



**UNRISD**

UNITED NATIONS RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

---

**Gendered Migrations, Livelihoods and Entitlements in  
European Welfare Regimes**

Eleonore Kofman, Middlesex University, UK

April 2005

Prepared for the UNRISD report  
Gender Equality: Striving for Justice in an Unequal World

**DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENT**  
Do not cite without the author's approval



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

Current research programmes include: Civil Society and Social Movements; Democracy, Governance and Human Rights; Identities, Conflict and Cohesion; Social Policy and Development; and Technology, Business and Society.

A list of the Institute's free and priced publications can be obtained by contacting the Reference Centre.

UNRISD, Palais des Nations  
1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland

Tel: (41 22) 9173020  
Fax: (41 22) 9170650  
E-mail: [info@unrisd.org](mailto:info@unrisd.org)  
Web: <http://www.unrisd.org>

Copyright © United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD).

This is not a formal UNRISD publication. The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed studies rests solely with their author(s), and availability on the UNRISD Web site (<http://www.unrisd.org>) does not constitute an endorsement by UNRISD of the opinions expressed in them. No publication or distribution of these papers is permitted without the prior authorization of the author(s), except for personal use.

## **CONTENTS**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1. GENDER AND IMMIGRATION CATEGORIES**

- 1.1 Patterns of migration
- 1.2 Labour Migrations
- 1.3 Family-linked migration
- 1.4 Asylum and refugees

#### **2. WELFARE, LIVELIHOODS AND MIGRATION**

- 2.1 Livelihoods and Welfare
- 2.2 Sectors of Employment
  - 2.2.1 Domestic work
  - 2.2.2 Skilled in feminised sectors
  - 2.2.3 Community and Inter-cultural
  - 2.2.4 Self employment
  - 2.2.5 Sex trafficking and trade

#### **3. CHANGING IMMIGRATION AND SETTLEMENT POLICIES AND STRATIFIED RIGHTS AND ENTITLEMENTS**

- 3.1 The Development of a Managed Regime of Migration
- 3.2 Managed Migration, Stratification and Entitlements
  - 3.2.1 Skilled/Less skilled/ Undocumented
  - 3.2.2 Family Reunification and Asylum
  - 3.2.3 Entitlements and Obligations
  - 3.2.4 Entitlements, Racism and Cultural Difference
- 3.3 Transnationalism, Social Mobilities and Entitlements

### **CONCLUSION**

## INTRODUCTION

In a previous era of mass, though far less restricted, migration from the 19<sup>th</sup> century until the First World War, Europe supplied by far the largest contingent of migrants. From 1880 to 1930, 40 million left the continent for the Americas and European colonies (Castles and Miller 2003: 56)<sup>1</sup>. Similarly intra-European migration was considerable until the Second World War. So though unwilling to acknowledge the significance of immigration and the contribution of migrants, European societies and states have a long history of immigration, both from neighbouring areas as well as from far-flung colonies throughout the world. In the initial post-war period until the stoppage of mass labour migration, distinct migratory regimes (colonial, hybrid, guestworker), defined in terms of the mode of entry, rights of residence and status of migrants, were characteristic of European countries (Kofman et al 2000: 46-56). The more expansive colonial regime, as in the UK, not only brought in workers but also whole families. Though attenuated, colonial links have left their imprint on migratory regimes in a number of European states, including those which in the earlier period had been countries of emigration, such as Portugal and Spain. Entry and/or access to citizenship may be facilitated for individuals with direct links to the country of origin or from former colonies. Historical and cultural attachments continue to attract students and skilled migrants from erstwhile colonies. Other states too have had privileged links and favoured access to the labour market for some migrants. The Nordic countries, and in particular Sweden as the largest economy, have since the 1950s operated as a regional unit. Germany too, though pursuing a guest worker regime premised on the rotation of single migrants unencumbered by family responsibilities, has since the end of the 1980s, received large numbers of ethnic Germans who have immediate access to German citizenship.

However just as the role of immigration in Europe has been marginalized, so too has an historical amnesia befallen female immigration. Yet as Hania Zlotnik (2003) points out, the percentage of female migrants in Europe (as in other developed regions) was already high (48.5%) in 1960. Indeed, amongst migrants from the Caribbean and the European periphery (Ireland and Southern Europe), many women migrated on their own or as workers with their spouses, often leaving their children behind. As with traditional societies of immigration, Europe states permitted family reunification from the 1970s, whilst entire families from former colonies also settled in states such as the UK, France, Netherlands, Belgium and Portugal.

---

<sup>1</sup> At this time the US was an important net recipient of immigrants and relative to population, its gross migration rates between the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century and the WWI were double what they are today. Thus it is not that contemporary globalization has necessarily generated higher rates of migration but that the number of states involved and their interdependence has been considerably extended from the earlier period of mass migration.

