific objective is to explore the following questions: first, whether and how emigration countries can influence civic participation of immigrants in immigration countries; and second, whether transnational links, in particular civic transnational activities, have an impact on civic participation in the receiving countries.

Information about the object, as it is constructed in the INTERACT project, is quite new and data about the impact of emigration countries on integration and specifically civic participation in immigration countries are dispersed in different bodies of literatures. The paper relies principally on existing literature on immigrant integration and immigrant political participation, on transnationalism, mainly political transnationalism and emigration and diaspora policies. As INTERACT intends to fill a knowledge gap, answers to its questions are not all in the literature: in fact, we aim more to refine question than offer answers here. Literature on immigrant integration and political participation aims, first of all, at understanding the conditions of integration from the perspective of the receiving country. And, in studies on immigrant transnationalism, the dependent variables are transnational practices and the conditions of emergence rather than consequences on integration, even though this issue is not completely absent (Snel *et al.,* 2006; Délano, 2010). But the transnational perspective seems to offer a relevant theoretical approach should we wish to grasp what occurs when immigration and emigration countries are simultaneously taken into account. Finally, literature on emigration and diaspora policies is still limited.

The paper offers, thus, an insight into how emigration countries influence immigrants in their host societies. It emphasizes how immigrants are involved in community life and how they participate in local and neighbourhood activities. In other terms, we look at how they try to fulfill their responsibilities and rights as residents and citizens, even though they may not have been yet granted the nationality of the residence country. Therefore, the dependent variable can be considered as civic participation in the host country seen as a form of integration, whereas independent variables are the country of origin in a broad sense (governments' institutions, state policies but also other non-state actors) and the links migrants maintain or develop with their origin society

The first part of the paper looks at the civic dimension of integration and provides a definition of civic participation. In the second part, we address the engagement of migrants in different types of organizations in the receiving country. The third and principal part explores the perspective of countries of origin on integration and civic participation. It discusses the compatibility between immigrant integration in the destination country and ties with the origin country. Some case-studies are put forward to better understand how engaging at origin and destination can be closely articulated and combined. The fourth part concerns, more broadly, diaspora policies and help map out the different origin country actors that can be involved in engaging emigrants abroad. A discussion related to conflicting and diverging interests between both countries of origin and destination ends this section. The concluding part tries to assess the impact of origin countries on civic participation and sums up the main insights of the paper by providing a table with all the actors at stake and their main actions.

2. Immigrants' integration and civic participation

The civic dimension of integration

Neither scholars nor political actors agree on a single definition of immigrant integration. Certainly, it is difficult to propose a definition that fits with the various approaches to integration. Immigrant integration starts with immigration policies and the way immigrants are conceptualized in admission policies. Viewing immigrants and immigration as an *ad hoc* measure to respond to the specific economic needs of the receiving country may imply superficial integration policies. Integration is not seen as an objective because immigrants are understood as being temporary, as a mere workforce. Integration relies on the space that the host society and the receiving country grant or allow to immigrants. With its comprehensive definition of integration conceived as "the process of becoming an accepted part of society", Penninx (2004) highlights precisely what is at stake: the role that the society recognizes to the migrant. According to Bosswick and Heckmann (2006), integration is "the process of inclusion of immigrants in the institutions and relationships of the host society". Both definitions insist on the dynamic feature of integration. The time factor has to be taken into account when observing integration. Furthermore, they identified the main stakeholders of integration: the migrants, the host society and the institutions of this society. The integration process is carried out in three dimensions: the political-legal, socio-economic, and the cultural/religious (Penninx, 2004).

Civic integration concerns the political-legal dimension of integration. It might be defined as the inclusion of immigrants in the civic institutions of the receiving country and they way in which citizens become an accepted part of society in civic terms. Civic integration, thus, means becoming a citizen of the receiving society, but not necessarily yet a full citizen with nationality and full political rights, which lead, in turn, to political integration. Morales (2011) gave a broad acceptance for the political integration which cannot be reduced to voting or electoral participation. Instead, she assessed the political integration of migrants in terms of their ability to use a repertoire of political actions that allows them to seek to influence decision-making (ibid.). Civic participation can, thus, be understood as a form of political participation taken in a broad sense.

Some "patterns of engagement with politics" have been identified in the literature: domestic or local politics, immigrant politics, and homeland politics. The presentation order does not give any information about steps in the political integration process. Simultaneous involvement in all three areas is not to be excluded at all. First, immigrants can participate in mainstream civil organizations or associations in the host society. DeSipio (2011) found, indeed, that rather than engaging directly in the politics of the new country of residence, migrants can tend to get involved in civic matters without even realizing that they are taking part in politics in parent-teacher associations. Second, the mobilization of migrants can concern more narrowly what Østergaard-Nielsen (2009) called *immigrant politics* namely "issues of socioeconomic integration, political rights, problem with discrimination and racism, and the role of Islam in public space". Third, as Martiniello (2009) points out immigrant political participation does not exclusively concern the political space of the state of destination. It may also concern the country of origin through transnational political activities. The *homeland politics* concerns "direct intervention in the political affairs of the homeland and lobbying the host government or other relevant political actors on issues related to the country of origin" (Østergaard-Nielsen, 2009). *Translocal politics* is a subset of homeland politics referring to the political activities undertaken from abroad and targeting local communities (*ibidem*). Projects of hometown associations fall into this category in as much as local and regional authorities in the country of origin are involved (Guarnizo *et al.*, 2003).

Morales and Pilati (2011) found "that the types of migration politics and the political context of immigration are likely to shape the levels and focus of migrants' political involvement, given that

more closed POS [Political Opportunity Structure] seem to hinder migrants' engagement or to direct it to ethnic issues." Indeed, the context of the receiving countries and integration approaches are part of the contextual factors shaping political integration (Koopmans and Statham, 2001) and civic integration. As Bauböck (2003) stated "[i]n a strongly assimilationist perspective there is no place for transnationalism – migration itself is regarded as international, whereas the process of settlement and integration of immigrants is exclusively determined by the receiving country." Other factors play a role on the political and civic dimension of migrants' integration. On the basis of the theory of political participation and their own comparative studies on immigrants' political integration in Europe, Giugni and Morales (2011) identified three sets of factors influencing the degree of political integration: first, individual characteristics such as education, gender, age, cultural tradition, migrations patterns, language proficiency, etc. or the "human capital"; second, involvement in associations and the social integration or "social capital" and third, contextual and institutional factors, namely the political opportunity structures or "political capital". These sets of factors are applicable to civic participation. Moreover, DeSipio (2011) found the positive impact of transnational political participation or engagement on civic engagement in the receiving society, even if this is less the case for second and subsequent generations. This "ethnic lobbying" (Østergaard-Nielsen, 2001)concerns rather the home country: though one could suppose that this civic engagement might also affect civic participation in the destination country.

Civic participation of immigrants

Within the INTERACT project, civic and political participation are considered separately. However, the frontier between them is, in conceptual terms, blurred. How could one participate politically without a strong sense of civic involvement? But when political participation refers strictly to voting, one can be civically engaged while not taking part in politics, *sensu stricto*. Even though civic participation is not something completely separate from state and electoral politics (Skocpol and Fiorina, 1999: 17), Martiniello proposed an interesting typology of political participation on the part of immigrants and their offspring and distinguished state politics from non-state politics (2009). The first refers to formal political and electoral participation including electoral politics, parliamentary politics and consultative politics. Civic participation relates, meanwhile, to a second type of political participation and concerns involvement in political parties, trade unions and other pressure groups to defend various interests (Martiniello, 2009). This distinction is analytically useful but in reality state and non-state politics can and do overlap. Nevertheless, it allows the definition of immigrant civic participation in terms of their involvement in informal politics.