**TABLE 1**

Proportion of women in immigration flows in selected EEA countries, 1999  
(unless otherwise indicated)

	Proportion of women in immigration flows, % of total	Average annual growth since 1990 <sup>1</sup>
Austria (1998)	46.5	--
Belgium	50.7	0.9
Denmark (1998)	49.7	0.4
Finland	50.3	1.4
France <sup>2</sup>	52.8	0.4
Germany	41.3	-0.1
Greece (1998) <sup>3</sup>	56.8	0.3
Luxembourg	46.4	-1.1
Netherlands	49.1	1.7
Norway (1998)	50.1	0.1
Portugal <sup>3</sup>	48.6	4.3
Spain (1998)	50.1	0.4
Sweden	51.6	0.9
Switzerland	49.8	1.2
United Kingdom	50.6	0.2

Note: Data refer to people (excluding nationals for France, Greece and Portugal) who wish to settle permanently in the country.

1. 1992 for Portugal; 1994 for Luxembourg

2. Data relate only to entries of foreigners (excluding refugees and people who benefitted from the regularisation programme).

3. Data relate only to entries of foreigners (excluding returns of nationals).

Sources: Eurostat (New Cronos database); Office des migrations internationales (France).

Since 1989 the spaces of immigration have been modified as the European Union has expanded its borders and deepened integration. Those from the former periphery (Greece, Portugal and Spain) became part of the European Union in the 1980s, thereby enjoying the benefits of mobility and entitlements conferred upon EU citizens. However, as Louise Ackers (1998) has forcefully highlighted, intra-European migration remains profoundly gendered given its assumption of a male breadwinner model and derivative social rights<sup>2</sup>. Rights are accorded to the worker, through whom the rights of family members, including the spouse, are channelled. Furthermore, the low levels of intra-European migration may well partly reflect the continuing difficulty of transferring social entitlements, such as pensions.

<sup>2</sup> Recent legislation has sought to facilitate the movement of non-workers, such as students, spouses. Directive on Rights of Residence of Community Citizens 2003.

Another round of enlargement of 10 countries in Eastern Europe and Mediterranean islands (Cyprus and Malta) took place in May 2004<sup>3</sup>. Immigration from Eastern and Central Europe has been a contentious issue such that the UK withdrew at the beginning of 2004 from their initial willingness to open up labour mobility and have adopted a more restrictive policy requiring registration and delayed access to a range of benefits. Elsewhere a transitional period of up to 7 years for full mobility has been imposed. Nevertheless, these migrants can circulate for periods of up to 3 months within the existing boundaries of the EU without the need for visas. Though under-studied (Krieger 2004), East-west movements in Europe have contributed to new ways of viewing the relationship between livelihoods, entitlements and gendered migrations. Even without the right to reside permanently or work, many migrants have developed strategies to accumulate resources from short-term and rotational stays in what Mirjana Morokvasic (2003) depicts as a pattern of ‘settled in mobility’.

During the past decade, patterns of migration (countries of origin, types of migration, duration) have become more diversified and stratified in line with the general globalization of migration (Castles and Miller 2003). Diversification and accrued stratification emerged most forcefully in Europe at the beginning of the 1990s, with continuing and new geopolitical conflicts in neighbouring regions in Eastern Europe, Middle East and Africa. States responded to increasing numbers of asylum seekers by generating a range of statuses, each with attendant rights (Kofman 2002; Morris 2003). From the beginning of this decade, some states, and especially the UK and Ireland, selectively opened up their economic routes of entry, whilst further enacting highly restrictive legislation against asylum seekers. Labour migrants too encountered differential rights and entitlements according to their utility to the economy and social esteem (see section on Changing Immigration and Settlement Policies). Hence whilst IT workers and domestics were both in short supply, the former enjoyed the rights attached to the skilled unlike those working in low status employment in the household.

Compared to the earlier post-war period of very distinctive migratory regimes, the current harmonisation of European Union policies has led to some convergence, particularly of family reunification, the control asylum and illegal immigration<sup>4</sup>. However, the common management of labour migration and its opening up within an orderly and rational system have been less successful. Populist and political opposition, especially amongst right wing parties, to labour migration and concerns about high levels of youth unemployment, especially amongst those of migrant origin, have prevented a sustained increase in Northern European countries. In the UK, vitriolic attacks by some of the popular press

---

<sup>3</sup> Following an agreement in 2002 with the EU, Switzerland too has been incorporated into the EU migratory space although various economic and social rights will only gradually come into force for EU nationals in Switzerland between 2004 and 2014.

<sup>4</sup> A number of immigration experts argue there has been convergence of immigration control policies in industrial democracies, especially in relation to asylum seekers and illegal immigration (Widgren 1994) in Europe in recent years. Others (Meyers 2002) contend that immigration control among Western receiving has been similar for over a century. In recent years, with the opening up of skilled migration in the UK, on the one hand, and restrictions on family migration in the classic immigration states of Australia, Canada and US, convergence has become more apparent.

and the Conservative Party succeeded in putting immigration back on the electoral agenda in early 2005.