The literature show that the two concepts of political participation and civic participation are not clearly differentiated and they have been discussed several times in order to distinguish them more clearly (Ekman and Amnå, 2009). "Civic engagement refers to activities by ordinary citizens that are intended to influence circumstances in society that is of relevance to others, outside the own family and circle of close friends" (Ekman and Amnå, 2009). One criticism of civic participation or engagement is that its meaning is often too wide. In its broad sense, civic participation may take several forms that are more or less passive, including following politics in the news (DeSipio, 2011). But there are also more active matters such as voting, participating in protests, signing petitions, boycotting products, giving funds to some causes, participating in school-based parental organizations, membership in political party, trade unions, community-based organizations, neighbourhood associations, home town associations, faith-based institutions, ethnic media, virtual social networks, etc. (Aleksynska, 2011; DeSipio, 2011). For some, this is still not broad enough: "The concept of civic participation [of immigrants] had to be broadened to include transnational communities, social capital, social organization, and community organizing in ethnic-specific populations in order to capture a clearer understanding of the issue as it relates to immigrants" (Association for the Study and Development of Community, 2002). Here, civic participation is approached as a form of political participation outside of traditional political institutions.

In this paper, civic participation is addressed in the active dimension and more precisely the collective and public dimension. "Definitions of civic engagement as collective action assumes that such engagement most often comes in the form of collaboration or joint action to improve conditions in the civil sphere" (Ekman and Amnå, 2009). In other words, civic participation concerns the way immigrants act as citizens, even though they may not have the nationality or citizenship of their new residence country and consequently cannot participate in formal politics (voting and standing for elections). Civic participation as the first form of politics among immigrants is an opportunity for integration because immigrants can participate regardless of their status (DeSipio, 2011).

3. Immigrants in the organizations

The integration process is gradual and civic integration is a part of it. It takes place at various levels and the question is through which channels it can be observed and furthermore the role of the origin country and of transnational links in this process. The temporary absence of citizenship or the limitations on political rights do not prevent migrants from engaging civically in the host country. One of collective forms of civic action that contribute to civic integration is to join or create an association. In this paper, even though other forms of civic participation exist, I will focus particularly on the involvement of migrants in organizations. They can be migrant organizations, hometown associations, but also mainstream organizations namely non-migrant associations, consultative bodies or even bi-national associations.

Migrant organizations but also mainstream organizations present a significant form of civic participation, with a collective dimension and with the potential empowerment dimension for all migrants, whatever their status. However, the first ones, also called ethnic organizations, can be very different in their objectives and impact from the second ones. According to some case-studies in the United States, migrant organisations are at times concentrated in the religious sphere and social services or "in transnational activities, advocacy, and cultural expression, such as arts and music". Mainstream organizations, on the other hand, are more likely "to be concentrated in civic clubs and those focused on education, sports, and health" (Ramakrishnan and Viramontes, 2006). Both migrant and mainstream organizations differ in their institutional history, their membership, their resources and their organizational characteristics (ibid.). In the following, we look also at bi-national associations, that are associations deliberately involving migrant and native residents.

Mainstream organizations

Migrants can get involved in *local politics* over mainstream issues or neighbourhood issues such as housing, education, urban space, etc. issues that are not specific to migrants. Even though immigrant participation in mainstream organizations can be of the utmost importance for integration, in particular in countries with a strong civil society tradition, literature and case-studies are quite scarce on this, particularly in the case of Europe.[1]

Mainstream organizations primarily serve the native population (Ramakrishnan and Viramontes, 2006) or more broadly the population without distinction of ethnicity. This participation is also called "community involvement" and "can range from individual volunteerism to membership in a church or a school council to participation in the electoral process. Activities indicative of community involvement include working in a soup kitchen, donating blood, and involvement in a parent teacher organization, labor union, or tenants association" (Ready *et al.*, 2006). Mainstream organizations are sometimes

---

[1] A comparative case-study is the INVOLVE project of involvement of third-country nationals in volunteering as a means of integration.

embedded in the receiving societies, e.g. civic clubs[2], or at a more local level, neighbourhoods or homeowners associations. In some cases, it has been found that participation tends to decrease both in mainstream and migrant organizations. But this does not happen to the same extent in hometown associations considered to "provide a relatively safe space for immigrants to get involved in civic affairs" because participation does not rely on legal status (Ramakrishnan and Viramontes, 2006).

Participating in mainstream organizations favours interaction with natives (Ahokas, 2010) even though these organizations do not have integration as an aim (Ramakrishnan and Viramontes, 2006). Volunteering in mainstream organizations is thus a way for immigrants to engage in the civic affairs of the new country of residence. Nevertheless, it relies a great deal on the openness of mainstream organizations to immigrants (Ahokas, 2010) and in some cases, even though they have joined these organizations, the limits in getting leadership positions causes immigrants to leave and to create their own associations (Ramakrishnan and Viramontes, 2006).

Migrant organizations

Studies have showed that migrants set up all kinds of migrant associations, though these associations are not easy to define (Moya, 2005). Migrant organizations are, indeed, very diverse (ethnic, cultural, regional, social, professional, religious, charitable organizations, sports) (Brettel, 2012). De Haas (2006) considered a migrant organization as "any kind of organisation consisting mainly of migrants and their descendants, irrespective of the specific activities of such organisations." Migrants associations are also called "ethnic" associations and are oriented towards issues linked to the country of residence (Portes *et al.*, 2008). Among the various migrant organisations, scholars distinguished diaspora organisations, which are also called (civic) hometown associations or even transnational organizations (Ramakrishnana and Viramontes, 2006). Hometown associations are "organizations that allow immigrants from the same city or region to maintain ties with and materially support their places of origin" (Orozco and Rouse, 2007). Hometown associations can also contribute to the integration of immigrants in the host countries as they are "organized points of contact and coordination between immigrants, the host governments, and other institutions" (Somerville, Durana and Terrazas, 2008).

Migrant organizations are an important place for affirming attachment to the country of origin (Brettell, 2005). They are considered as a means for gathering and creating links with immigrants from the same country of origin and also for promoting the culture and the language of the home country (ibid.). Their agenda is not necessarily focused on one society, but it can target both the homeland issues and the integration problems in the host society (Cordero-Guzmán, 2005; Portes *et al.*, 2008). If migrant associations can thus be orientated toward the country of origin like transnational associations or toward immigrant integration in the country of immigration, some of those also gradually present a mixed agenda (Faist *et al.*, 2013). Their agenda is thus not necessarily focused on one society, but it can target both homeland issues and integration problems in the host society (Cordero-Guzmán, 2005).

The Indian Association of North Texas (IANT)
This example is particularly relevant to show how a migrant organization, in this case one created by Indian immigrants in the United States, can have a quite broad agenda open also to host society. "The mission is "to serve as an organization that brings together all people of Indian origin in North Texas. lANT will strive to promote India's rich heritage and cultural diversity, and help people of Indian origin become a part of mainstream America. lANT will also strive to serve the North Texas community at large, regardless of the person's national origin, race, creed, color, or any other

---

[2] "Civic clubs are voluntary associations that meet regularly for social purposes and occasionally perform charitable works. The prototypical examples of mainstream civic clubs are the Lions Club, Kiwanis International, and Rotary Club—organizations that have been in the United States for nearly a century. Civic clubs are generally seen as being concerned about the overall welfare of the city rather than of members of any particular group, whether defined by ethnicity, age, or occupation." (Ramakrishnan and Viramontes, 2006: 38).

characteristic" (Brettell, 2005). The objectives of the IANT are clearly threefold: maintaining links with India, integrating Indian emigrants and engaging with the host society.

Migrant organizations emerge often spontaneously as informal social networks but progressively they organize in more formal organizations with several objectives. Migrant associations are not exclusively initiated by migrants. Countries of origin can encourage their creation (Xiang, 2003; Délano, 2010; Ramakrishnan and Viramontes, 2006).

Local authorities in Mexico encouraging the creation of hometown associations
"In the case of Club Santa Rita of the Federation of Jalisco Clubs of Southern California, 11 members were approached by Santa Rita's mayor to form the group, and with the assistance of Consular officials it was incorporated as an organization in 2004. 41 Club San Martín de Bolaños was formed in 1992 by a group of four individuals, encouraged by the local priest in their hometown. As interest in the informal group grew, members elected to form an official club, now registered with the Mexican Consulate in Los Angeles and the Federation of Jalisco Clubs of Southern California." (Ramakrishnan and Viramontes, 2006)

Migrant organizations can also be fomented by receiving countries or regional authorities especially in the case of development policies or co-development policies (Østergaard-Nielsen, 2009). Furthermore, migrant organisations can differ from one country or even from one city to another because "political or institutional opportunities in the host and sending societies strongly influence immigrant organisations" (Schrover and Vermeulen, 2005).

Bi-national organizations

Some authors found that some associations are bi-national and serve as bridges between natives and migrants (Brettel, 2005). For example, the Indian American Friendship Council association was founded in California in 1990 but went nationwide six years later (Brettell, 2005). Brettell (2005) also highlighted that in bi-national organizations like this one "participants can be both Indian and American, they can develop social and political relationships with both Indians and Americans, and they can promote both Indian and American causes."

In some cases, organizations with mainstream origin become rather "hybrid organizations" because if initially mainstream their membership diversified ethnically to a significant extent (Ramakrishnan and Veramontes, 2006). In their study on the involvement of migrants in California, Ramakrishnan and Veramontes found that hybrid civic organizations defined as "groups based on mainstream civic clubs but with a predominantly ethnic membership" were quite recent; they gave the example of the Filipino American Kiwanis Club of Glendale.

Another kind of civic body characterized by bi or even multi-ethnic membership including migrants and natives are the local consultative councils for foreign residents. Some would argue that consultative bodies refer rather to formal political participation (Martiniello, 2009), but they can also be seen as a place of civic participation as they, in some cases, were developed before allowing foreign residents to vote. Local consultative bodies for foreign residents are often set up by local authorities in the residing country and they bring together foreign residents and local elected representatives (Gsir and Martiniello, 2004). These councils pursue two main objectives: first, integrating and encouraging the participation of foreign residents in local public life and second, improving or harmonising relations between foreign residents and other sectors of the community (authorities, administrative bodies, nationals) (Gsir and Martiniello, 2004). They, thus, represent a privileged place of civic participation.

4. Civic participation and the country of origin perspective

According to Ramakrishnan and Viramontes (2006), "[h]ybrid and ethnic civic organizations display a mode of assimilation characterized by a strong desire to integrate into the mainstream while maintaining allegiance to ethnic-specific issues and concerns." Rather than mainstream organizations, migrant organizations and specifically hometowns associations but also bi-national organizations may be considered as places of civic participation where country of origin actors can have an impact.

Integration and transnational civic activities

Migrant associations are considered as the locus of transnational political activities (Morales and Jorba, 2010). Transnational political are activities "conducted by migrants of the same national origin but residing in different destination countries or when the state authorities of the sending country interfere with their emigrants' activities in the country of residence" (Martiniello and Lafleur, 2008). "Civil society actors – and, in particular, migrants' organisations [...] provide the networks and the infrastructure to facilitate and sustain various forms of transnational engagement by individuals and communities (Faist, 1998), most notably civic and political transnationalism" (Morales and Jorba, 2010). Accordingly and regarding the purpose of this paper, transnational civic engagement can be defined as civic activities that emigrants developed from the receiving country but that are oriented to the sending country.

There is an emergent literature on the role of migrants' transnational ties in their integration into the receiving country (Levitt, 1999; Pantoja, 2005; Snel *et al.*, 2006; Portes *et al.,* 2008; Morales and Morariu, 2011).Maintaining active civic ties with one place (emigration country), while residing and developing civic links with another (immigration country) raises the question of multiple membership and allegiance as regards political ties. With respect to transnational practices and integration, some consider that both are incompatible because integrating a society can only be completed by cutting ties with the origin society. Others, meanwhile, assume that migrants can fully integrate the host society and, at the same time, maintain ties and even develop transnational activities. These two positions are particularly relevant in the case of transnational civic activities but also of political ones and of the recognition of dual citizenship or nationality. When migrants engage civically in two different societies, this can raise the question of his/her loyalty to each nation-state. Moreover, the question is whether civic activities oriented towards the country of origin reduce the civic participation of the immigrant in the new residence country and thus limit integration. What is at stake is the possibility toof being faithful to more than one nation-state on with, beyond this, the question of the development of civic commitment independently of the nation-state and of the citizenship acquisition.

In the first position, civic participation is oriented and linked to one nation-state, namely the country of origin. Portes (1999) pointed out that in some cases diaspora policies can provoke conflicts in the community because not all immigrants necessarily agree with homeland politics or with the political regime. According to him, the efforts of emigration countries can break the solidarity among immigrants, politicize their civic organizations and jeopardize integration (Portes, 1999). "Many in receiving societies fear that this [transnational] engagement will, at a minimum, slow or stop the process of immigrant adaptation to the new society and add to social tumult. In a more extreme form, critics of transnational engagement fear that transnationally engaged immigrants will act as a destabilizing force on the politics of the new home and act as an agent of the sending country's government. These concerns are particularly amplified when the number of immigrants from a sending country is large and it shares a border with the receiving society" (DeSipio, 2011). Furthermore, since 9/11, there is even more suspicion towards emigrants political activities and especially remittances to conflict areas (Kleist, 2008). Transnational networks are, thus, perceived as challenging single allegiance (Kastoryano, 2000) and civic activities impeding integration.

The second position assumes the compatibility of transnational political activities oriented to the emigration country and political integration in the destination country (Portes *et al.*, 2008). It views civic and political participation coming from the belief in democracy and democratic values and possibly developing within more than one nation-state (beyond methodological nationalism). Certainly, countries of origin intend to preserve loyalty of emigrants through their diaspora policies (Portes *et al.* , 2007) but, "[t]ransnational practices, and in particular political transnationalism, are viewed as leading to the political incorporation of migrants because they enable them to forge political coalitions and organizations that will allow them first to engage in 'ethnic' politics and, later, to become active in receiving-country politics" (Morales and Morariu, 2011). Even in the case of conflict in the country of origin, the INFOCON project – which looked at the portability of conflicts in countries of immigration – revealed that transnational civic participation increased civic participation in host societies (Perrin and Martiniello, 2010). Furthermore, political participation in the country of origin (political orientation or identification) can differ according to countries of destination (Østergaard-Nielsen, 2009). Turner (2008) showed that parts of the Burundian diaspora adopted political positions radically different from the country of origin, relying on the security and the distance provided by the host country. According to Portes (1999), civic activities oriented towards the country of origin can thus be seen as a means to increase the level of migrant political awareness, and thus as a first step in a civic integration process.

The following case-studies allow bring out further the question of the impact of transnational civic engagement and the whole matter of the role of actors located in origin countries vis-à-vis immigrant civic participation in host societies.