In Southern Europe the shortage of labour has been recognised in several less skilled sectors (agriculture, construction, hotel and restaurants and the household) and this has led to the development of quotas, albeit totally inadequate to meet the real shortages. And throughout Europe as elsewhere, migrant women underpin the globalisation of care and social reproduction (Hill Maher 2004; Mills 2003; Poster 2002), yet except for the most skilled in the education and health sectors, the role of migrants is undervalued. Nonetheless, as the section on Welfare, Livelihoods and Migration shows, an increasing proportion of female migrants are engaged in biological and social reproduction in the household, the community, the private sector and the state. The over-representation of Third countrywomen ie. those with a citizenship from a state outside the European Union in devalued sectors of the economy, both as legal and undocumented migrants, has profound consequences for their entitlements compared to homestate women.

Many formal rights and claims to entitlements are taken for granted by citizens of the European Union but for migrants, rights may be legally withheld, be subject to conditionality and be discretionary. Their relationship to entitlements, defined as access to resources, and covering material, social and symbolic dimensions, is more problematic and constrained by lack of rights. It is therefore not just a matter of the inability to exercise rights but formal exclusion, which is sanctioned by immigration, residence and employment regulations.

Some of the key areas differentiating citizens and migrants are: the right to enter, conditions of residence and unlawful presence in the territory, security from deportation, the rights and conditions of family life, employment, including access to the public sector, self-employment and the liberal professions, access to citizenship and the ability to make the transition from one legal, residence and employment status to another. Formal dependency may be sanctioned through immigration legislation, a situation which particularly affects migrant women. They are bound as family members by a probationary period in most European states and in a few cases not permitted to enter the official labour market in the first few years, for example in Germany. Thus for an increasing number of migrants, their lives are constrained by their tenuous status and their limited claims to welfare entitlements.

This paper focuses on the livelihoods and entitlements of Third Country women in different welfare regimes, and who enter on their own for work and education, as family migrants or as asylum seekers and refugees. It primarily focuses on first generation migrants, that is those who were born in another country. In many European countries the term migrant is both narrower and more extensive. Narrower in the sense that too often a 'migrant' is someone from a Third World country with value systems different to prevailing European norms. Frequently, migrant women, and especially if Muslim, quintessentially exemplify the weight of tradition. Recent immigration and integration policy has evolved around the idea of "immigrant islands outside the social consensus" who need to be integrated (German Federal President Johannes Rau). At the same time,

‘migrant’ may, in states such as Austria, Germany and Switzerland, be applied to all non-nationals, many of whom have been born and educated in the country<sup>5</sup>. In this case it is difficult distinguishing those of migrant origin from recent arrivals.

The paper is divided into three sections. The first section outlines the gendered characteristics of different categories of immigration (labour, family, asylum) which are internally differentiated. The second section turns to migrant livelihoods and examines the influence on the nature of female employment patterns of migration in five countries with different welfare regimes. The third section evaluates the differential impact and outcomes of immigration, residence and citizenship regulations on women migrants.

The countries selected for a fuller analysis of gendered migrations, livelihoods and entitlements are positioned differently in terms of welfare and migratory regimes. The typology of welfare regimes is largely drawn from the influential model proposed by Gosta Esping-Andersen (1990) but modified to take account of their recent trajectory in the 1990s (see section 2 Welfare, Livelihoods and Migration). Sweden has a social democratic welfare regime and has mainly received family reunion migrants and large numbers of asylum seekers since the stoppage of labour migration in 1972. Germany is a conservative corporatist welfare regime, which originally drew its migrants from the Mediterranean as guest workers based on an ethnic and exclusionary model of incorporation. Following the end of the bipolar world, its migrants have increasingly come from Eastern Europe while the numbers applying for asylum have on average been the highest in Europe. France, also a conservative corporatist welfare regime, has a long history of waves of immigration, both from neighbouring states and its colonies in North and West Africa and South East Asia. Spain could also be said to have become a conservative Southern rim welfare regime. Its immigration history is more recent and diversified than countries in Northern Europe. Colonial links too play a part in migratory patterns, though its proximity to North Africa and the opening up of Eastern Europe have shaped its recent migratory patterns. Lastly, the UK, a welfare regime in the vanguard of neo-liberal measures, which has been profoundly marked by its colonial ties in its migratory patterns and policies. As subjects, the population from its colonies were incorporated in the post-war period until 1981 as citizens. The implementation of neo-liberal policies in the 1980s contributed to the reduction of investment in professional training, eventually resulting in severe shortages, not just in information technology but also in many social and welfare occupations. Additionally, the UK sees itself positioned

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

[https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5\\_21314](https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_21314)