Mexican hometown associations in the U.S. a case of "civic bi-nationality"

Mexican emigrants in the United States created grassroots associations with two main purposes: fundraising to finance projects in their hometown in Mexico and consolidating their migrant community in their new country of residence (Rivera-Salgado *et al.*, 2005). The Mexican government implemented different programs to facilitate relations between these associations and Mexican society (ibid.). These programmes, such as the famous 3X1 *tres por uno*, allowed continuous remittances, but also created an institutional framework for hometown associations to interact with the different governmental levels in Mexico (Délano, 2010).[3] During the 1990s, a shift regarding the scope of their action has been observed; they increasingly engaged in the civic and political issues of the U.S., furthermore, some hometown associations federated to strengthen on immigration issues (ibid.). In the box below, two concrete examples of this shift from transnational civic engagement to civic participation concerning the host country politics are highlighted.

---

[3] The 3X1 Programme for Migrants is a programme encouraging remittances that multiplies their effects. Indeed, for each dollar sent by hometown associations, additional dollars are brought by the federal, the state and the local governments of Mexico. This programme is often mentioned in the literature (see among others Rivera-Salgado *et al.*, 2005; Faist, 2007; Somerville *et al*., 2008; Délano, 2010; Lafleur, 2013).

Migrants civic mobilizations in U.S. migration policy

Scholars often presented the mobilization of Mexican hometown associations regarding the Proposition 187 in Southern California as the first political event to which Mexican migrants engaged civically (Rivera-Salgado *et al.*, 2005). It concerned a referendum organized in 1994 in order to exclude undocumented immigrants from access to some public services (Somerville *et al.*, 2008). Denouncing this proposal, Mexican hometown associations of Southern California published an open and critical letter to the Governor of California in the most influential Spanish-language newspaper (Rivera-Salgado *et al.*, 2005). They took position publicly and acted as civic actors fully involved in the U.S. political arena. The immigrants' involvement did not end and rather increased over the years. The second more recent example was a clear proof of this process of progressive civic and political integration among Mexicans. "In the Spring of 2006, more than three million immigrants – most of them originally from Mexico – marched through the streets of Chicago, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Milwaukee, Detroit, Denver, Dallas, and dozens of other U.S. cities, to protest peacefully for a comprehensive immigration reform that would legalize the status of millions of undocumented immigrants in the United States" (Bada *et al.*, 2006).

Through their activities in hometown associations (e.g. in terms of increasing numbers) and thus through transnational civic engagement, emigrants became more visible in the receiving society (Rivera-Salgado *et al.*, 2005). Public visibility is undoubtedly an important step for civic integration. The title given by Bada and his colleagues (2006) to the edited volume is from this point of view eloquent: "*Invisible NO More: Mexican Migrant Civic Participation in the United States.*" Hometown associations can thus serve migrants and help them to be collectively represented in the public and political spheres in both origin and receiving countries. And as Brettell (2005) pointed out "[i]ncorporation involves gaining some sort of public recognition". Furthermore at the individual level, García Zamora (2005), who studied hometown associations linked to the emigration state of Zacatecas, found that the involvement in los *clubes zacatenos* helped Mexican emigrants to develop in different ways. Their political capacity for negotiations grew because they had to deal with three levels of governments (federal, state and local): their capacity of collaboration also shot up because of the contacts with other associations in the U.S.

To conclude, Fox and Bada (2009) observed that "[f]or many Mexican migrant organizations, efforts to help their hometowns in Mexico often lead to engagement in U.S. society through similar civic and political efforts in their new hometowns in the United States". They called this dual engagement in both societies "civic bi-nationality" in order to take into account the development of active civic participation in both countries of origin and destination (ibid.)

Other cases of civic participation influenced by links with the country of origin

Itzigsohn and Villacrés (2008) showed how another emigrant community in the United States, the Salvadoran emigrants in Washington, got involved in a hometown association (Fundación Unidos por Intipucá), with the hope for development projects in Intipucá. This hometown association has been considered as one of the best organized and successful and it has carried out several projects (ibid.). Moreover, it presented apparently balanced governance in decision with two boards of directors (one in the U.S. and one in El Salvador) (ibid.). However, the key decisions were made exclusively by emigrants in Washington (ibid.). This has been considered problematic because they were deciding unilaterally on projects influencing the life of Salvadorans who had not emigrated (ibid.). Over the years, some critics emerged regarding the decision-making process and in reaction, the Washington side of the hometown association decided to disband (ibid.). The authors considered that "although transnational involvement constitutes a source of status and reward, faced with criticism in the home country migrants may decide to concentrate their efforts in the country of reception" (Itzigsohn and Villacrés, 2008).

A case-study on Dominicans indicated that some transnational ties simultaneously impede *and* foster political incorporation in terms of the definition of political incorporation and transnational ties (Pantoja, 2005). This was also the conclusion drawn by Morales and Morariu (2011) in their comparative study on the impact of transnational activities of three ethnic groups in European cities on the political integration in receiving countries: Ecuadorians in Barcelona, Madrid and Milan, Moroccans in Lyon, Barcelona and Madrid, and Turks in Oslo, Stockholm and Zurich. They found that non-electoral participation varied from city to city and between groups with a trend for Moroccans in Lyon and Turks in Stockholm to be more engaged (ibid.). It has been observed elsewhere that Moroccans, Algerians and Tunisians engaged in mainstream protests in Lyon (Morales and Pilati, 2011). Morales and Morariu (2011) tried to measure the influence of migrants' transnational practices, and in particular, transnational political activities on political and civic integration. They did so by talking about homeland politics, voting in homeland elections, activities in the host country oriented towards homeland politics, and transnational civic participation through membership of an ethnic organization in the host country (ibid.). First, they found that neither non-political transnational activities such as visits to the country of origin nor associational transnationalism had a significant effect on political integration (ibid.). Second, they observed that "migrants' propensity to engage in non-electoral political action is to a relevant degree related to their gaining citizenship, and that cross-group variations are in this case largely related to the ease with which they can actually obtain the citizenship of the countries where they live. […] the strongest effect among the political transnational practices comes from the equivalent form of engagement related to the homeland country. Thus, migrants who engage in political action that address concerns related to their homelands are more likely also engaged in political actions that address concerns related to the countries where they live" (Morales and Morariu, 2011).

Engaging there and here

Empirical case-studies give helpful insights into whether integration and transnational ties are or are not in contradiction. The experience of hometown associations is a way for emigrants to be civically engaged by participating in homeland politics. They can sometimes gain power in particular in the country of origin, but they can also develop interest in becoming engaged in civic activities in their new country of residence. Moreover, Morales and Morariu (2011) highlighted the role of transferable political skills and capital and the mobilizing capacity of transnationally–engaged emigrants.

Transnational civic engagement can have a positive impact on civic participation in the destination country. However, it can also create frustration and become negative: so much so that emigrants will prefer to give up civic actions concerning the country of origin and they will focus on the receiving country, instead. The Intipucá organization was disbanded due to criticism from the country of origin (Itzigsohn and Villacrés, 2008). Other cases with Moroccan or Turkish associations in Europe revealed other reasons such as unsatisfactory implementation of policy or conflicting relations with local authorities in the origin country (Østergaard-Nielsen, 2009). Potential conflicts between hometown associations and communities of origin can indeed deter civic participation in homeland politics when "the transnationalisation of political participation creates tensions between mobile and relatively immobile people and associations" (Faist, 2007).

To conclude, the INTERACT project hypothesis assumes that origin countries and, in particular, their diaspora engagement policies can influence immigrant integration in Europe and, thus, the political and civic dimension. It also assumes that links maintained with the countries of origin or transnational ties can have an influence on civic participation. However, it does not presume that civic participation is exclusively determined by the emigration country: far from it. The way immigration is presented to the host society and the way this society is encouraged to integrate immigrants is crucial. The immigration country structures fundamentally immigrant integration process through immigrant or integration policies, but also through diversity policy and through discourse on immigration and immigrants. In other words, even though, politically, there is a strong attempt to externalize integration

policies on migrants, and second, on countries of origin, with pre-integration tests for example (Scholten *et al.*, 2012), integration is, above all, a host country issue. Other case-studies have also demonstrated that transnational activities do not necessarily develop because of a lack of integration and a will to stay connected with origin country to the detriment of the host country. Rather "these [transnational] activities are more common among better-established, better-educated, and wealthier migrants" (Portes *et al.*, 2007). This is to say that if contextual and institutional factors are fundamental, individual characteristics of migrants must also be taken into account when analyzing the civic dimension of integration.

5. Diaspora policies and actors in the country of origin

Diaspora engagement policies

The interest of emigration countries for their nationals abroad is not new. Besides emigration policies, countries of origin developed diaspora policies or "diaspora engagement policies" (Gamlen, 2006). Délano (2009) includes in emigration policies the state's engagement with the diaspora. Here, I would rather distinguish emigration policies from diaspora policies. The emigration polices include the exit rules of the country and can vary from forbidding emigration to free emigration (Weiner, 1985). Diaspora policies are aimed at engaging the diaspora abroad, and at keeping links with emigrants living henceforth in a new country of residence. In various ways, "[…] emigration states attempt to maintain the umbilical cord between the homeland and emigrants" (Lafleur, 2013). Although they accepted and even promoted emigration, they view emigrants as even more resourceful and therefore useful for the country's interests. As noted by several scholars, countries of origin are mainly motivated by attracting emigrant remittances, opening markets and the defense and representation of national interests in the host country (Portes, 1999; Bauböck, 2003). Diaspora policies consist in an array of measures such as ministerial or consular reforms, investment policies to attract remittances, extension of political rights (dual citizenship, right to vote from abroad), extension of state protection or services, symbolic policies to reinforce a sense of belonging (Levitt and de la Dehesa, 2003). They address emigrants in the receiving country but can also address them when they come back "home" by offering them, specific provisions: for example, protection against rackets or advantageous conditions of investment.

Advisory Council of the Institute of Mexicans Abroad
In 2003, the Mexican government created the Advisory Council of the Institute of Mexicans Abroad (Instituto de los Mexicanos del Exterior-IME) namely Consejo Consultivo del IME or CCIME (Délano, 2010). This quasi-governmental institution was composed of 125 elected Mexicans and Mexican-Americans who were in charge of making recommendations regarding the diaspora engagement policy of Mexico (ibid.) This involvement was, of course, supposed to improve the civic participation skills of emigrants.

Diaspora policies depend on how emigrants are perceived by the country of origin. Are they considered as traitors who fled their homelands? Or on the contrary, are they celebrated and perceived as heroes? In several countries, maintaining links with emigrant workers in view of their permanent return home has been progressively replaced by keeping up links with emigrants and their descendants abroad. This strategy takes into account the possibility of pendular travels between the country of emigration and immigration (Portes, 1999; de Haas, 2007). Several studies have demonstrated how countries of origin such as Morocco, Mexico and China among others have shifted from one control approach to another, aiming, rather, at courting emigrants abroad (DeSipio, 2002; Xiang, 2003; De Haas, 2007; Délano, 2009; Gamlen, 2012). Furthermore, emigrants even if they come from the same country or region of origin do not constitute a homogeneous group; some of them may be in opposition to the regime or ruling authorities of the country of origin. Therefore, the government of

the country of origin will adopt actions depending on the different components of the diaspora (e.g. the Turkish diaspora with Kurdish emigrants (Østergaard-Nielsen, 2003b)).

Gamlen (2006; 2008) proposed to consider two types of "diaspora mechanisms" according to their objectives. Through their "diaspora engagement policies," states of origin work, first, at diaspora building and, second, at diaspora integration (Gamlen, 2008). Diaspora building aims at cultivating diaspora identity or recognizing it (ibid.). Diaspora integration does not refer to integration in the host country but rather to re-integration in the origin country. Emigrants can be re-integrated into homeland politics by extending their rights abroad and in the origin country, such as the right to retain citizenship. Together, state of origin attempts to extract obligations from them. In order to build their diaspora, countries of origin celebrate national holidays abroad, honor emigrants with awards, provide national language and history education, etc. In this way they recognize diaspora achievements, they commission studies, expand their consular network, maintain a diaspora program, etc. (Gamlen, 2006; 2008). In re-integrating migrants into the homeland polity, some measures may have an impact on civic participation such as the creation of "consulting expatriate councils or advisory bodies" (ibid.)

As well as diaspora building and diaspora integration in homeland polities, the INTERACT project assumes a third kind of diaspora mechanism that I will call **diaspora empowering** in the host country. Emigration countries can strive to sustain and facilitate emigrants' integration in the receiving country. Moreover, even though diaspora engagement policy does not directly aim at shaping civic participation and integration in the host country, its implementation can influence civic participation by giving conditions (such as dual citizenship) to develop it or by empowering migrants and raising their interest to get involved in community issues.

Training for emigrants leaders in Mexican consulates
Délano (2010) indicated that some Mexican consulates provided leadership training for hometown associations in collaboration of U.S. associations and institutions.

Actors in the country of origin

In order to better understand the role of the country of origin on civic participation, it is useful to take into account the various actors located there. The first crucial distinction is between state and non-state actors.

Mapping state actors engaging diasporas on the basis of the study of institutions of 30 developing countries, Agunias (2009) distinguished "government institutions at home", "consular networks" and "quasi-government diaspora institutions."

a) Government institutions

Agunias (2009) classed government institutions in terms of the level of government concerned (ministerial or not; national or local) and the aim of the institution: does it address only the diaspora? Or are diaspora affairs one area among others within the same body? Classifying state actors in terms of government levels is likely a useful way to better understand the resources available and the power dimension.

Thus among these state institutions, one can find:

- Ministry of diaspora: e.g. Ministry of Social Affairs, Solidarity and Tunisians Abroad.
- Ministry of diaspora included in another ministry: e.g. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The National Institute (Albania).
- Other national institution: e.g. Ministry Delegate for the Prime Minister Responsible for Moroccans Resident Abroad.

- Local level institutions: Overseas Chinese Office of Shangai Municipal People's Government.

b) Consulates

Other important institutions include the consulates. Among their tasks, they offer a range of services to emigrants abroad. Consular networks are special institutions as they are country of origin institutions located in the host countries.

c) Quasi-governmental institutions

Quasi-government diaspora institutions are mixed actors with public and private elements. Examples include Hassan II Foundation for Moroccans Resident Abroad or advisory councils with for example government officials and leaders from the diaspora, e.g. High Council of Malians Abroad.

However, the role of origin countries cannot simply be reduced to state actors. Different kinds of non-state actors can try to engage or maintain links with emigrants abroad. They come from the political sphere but also from the civil sphere. They can be very diverse: political parties, trade unions, different types of associations, NGOs, churches, media, etc. all based in the country of origin. To assess the influence of these actors on the civic participation of emigrants abroad, it is necessary to examine their purpose and agenda. State and non-state actors do not necessarily have the same interests and the same agendas towards diaspora host country civic participation in particular in case of conflicts or contested political situations in the country of origin.

Conflicting and converging interests in migrant civic participation

Emigration states, like receiving states, lack complete control over migration patterns. Even though there are attempts to manage migration at a global level or to create partnership at a European level, emigration and immigration countries pursue their own goals and interests in terms of international migration (Schmitter Heisler, 1985). Temporary labour migration has been considered to serve emigration and immigration countries. Keeping ties with emigrants abroad, therefore, and impeding their integration in the host country were seen as essential in order not to lose the social capital invested before emigration (ibid.). In the case of Morocco during the period of active European labor migrants recruitment, "Moroccan migrants were actively discouraged from establishing independent organizations, joining trade unions or political parties or voting during elections in the countries that the Moroccan and European states considered as their temporary residencies." (De Haas, 2007). In contrast, Bauböck (2003) argued that some emigration states accept permanent migration and even promote integration in host society because they view emigrants as a "domestic political force within the receiving country". Therefore, instead of adopting a very rational and cost-benefit approach, it has been demonstrated that even in the case of integration and settlement, emigrants continue to keep links with the country of origin and this benefits their integration.

Of course, the interests of origin and destination states may change over time. From the point of view of origin states, different kinds of interests are there to be highlighted even though the fear of losing citizens by promoting dual allegiance is always there. First, there is an obvious economic interest in guaranteeing remittance flows. Projects developed by hometown associations are a means of capturing collective remittances. These projects can meet emigration state interests in developing infrastructures, improving local municipalities, etc. Another kind of economic interest is to benefit from emigrants' knowledge resources, as in the case of the diaspora engagement policy of New Zealand towards highly-skilled emigrants (Gamlen, 2012). Second, several political interests are at stake, like defending emigrants' rights abroad but also developing emigrants lobby abroad to support foreign policy agenda. At the civic level, "[…] sending countries seek to align the political practices of nationals abroad with the policy agenda of the government in the country of origin" (Østergaard-

Nielsen, 2003a). They want emigrants to be good ambassadors. Accordingly, they will promote lobby organizations, encourage a vote in the host country, which is favorable for the origin country, and spur letter writing campaigns aginst critics of the origin country (ibid.). Their civic integration can, over the long run, serve homeland politics. And, third, improving the country's image abroad can depend on how emigrants are perceived in host countries. Therefore, sustaining migrants' integration in the host country is a strategy even for other policies (tourism, bilateral agreements, economic policies, etc.). However, as Délano (2010) remarked in the case of Mexico immigrant integration is often an "unstated objective" of the state of origin.

The perspective of receiving states is different. Main interests reckon on immigrant integration, even if measures to promote political integration were often implemented later than other integration dimensions. For one decade, immigrants' civic integration is considered as being fundamental in Europe. Indeed, there is a European trend to set up (civic) integration programmes for newly-arrived immigrants (Gsir, 2006). If most of them consist mainly in language courses, they also include civic courses. Civic courses entail a presentation of receiving country institutions, the political system, core values, citizens' rights, etc. Civic courses are not merely symbolic because in some countries the civic course is compulsory, even though the emigrant has shown proficiency in the host country language.

As mentioned above, receiving states can be skeptical about immigrants' civic participation when it is focused on the country of origin. However, they can also try to promote the civic engagement of immigrants in terms of development policies rather than integration policies. This has particularly been observed with the emergence of co-development policies (Østergaard-Nielsen, 2009). In Spain, for example, the Catalan authorities tried to prompt mobilization and creation of migrant associations to sustain development projects in Morocco (ibid.). Finally, receiving states may also have some "unstated objectives" not in terms of the integration of immigrants but rather connected to their participation in development. Current trends in Europe show efforts to reduce or to limit integration costs. This is carried out through pre-departure integration measures (Scholten *et al.*, 2012) or by emphasizing that migrants have to bear full responsibility for integration. This strategy is similar to the one adopted regarding immigration control namely externalization, in other words outsourcing to external actors.[4]

In conclusion, both the interests of receiving and origin states can converge or diverge according to the internal politics. Regarding development issues, they converge. Some receiving states aim at involving immigrants in development projects in countries of origin. They see immigrants as potential development agents (Faist, 2008). And emigration states are very much interested at maintaining remittance flows of any kind. Then hometown associations can be a relevant point of departure for observing transnational civic activities. Furthermore, emigrants may also present interests that conflict with the emigration state or home society (Faist, 2007, 2008; Itzigsohn and Villacrés, 2008). According to Faist, Fauser and Reisenhauer (2013) even though emigrants can gain power through hometown associations projects, "the interests of migrants are most often focused more strongly on participation in the politics of the immigration state."

6. Assessing the impact of country of origin on civic participation

This paper focused on how links with the origin country and transnational links can affect immigrants' civic participation in the destination country, taking migrant civic engagement as a measure of integration. Nevertheless, as already mentioned, integration and in this case civic integration in the host country cannot be understood by isolating one factor, be that factor in the emigration country or transnational ties. Several factors may raise the civic capital of the migrant and none of them are in

---

[4] In the case of immigration control, see Guiraudon and Lahav, 2000.

relation with the country of origin. It is crucial to never forget the importance of the context of settlement in the political integration process (Morales and Giugni, 2011).

Here I considered immigrants' civic participation in a broad sense and not exclusively engagement regarding receiving society issues. Indeed, even from the receiving country, migrant can engage with the country of origin in civic terms. I assumed that any civic engagement could empower the immigrant and foster integration in the receiving society, even if indirectly. Therefore, the definition proposed by Martiniello and Lafleur (2008) regarding immigrant political transnationalism might be adapted to civic transnationalism and reformulated as followed:

"Immigrant *civic* transnationalism covers any *civic* activity undertaken by migrants who reside mainly outside their homeland and that is aimed at gaining political power *and increasing civic participation* or influence at the individual or collective level in the country of residence or in the state to which they consider that they belong."

This definition manages to link activities and their potential effects on civic participation both in the emigration and in the immigration country. One could argue that even other types of civic activities can have an impact on civic participation. This is certainly true. However, this paper has to be considered as a first step in research into the role of transnational links on civic participation.

The literature gave some insights about the actions undertaken by actors in the country of origin to engage diaspora and about the transnational civic links developed between them and the emigrants. Three kinds of actions affecting civic participation in the receiving country need to be highlighted accordingly and their relevance might be tested in further research (INTERACT survey):

- Instigating the creation of organizations in particular migrant organizations such as hometown associations or bi-national national associations
- Sustaining migrant organizations such as hometown associations or bi-national national associations
- Empowering the civic capacities of emigrants abroad

Several cases highlighted the way in which transnational activities can have an impact in the receiving country. "Individuals who are active in this organization [migrant organizations] often move on to become active in other civic organizations" (Brettell, 2005). Morales and Morariu (2011) talked about "different spillover effects on migrants' political engagement in the receiving society depending on the type of skills they acquire or need to develop." These spillover effects affect civic skills and mobilizing capacities (ibid.). "Immigrant organizations are also spaces where civic skills can be developed; indeed, participants learn about American ways of organizing, including fundraising, in these contexts" (Brettell, 2005). Engagement in immigrant organizations contribute to social integration because they give opportunities for interacting with natives and for creating social networks (CEV 2006). And, as already mentioned, political power and influence and public visibility benefit from this kind of civic engagement (Brettell, 2005).

The table below gives a summary of the elements at stake when considering the impact of the country of origin on migrant civic participation in the receiving country. First, "the country of origin" has been used all through this paper as a broad term which covers several actors namely state, non-state and mixed actors (see the Table 1). These actors undertake different actions targeting the emigrants or they maintain or develop transnational links with them such as transnational civic activities. In the bottom portion, emigrants residing in the receiving country can get involved civically. Their civic participation has been taken into account within different types of organizations: mainstream organizations; migrant organizations and in particular hometown associations because they are an important place for sustaining links with the country of origin; and, bi-national associations. The space in between indicates the different actions and transnational civic activities that can influence civic participation.

Tab. 1

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN	
STATE ACTORS	**NON-STATE ACTORS**

Government institutions (Agunias, 2009)
   1. **Ministry of diaspora**
   2. **Ministry of diaspora included in another ministry**
   3. **Other national institution**
   4. **Local level institutions**
 	
Consular networks
	Political parties
	Trade unions
	Associations
	NGOs
	Religious institutions
	Medias

MIXED ACTORS	

Quasi-governmental institutions (Agunias, 2009)
   1. **Foundations**
   2. **Advisory councils**	

ACTIONS AND TRANSNATIONAL CIVIC ACTIVITIES	
• Instigating the creation of organizations (hometown associations; bi-national) • Sustaining organizations • Empowering emigrants	

Mainstream organizations	Migrant organizations hometown associations	Bi-national associations

EMIGRANTS' CIVIC PARTICIPATION IN THE RECEIVING COUNTRY

Acknowledgements

7. References

Agunias, Dovelyn (ed.) (2009) Closing the Distance. How Governments Strengthen Ties with Their Diasporas. Washington, MPI.

Ahokas, Laura (2010) Promoting Immigrants' Democratic Participation and integration. Tampere, EPACE Publication.

Aleksynska, Mariya (2011) Civic participation of immigrants in Europe: Assimilation, origin, and destination country effects, European Journal of Political Economy, 27(3), 566-585.

Association for the Study and Development of Community (September 2002), Lessons Learned About Civic Participation Among Immigrants,
http://www.racialequitytools.org/resourcefiles/washingtonarea.pdf

Bada, Xóchitl, Jonathan Fox and Andrew Selee (ed.) (2006) Invisible no more. Mexican migrant civic participation in the United States, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Bauböck, Rainer (2003) "Towards a Political Theory of Migrant Transnationalism", *International Migration Review*, 37(3) 3,–723.

Bauböck, Rainer and Thomas Faist (eds) (2010) Diaspora and Transnationalism. Concepts, Theories and Methods. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, IMISCOE Research Series.

Bosswick, Wofgang and Heckmann Fredrich (2006), Integration of migrants: Contribution of local and regional authorities, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Dublin, http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2006/22/en/1/ef0622en.pdf

Brettell, Caroline (2005) "Voluntary organizations, Social Capital, and the Social Incorporation of Asian Indian. Immigrants in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex", *Anthropological Quarterly*, 78(4) 853-882.

CEV (2006) INVOLVE Involvement of third country nationals in volunteering as a means of better integration, final project report (2006), European Volunteer Centre

Cordero-Guzmán, Hector (2005) "Community-based organisations and migration in New York city", Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 31(5), 889-910.

de Haas, Hein(2006) "Engaging diasporas: How governments and development agencies can support diaspora involvement in development of origin countries", a study for Oxfam Novib, Oxford: International Migration Institute, University of Oxford.

de Haas, Hein (2007) "Between courting and controlling: The Moroccan state and 'its' emigrants", Working Paper No. 54, Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, University of Oxford.

Délano, Alexandra (2010) "Immigrant Integration vs. Transnational Ties ? The Role of the Sending State", Social Research 77(1), 237-268.

Délano, Alexandra (2009) "From Limited to Active Engagement: Mexico's Emigration Policies from a Foreign Policy Perspective (2000-2006)." International Migration Review 43(4), 764-814.

DeSipio, Luis (2002) "Immigrant Organizing, Civic Outcomes: Civic Engagement, Political Activity, National Attachment, and Identity in Latino Immigrant Communities", paper 02'08, Center for the Study of Democracy, University of California, http://repositories.cdlib.org/csd/02-08

DeSipio, Luis (2011) "Immigrant Incorporation in an Era of Weak Civic Institutions: Immigrant Civic and Political Participation in the United States", American Behavioral Scientist, 55(9), 1189-1213.

Ekman, Joakim and Amnå, Erik (2009) Political Participation and Civic Engagement: Towards A New Typology, Youth and Society (YeS), Working Paper 2.

Faist, Thomas (1998) "Transnational social spaces out of international migration: evolution, significance and future prospects", *Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, 39(2), 213-247.

Faist, Thomas (2007) Transstate Social Spaces and Development: Exploring the Changing Balance between Communities, States and Markets", Discussion Paper, International Institute for Labour Studies.

Faist, Thomas (2008) "Migrants as Transnational Development Agents: An Inquiry into the Newest Round of the Migration-Development Nexus", Population, Space and Place 14, 21-42.

Faist, Thomas, Fauser, Margit and Reisenauer, Eveline (2013) Transnational Migration. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Fox, Jonathan and Bada, Xóchitl (2009), "Migrant Civic Engagement", Research Paper Series on Latino Immigrant Civic, 3, 1–20. http://www.wilsoncenter.org/publication/invisible-no-more-mexican-migrant-civic-participation-the-united-states

Gamlen, Alan (2006) "Diaspora Engagement Policies: What are they, and what kinds of states use them?" Working Paper 06- 32, Compas, University of Oxford.

Gamlen, Alan (2008) "The Emigration State and the Modern Geopolitical Imagination", Political Geography, 27 (8), 840-856.

Gamlen, Alan (2012) "Creating and destroying diaspora strategies: New Zealand's emigration policies re-examined", Transactions 38, 238-253.

García Zamora, Rodolfo (2005) "Migración internacional y remesas colectivas en Zacatecas", Foreign Affairs in Spanish 5 (3), 43-53.

Giugni, Marco and Morales, Laura (2011) "Conclusion: Towards an Integrated Approach to the Political Inclusion of Migrants", in Morales, Laura and Giugni, Marco (eds) Social capital, political participation and migration in Europe. Making Multicultural Democracy work? Basingstoke-New York, Palgrave Mac Millan, 262-274.

Gsir, Sonia (2006) Les dispositifs d'apprentissage de la langue du pays d'accueil pour les primo-arrivants en Belgique, en Europe et au Québec, Rapport destiné au Service de la langue française du Ministère de la Communauté française de Belgique, unpublished.

Gsir, Sonia and Martiniello, Marco (2004) Local Consultative Bodies for Foreign Residents: A *Handbook*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe.

Guarnizo, Luis E., Portes, Alejandro, Haller, William (2003) "Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action among Contemporary" Migrants, American Journal of Sociology 108(6), 1211-1248.

Guiraudon, Virginie and Lahav, Gallya (2000) "A Reappraisal of the State Sovereignty Debate The Case of Migration Control", Comparative political studies 33 (2), 163-195.

Itzigsohn, José and Villacrés, Daniela (2008) "Migrant political transnationalism and the practice of democracy: Dominican external voting rights and Salvadoran home town associations", Ethnic and Racial Studies 31 (4),664-686.

Kastoryano, Riva (2000) "Settlement Transnational Communities and Citizenship", International Social Science Journal 52(165), 307–312

Kleist, Nauja (2008) "In the name of diaspora : between struggles for recognition and political aspirations", Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 34(7), 1127-1143.

Koopmans, Ruud and Statham, Paul (2001) "How national citizenship shapes transnationalism. A comparative analysis of migrant claims-making in Germany, Great Britain and the Netherlands", Revue européenne de migrations internationales 17(2), 63-100.

Lafleur, Jean-Michel (2013) Transnational Politics and the State. The External Voting Rights of Diasporas. New York-Abingdon, Routledge.

Levitt, Peggy (1999).Towards an Understanding of Transnational Community Forms and Their Impact on Immigration Corporation. Paper presented at the Comparative Immigration and Integration Program, University of California at San Diego.
http://migration.ucdavis.edu/rs/more.php?id=47_0_3_0

Levitt, Peggy and de la Dehesa, Rafaela (2003) "Transnational Migration and the Redefinition of the State: Variations and Explanations", Ethnic and Racial Studies 26(4), 587-611.

Martiniello Marco (2009) Immigrants and Their Offspring in Europe as Political Subjects. In J. Hochschild, Jennyfer and Mollenkopf, John (eds.) Bringing Outsiders In: Transatlantic Perspectives on Immigrant Political Incorporation, Cornell Univ. Press, 33-47.

Martiniello, Marco and Lafleur, Jean-Michel (2008) "Towards a transatlantic dialogue in the study of immigrant political transnationalism", Ethnic and Racial Studies 31(4), 645-663.

Morales, Laura (2011) "Conceptualizing and Measuring Migrants' Political Inclusion", in Morales, Laura and Giugni, Marco (eds.) Social capital, political participation and migration in Europe. Making Multicultural Democracy work? Basingstoke-New York, Palgrave Mac Millan, 19-42.

Morales, Laura and Giugni, Marco (2011) "Political Opportunities, Social Capital and the Political Inclusion of Immigrants in European Cities", in Morales, Laura and Giugni, Marco (eds) Social capital, political participation and migration in Europe. Making Multicultural Democracy work? Basingstoke-New York, Palgrave Mac Millan, 1-18.

Morales Laura and Jorba, Laia (2010) "Transnational links and practices of migrants'organisations in Spain", in Bauböck, Rainer and Thomas Faist (eds.) Diaspora and Transnationalism. Concepts, Theories and Methods. Amsterdam, University Press of Amsterdam.

Morales, Laura and Morariu, Miruna (2011) "Is 'Home' a Distraction? The Role of Migrants' Transnational Practices in Their Political Integration into Receiving-Country Politics", in Morales, Laura and Giugni, Marco (eds.) Social capital, political participation and migration in Europe. Making Multicultural Democracy work? Basingstoke-New York, Palgrave Mac Millan, 140-171.

Morales, Laura and Pilati, Katia (2011) The Role of social capital in migrants' engagement in local politics in European cities, in Morales, Laura and Giugni, Marco (eds.) Social capital, political participation and migration in Europe. Making Multicultural Democracy work? Basingstoke-New York, Palgrave Mac Millan, 87-114.

Moya, Jose (2005) "Immigrants and Associations: A Global and Historical Perspective", Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 31(5), 833-864.

Orozco, Manuel and Rouse, Rebecca (2007) "Migrant Hometown Associations and Opportunities for Development: A Global Perspective", Migration Information Source, February.

Østergaard-Nielsen, Eva (2001) The Politics of Migrants' Transnational Political Practices, Paper given to the conference on Transnational Migration: Comparative Perspectives. Princeton University, 30 June-1 July 2001

Østergaard-Nielsen, Eva (2003a) International Migration and Sending Countries: Key Issues and Themes, in Østergaard-Nielsen, Eva (ed.) International Migration and Sending Countries: Perceptions, Policies and Transnational Relations, Basingstoke-New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 3-30.

Østergaard-Nielsen Eva (2003b) Turkey and the 'Euro Turks': Overseas nationals as an ambiguous asset, in Østergaard-Nielsen, Eva (ed.) International Migration and Sending Countries: Perceptions, Policies and Transnational Relations, Basingstoke-New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 77-98.

Østergaard-Nielsen, Eva (2009) "Mobilising the Moroccans: Policies and perceptions of transnational co-development engagement among Moroccan migrants in Catalonia", Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 35(10), 1623-1641

Pantoja, Adrian (2005) "Transnational Ties and Immigrant Political Incorporation: The Case of Dominicans in Washington Heights, New York", International Migration 43(4), 123-44.

Penninx ,Rinus (2004), "Integration processes of migrants in the European Union and policies relating to integration." Presentation for the Conference on Population Challenges, International Migration and Reproductive Health in Turkey and the European Union: Issues and Policy Implications, held in Istanbul, October 11/12, 2004, http://www.esiweb.org/pdf/turkeynetherlands/RinnusPenninx.pdf

Perrin, Nathalie and Martiniello, Marco (2010) Beyond the Core Conflict: New Minorities, New Confrontations and New Policies, Final Report of the Work Package 5 of the Research Project International Civil Society Forum on Conflicts (infocon).

Portes, Alejandro (1999) "Conclusion: Towards a new world – the origins and effects of transnational activities", Ethnic and Racial Studies 22 (2), 463–77.

Portes, Alejandro, Escobar, Cristina and Radford, Alexandra W. (2007) "Immigrant Transnational Organizations and Development: A Comparative Study", International Migration Review 41 (1), 242-281.

Portes, Alejandro, Escobar, Cristina and Arana, Renelinda (2008) "Bridging the gap: transnational and ethnic organizations in the political incorporation of immigrants in the United States", Ethnic and Racial Studies 31(6), 1056-1090.

Ramakrishnan, Karthick and Viramontes, Celia (2006) "Civic Inequalities: Immigrant Volunteerism and Community Organizations in California", San Fransisco, Public Policy Institute of California

Ready Timothy, Knight, Roger and Chun Sung-Chan (2006) "Latino Civic and Community Involvement: Findings from the Chicago-area Survey," Latino Research @ ND3 no. 4.

Rivera-Salgado, Gaspar, Bada, Xóchitl and Escala-Rabadán, Luis (2005) "Mexican migrant civic and political participation in the US: the case of hometown association in Los Angeles and Chicago" (paper presented at the seminar Mexican Migrant Social and Civic Participation in the United States), Washington DC, November 4-5, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/publication/mexican-migrant-civic-and-political-participation-the-us-hometown-associations-la-and

Schmitter Heisler, Barbara (1985) "Sending Countries and the Politics of Emigration and Destination", International Migration Review 19(3), 469-84.

Scholten, Peter W.A., Entzinger, Han, Kofman, Eleonore, Hollomey, Christina and Lechner, Claudia (2012) Integration from Abroad? Perception and Impacts of Pre-Entry Tests For Third Country Nationals, Prosint, Comparative report.

Schrover, Malou and Vermeulen Floris (2005) "Immigrant Organisations", Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 31(5), 823-832.

Skocpol, Theda and Fiorina, Morris (eds.) (1999) Civic Engagement in American Democracy. Washington, D.C., Brookings Institution Press.

Snel, Erik, Engbersen, Godfried and Leerkes, Arjen (2006) "Transnational involvement and social integration", Global Networks 6(3), 285-308.

Somerville, Will, Durana, Jamie and Terrazas, Aaron (2008) "Hometown Associations: An Untapped Resource for Immigrant Integration?" Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute.

Turner, Simon (2008) "The waxing and waning of the political field in Burundi and its diaspora" Ethnic and Racial Studies 31 (4), 742-765.

Sonia Gsir

Vogel, Dita and Triandafyllidou, Anna (2005) "Civic activation of immigrants – An introduction to conceptual and theoretical issues", POLITIS-Working paper 1. Migration 41(3), 22-48.

Weiner, Myron (1985) "On International Migration and International Relations", Population and Development Review 11(3), 441-455.

Xiang, Biao (2003) "Emigration from China: A Sending Country Perspective", *International Migration*, 41(3), 21-48.